

# Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring

---

## Meeting Minutes

Friday, July 19, 2019

8:00 AM – 1:00 PM

### Meeting Locations:

#### Video Conference

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Road Las Vegas, NV	Las Vegas Board Room
Department of Education	700 East Fifth Street Carson City, NV	Carson City Conference Room

### 1. Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance

Dr. Michael Maxwell, Commission Chair, called the meeting to order on Friday, July 19, 2019 at 8:15 AM.

*(Note: The audio portion of the meeting was muted for the Pledge of Allegiance and Agenda Item 2 - Roll Call)*

### 2. Roll Call

**Quorum was not established (4 Board Members present)**

**Commission Members present in Las Vegas:** Michael Flores, Douglas Garner, Michael Maxwell

**Commission Members present in Carson City:** Matt Morris

**NDE Staff Present in Las Vegas:** Dr. Willie Killins, Rose Cota, Gabby Lamarre

**NDE Staff Present in Carson City:** Dr. Jonathan Moore, Sarah Nick

**Others in Attendance:** Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Deputy Attorney General David Gardner, Mollie Latham, Antonus Pullum, Cameron Miller, Marina Negrofonte, Dr. Douglas Garner, Tiffani May

### 3. Approval of Flexible Agenda (For Possible Action)

Because quorum was not established, this action item was not put to a vote. Dr. Maxwell stated that they would operate the working session with a flexible agenda as this best suited their needs.

### 4. Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Maxwell welcomed the group to the table and stated there were a number of items they needed to go through. He said he wanted to get Member input and opinions on these items, knowing that at the next Commission meeting they will be able to vote on them and then hopefully be able to move a lot faster as far as accomplishing the things that need to be done by the Commission.

### 5. Approval of June 21, 2019 Meeting Minutes (For Possible Action)

Because quorum was not established, this action item was not put to a vote.

## 6. Public Comment #1

Ms. Molly Latham from BBBS reported that one of the projects that My Brother's Keeper has been working on is assessing community attitude of law enforcement. They are working with Dr. Tara Raines to craft a "proper" survey for administration. It will be available for administration both in English and Spanish and both electronically and in paper. They've already engaged some community partners for distribution such as the Southern Nevada Health District. They are targeting back to school fairs for administration of this survey, and they would like to collect as many completed surveys as possible. They are dovetailing on the work of Dr. Terry Mitzi [phonetic] at UNLV who got them started with some good information from one of his research projects, and then they are building upon that. They will be distributing both link and electronic paper copies for those people that want to distribute it that way, but they just encourage everyone on the Commission to distribute the survey far and wide and collect them prior to September. And then that task force will develop appropriate community engagement opportunities to try to improve relations between particularly youth and law enforcement.

## 7. Review of AB235 p.6 "Commission Charge" (Information/Discussion)

Dr. Killins provided a review of AB235, highlighting page 6 of that bill. It identifies the specific areas that the Commission is to cover with regard to its service task.

**Item 1:** establish model guidelines and parameters for existing mentorship programs, including, without limitation:

(1) The development of a model management plan for setting forth guidelines for the operation of mentorship programs and strategic goals and benchmarks to measure the success of a mentor program.

**Item 2:** the process for identifying children in need of mentorship and geographic areas of need within the state.

Such a process must include without limitation: (1) Children who are disproportionately at risk of being deprived of the opportunity to develop and maintain a competitive position in the economy. (2) Children that are disproportionately at risk of failing to make adequate yearly progress, AYP, in school in this state. (3) Children that have been involved with the system, the juvenile justice system, in this state. (4) Children that have been involved with the criminal justice system in the state either as a victim or as an offender. And (5) Children that are currently in the welfare system.

**Item 3:** develop a model fiscal plan that provides for the sustainability and fiscal stability of mentorship programs.

Dr. Killins said the moral imperative that individuals have on the Commission is to serve the students and the children and families of the state. They have much work to do.

## 8. Work Session Focus/ Vision for Nevada Statewide Mentoring (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Dr. Killins explained the concept of **community agreements** to Members and asked that they consider using these community agreements as a moral gauge to motivate them in their work ahead. He listed the understandings of community agreements:

- 1) The Commission is here to establish a community vested in collaboration with the willingness to develop and implement strategies that will benefit all. We define community as a group of individuals coming together under a Commission established by the Governor of Nevada charged with supporting a facilitating mentorship programs in the state of Nevada that focus on mental health and family wellness, criminal justice and employment and academic capacity building. Those points are in the language AB235.
- 2) We are all present with the mindset of transforming through the community which we have just defined.
- 3) We engage this work without hubris and find value and critical analysis toward realizing and sustaining a lens for continuous mentee/mentor opportunity, outcomes and organizational improvement.

## Work Session (continued)

- 4) We tell our truth as we know it and will listen for the truth of others.
- 5) We will attempt to make meaning and be open to outcome through shared airtime.
- 6) We will be unapologetically transparent about the needs of the community.
- 7) We will hold community members accountable.
- 8) We will approach the development and implementation process with commitment rather than just compliance. Commissioner Morris asked where do they want to incorporate the community agreements? They sound more like the mission/purpose/value statement in their bylaws. What's the role for these sorts of statements.

Dr. Killins said the community agreements are simply a way to begin a meeting and tie everybody to the purpose of the Commission. It is not to replace anything in the bylaws. It is not to supplement anything. It is just to be something to guide the spirit of conversation for the Commission. They're sort of a brief statement instead of going back through the by-laws, going back through mission statement definitions and things like that. There's no need for any kind of formal adoption of the community agreements.

***Note: Agenda Items Number 9, 10, 11, and 14 were incorporated in the active work session that took place after Agenda Item 8. Individual Agenda Items were not parsed out in a formal manner in the meeting; it was not announced that the meeting was moving from one Agenda Item to another. However, Agenda Items 9, 10, 11, & 14 were deliberated thoroughly in the roundtable discussions that followed.***

### 9. Work Session Action Plan and Timeline (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Discussion took place during work session following Agenda Item 8.

### 10. Infrastructure Plan

Discussion took place during work session following Agenda Item 8.

### 11. Mentoring Focal Points Plan

Discussion took place during work session following Agenda Item 8.

The work session started when Dr. Killins asked Attorney General Gardner to give them some background about how the Commission will turn over over based on AB235.

Deputy Attorney General David Gardner started off by clarifying Section 4 of AB235. It says, "As of July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019, any member who is currently on the Board as of July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019, your term has ended." That does not mean that you were kicked off. What that means is that there is a new appointing timeframe, which means that the appointees that are the same that were previously, get to appoint new people. It means the Governor appoints three. The legislative leaders appoint four. There are two superintendents for Washoe and Clark and then there are four this Commission will then choose. After all those nine are picked, they will pick another four, and those 13 will be the members of this Commission. That needs to be done, according to the bill, as soon as possible. Appointments tend to take awhile just because there are a lot of appointments, but they're supposed to be done by October 1<sup>st</sup>. Just because it has to be done by October 1<sup>st</sup> doesn't mean that anybody chosen between now and October 1<sup>st</sup> has to be

## Work Session (continued)

replaced. What that means is that anybody appointed after July 1<sup>st</sup> is going to be on the Commission for at least one to two years.

Section 4 of the bill says that there are going to be a staggering of terms. All terms have been changed to two years, but there's going to be the nine that are appointed by the various groups, the Governor, the superintendents and the legislative leaders, are going to draw lots. Five will get one year, four will get two years. And that will be determined, once again, after all nine of those have been appointed.

It says the superintendent. It does not say designee. That can be interpreted two different ways. Sometimes in statute that is interpreted as just the superintendent. Other times because it says "superintendent" they're allowed to put a designee. Deputy Attorney General Gardner's interpretation would be that a designee would be allowed.

Dr. Killins asked if there was an official new sponsor for the bill that's listed with legislation? Deputy Attorney General Gardner said Assemblyman Thompson's name was not removed, so he would still be the sponsor of the bill. Assemblywoman Neal took the reins to move this bill forward and she was the presenter of the bill, but the sponsor would be former Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson.

Dr. Killins asked about working with state legislators since AB235 talks about legislators not being a part of the Board. Is there a legal process, open meeting process, that they need to be aware of moving forward. This could set precedence for having other folks come in and really add value to work sessions.

Deputy Attorney General Gardner responded that the Commission could have pretty much anybody they like come in. Former Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson birthed this Commission, but he was never on the Commission. He was never a member. Assemblywoman Neal did the same this last session by making sure this bill got through. But as such, they are not on the Commission. They don't have a vote on the Commission. They are at best, members of the public or helpers. There are all sorts of things they can do to help, but any member of the general public can come to these kind of meetings. And if the Commission wants to give them a position on their agenda, they can do that too.

Assemblywoman Neal said it should never be an issue if she is sharing task information or data with the Commission. She plans to continue to share, because at the end of the day she wants to see AB235 manifest in a real way. And there are no rules about helping someone get their legislation together, and nobody can tell her that there's public policy that says the opposite.

Dr. Killins said some of this information is new, so in terms of him identifying the legislators and communicating with them to get the process started is something he will take on. He said he would get a letter drafted early next week, get it to Ms. Lamarre and Ms. Lamarre will forward it on to Dr. Moore and then the process will start.

Dr. Killins said he would propose they create a protocol so that there's no ambiguity in-between working with the Commission and sharing information. If they have a protocol for working with the Commission, and then they have other people who can follow that protocol as they bring people in, it will take away from some of the shadow that can be cast and really open it up to individuals to come in and share freely. It would just be the Commission with the protocol, bringing individuals in, maybe talking about their specific reason for participating with the work session, vetting them and really sticking with the flow of presentation or whatever that they committed to doing to

## Work Session (continued)

add value to what the Commission is trying to do. Dr. Killins said he would take the responsibility of drafting a protocol for that if it were the will of the Commission.

Dr. Maxwell said going forward as far as the Commission is concerned, he wants to be able to take that input, that influence, that guidance from any Assemblyperson or any member of the legislature. When they go through the process of getting appointees and so forth, they've never really engaged those folks that are in the legislature who made their appointments. The Commission should not only engage the folks who are making the appointments, but ensure that transparency goes throughout, and it should be something that everyone can see everything that the Commission is doing so that there is no sense of appearance of things being decided by legislators and so forth. The Commission should make sure that they engage everybody that is in the legislature, the community and so forth.

Assemblywoman Neal asked as a sitting legislator, what protocol needs to be established for her to share information so that everybody can be clear who's in status in NDE.

Dr. Killins said a person like himself who is officially identified as an EPP, Educational Programs Professional for the Nevada Department of Education; they have been told that they do not communicate directly with legislators. That's why he was suggesting that they craft a NACOM protocol for bringing in individuals that are outside of the Commission. He doesn't see how the Department of Public Instruction can be as effective or reach its potential without having hand-in-hand with the legislators or the grassroots community people. A NACOM protocol would take away anything that might be ambiguous so that they can just move the work forward and not have to deal with anything like this at all.

Assemblywoman Neal said they could "put a nail in this." Absent any protocol, she will figure out how to deal with what's going on in NDE.

Ms. Gaby Lamarre said they have new leadership. With new leadership, comes new protocols, comes new processes. And so what they have to do as NDE staff is learn to navigate those new protocols and processes. The new administration is a couple months in, and so they just want to make sure that they are being inclusive, and they are getting the ideas from everybody in the community. They need to make sure that they are adhering to new leadership processes and protocols that they have. She proposed going up their chain to talk to Dr. Moore, Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement about this matter.

Dr. Maxwell clarified that that proposal is something that will happen within NDE. As far as the Commission is concerned, everybody that's outside of the Commission is a member of the community. They can give their input, but it's actually the Commission itself that determines the agenda, that determines where they're moving as far as goals and objectives. The Commission is now at the point where they can move forward, they have the relationships that they need to have as far as the support from NDE and moving forward with getting their full appointees to the Commission. The Commission will be able to operate as an entity without having to worry about if where input is coming from and making sure that they follow all of the policies, guidelines, whatever may be, and those informal ones, such as the leadership of the Commission or how the Commission operates amongst its members. They now have some clear lines of delineation as far as NDE is concerned, as far as legislators are concerned, and then as far as the Commission is and how they operate.

Dr. Killins said to get their work started he would like to use a "**tuning protocol**" to guide the presentation process. He explained a tuning protocol is a way to have a structured conversation about an idea, a concept or a plan in a

## Work Session (continued)

way that is nonthreatening for the presenter because you come with the spirit of moving the plan forward. Using the upcoming presentation by Assemblywoman Neal as an example, he outlined the steps of the tuning protocol. The tuning protocol starts when Assemblywoman Neal does her presentation. Then what will happen is they will ask clarifying and probing questions. After that question section, what they'll do is have what's called a fishbowl. Assemblywoman Neal will sit outside the group and listen attentively and take copious notes while they address what they heard, what they didn't hear and how they can move this wonderful outline forward into the plan that they have. The next piece is they'll take a few minutes to just pause and reflect, and then they'll bring Assemblywoman Neal back for the reflection. And she'll talk about how she saw the plan kind of grow and move forward. This also consists of identifying a guiding question. So the guiding question for this presentation will be: can we see how Assemblywoman Neal's outline can align to the charge of the Commission? With that, he welcomed Assemblywoman Neal to the microphone.

Assemblywoman Neal explained she created the Mentoring Commission outline when she was trying to figure out how to take the Commission charge and think through some detailed things of what the Commission may need to establish and think about. She had Members do a side-by-side comparison of the Commission charge and the Mentoring Commission outline while she gave her presentation so they could see where those pieces fit in. On Assemblywoman Neal's outline, she was trying to match her Roman Numeral I up with sub (a) on line one from the Commission charge, which is establish model guidelines or parameters or existing programs. And (a)(1), so (a) and (a)(1).

So what is it that they need to do? Research says there are three kinds of mentoring groups, and when they break down mentoring models, they needed to figure out how to fit AB235 into what is going on.

Assemblywoman Neal's thoughts were to establish mini grant categories and processes for applying if the organization does one-on-one mentoring, group mentoring or combined model of mentoring and setting an allotment for each type. She thought that was important because not all models are the same, so not all mini grant models would be the same because what your objective and what your goal is will be different.

Assemblywoman Neal's Roman Numeral II seemed like it was line 6 in the Commission charge which was your sub (2), the process for identifying children in need of mentorship and the geographic areas within the state. And so, Assemblywoman Neal's Roman Numeral II was an attempt to try to get at line 6, which was establishing the goals that they want the organizations to meet.

There are four areas of the Commission. What are the unmet needs and what do they want the mentoring organization to do in terms of completing their outcomes? The idea around this was they don't want a mentoring group out there who is not focused on an unmet need. They're probably already doing a need, but if they were a new organization, the Commission needs to be really clear about what do they want the mentoring group to do. When Assemblywoman Neal laid out the a, 1 through 6, and then broke it down, she really wanted to get at what kind of documentation evidence model, what the Commission would like them to have, what are the target populations, age, demographics, established for each of those categories (the one-on-one mentoring, the group mentoring, the combined model). The Commission must define the specific focus and have exact expectations.

## Work Session (continued)

What kind of staffing would the Commission like the groups to have? The reality is mentoring groups are not a one-size-fits-all, so there could be many different variations for staffing. What kind of resources would the Commission like the groups to have? In terms in in-kind resources, that in-kind can make up the difference for an organization, your volunteers, the grants that you may already have, the community partnerships that may already exist. But the Commission needs to spell out what they would like to see.

How does the Commission want the RFP to look and what criteria do they want established for a grading system? What are the metrics? If the Commission puts out an RFP for a mini grant, they need to have a rubric; they need to have a grading system that says they met point A, B, and C. And then because it has to be transparent and it has to be public, people have to be aware they were graded on this model and this is why you lost, or this is why you won.

Assemblywoman Neal's number 6 is really broken down if you look through a through f. When she thought through what an RFP should at least attempt to consider, she included the incorporation of advocacy, the teaching role of the mentors, the parent engagement components or staffing, the mentoring matching system, background checks, facilities or services or partnership for facilities.

Assemblywoman Neal said she was able to kind of reach into the Commission charge because curriculum development and establishment of curriculum all fits into line 35 sub (c) which is develop model protocols for recruitment, screening, training, matching, monitoring and support of mentors.

And then ability to leverage resources, external partnerships and do they want to make organizations have a logic model? What does the Commission want the groups to walk in with and what do they want to make sure that they are responsible for?

Assemblywoman Neal's number 7 was built from line 37 on the Commission charge, sub (d), which was, develop model protocols for effective management of mentors, mentees and matches under mentorship program. And so the Commission needs to develop metrics, forms, progress reports and final reports and setting up templates. These are spelled out a through f and include youth centered metrics and the closure of the mentee relationship. There are also provisions of structured youth activities, proof of final curriculum, and final establishment of external partnerships and proof of leveraged resources.

At the end of the grant what does the Commission want groups to turn in? What do they want to see in terms of outcomes? There should be certain things groups need to turn in to document their efforts.

Assemblywoman Neal's number 8 was the process for notification of the award, eligibility for reapplying if failure occurs and process for subgrant and partnerships. Those things need to be spelled out by this side of the house going forward so there's not a question because if you apply for the RFP and you are not eligible, how do you reapply? That can't be a myth. That needs to be an actual policy. That needs to be spelled out. There needs to be a process if they say well, I plan on giving \$500 to this other group, who's going to help me complete this youth centered activity, you need to have that process spelled out for those individuals. And you need to be clear about what are the partnerships or the type of partnerships that you would like to see. If you're saying well, an in-kind partnership is okay or a private, public partnership, whatever, the thing is it still needs to be spelled out from this side of the house going forward.

Assemblywoman Neal's Roman Numeral III was pulled from line 30, sub (5). And line 30, sub (5) said identification of potential strategic private partners to assist in implementation and continuation of mentorship programs. There's no way the Commission is going to get a year conference off without those partnerships. The Commission is not going to get categories of excellence to move mentoring organizations forward without partnerships.

## Work Session (continued)

Assemblywoman Neal said when she referred to categories of excellence to move mentoring organizations forward, it's about figuring out how does the Commission want to segment and deliver their agenda which should carry forth a mission and it should complete areas which should tie into the four areas, but it should be what is the level of excellence that the Commission is trying to establish within the mentoring community. That really needs to be spelled out.

In regard to the conference, whatever they design and deliver should ensure that people walk away with something of value. They walk away with a toolset or a vision or hope or a continuation that they will continue to strive for excellence within mentoring.

Assemblywoman Neal's (c) is just a continuation of identifying external partners for the conference because the Commission didn't get a lot of money, which means there needs to be in-kind or who's going to get something for free.

Assemblywoman Neal's (d) and (e) is a continuation, and then e, in the actual Commission charge there was a marketing which was line 32, sub (6), marketing and advertising plan for the conference. Whatever Members plan on doing in terms of the conference is the thing that legitimizes the Mentoring Commission. And however it is marketed and however it is advertised and plan for, that conference is going to be a true representation of their agenda.

Assemblywoman Neal's Roman Numeral IV was pulled from line 18 in the Commission charge, 18 sub (b), the professional development, grant-writing seminars, strengthening the nonprofit status through formal legal structure. There are some entities out there in the community who are functioning and don't have a formal legal structure because they don't know how to do it, but they've just been doing it.

Assemblywoman Neal's (d) was accounting practices for nonprofits when they receive grants. The Commission needs to have a clear accounting practice and if necessary, train the non-profits how to do it. (e) was creating the metrics and tools to show the outcomes, meaning what does it look like when they turn it back to the Commission? Not everybody knows how to assign their goals a metric. Not everybody even knows just how to show the simple outcomes. They may be used to just giving you a paragraph. But that may not be what you desire and that may not be what you seek. The Mentoring Commission is supposed to strengthen the mentoring organizations to be able to maintain themselves in the community and build an infrastructure for themselves so that they are strong on their own because they got help.

Dr. Killins asked a clarifying question and then a probing question. Was Assemblywoman Neal aware of any existing processes that the Commission can take in terms of grantee/grantor process that already exists that they can just bring in? What type of database activities should the Commission be engaged in so that the next two years when the Commission goes back to the legislative session maybe they can build a case for more money for more individuals who can be hands-on and do this work.

Assemblywoman Neal said for database activities you list all of your organizations. You list all of your grant awards, and you need to be able to lay out outcomes for each award that was met, and you need to tie all of those back to the four areas. And so it could be as simple as a chart that you create. It could accompany a graph. It could



## Work Session (continued)

accompany a bar chart, it could be an Excel sheet, but you need to have a structured process. Everybody on the Commission needs to be able to read it, apply it and use it.

An unidentified speaker said he definitely liked the idea about how they tie all this into the summit. He also liked the goal of making organizations self sufficient so they are able to support themselves. The Commission needs to figure out from a marketing standpoint how to make that a part of their messaging. Since they are working on a state level, maybe they should also work with Barbara Cegavske, Secretary of State, and her office and the work that they do to help nonprofits get legitimized and through their process through the state to be a part of this conversation.

Ms. Tiffani May asked would be would this be a good time to bring in the community agreements.

Assemblywoman Neal said yes, but the community agreement that was discussed at the beginning was more a modus operandi. It really is like a hope statement. But the Commission needs an actual structured RFP. The vision and an RFP are totally different because the community agreement of what you expect an organization to do needs to be crystal clear. The expectations will differ based on the model. There's nothing wrong with having subcategories and having a broad vision with subcategories and saying well this RFP is tweaked this way and the second RFP is tweaked that way and the third RFP is tweaked this way, and here are the terms and the things that you agree to meet. But it must be spelled out first.

The same unidentified speaker said that within the National Mentoring Partnership the Center for Research and Mentoring Excellence is funded by OJJDP. That is OJJDP's research arm. And OJJDP are the big dogs in funding mentoring work in our country. And so when you take the effective elements for mentoring and when you apply for OJJDP funding, that is what's required typically in their RFP. You take the elements and then you outline how your service delivery model and standards of practice fit into that matrix of the effective elements of mentoring. If the Commission is moving forward to becoming an affiliate of the National Mentoring Partnership, this is absolutely the framework they should use.

Commissioner Morris thanked Assemblywoman Neal for putting all the hard work into this, and said her outline looks awesome. He said he was glad that they also talking about the OJJDP because that is an \$80M conversation. Nevada needs to leverage their mentoring programs to compete for those grant dollars, and NACOM has to have a role in that. And so to the extent that they need to put their own matrix together and their own rubric for grant eligibility, he agrees that they just need to mirror what is working on the Federal level as much as possible and replicate that so that NACOM can be more effective at competing for those funds. Commissioner Morris said there is a Congressional Research Service Report that gives an overview of these programs and he will send that out to all of the NACOM members at the end of the meeting so everybody can kind of have an idea about what those programs look like. He suggested including a specific item for the next meeting in terms of somebody putting together a draft rubric and something that the Commission can look at next meeting that relates back to the DOJ grant program so they can keep the progress and keep the momentum going.

Dr. Garner asked if they were going to become an affiliate of the Mentor program? Assemblywoman Neal said yes, because the legislature already allocated money (\$125,000) for that specific program. This news came as a surprise to everyone. Assemblywoman Neal explained there were negotiations that happened during the session. They asked for a million dollars to come on board to partner with Assemblyman Thompson in his bill and Majority Leader

## Work Session (continued)

Benitez Thompson negotiated and brought the number down to about \$125,000 that they would be paid. They have already been paid. NACOM just needs to access that relationship and bring them on board.

Commissioner Flores said whether it was in the bill or not, it's what NACOM put on the record. They put on the record that they are locked in and saying they've negotiated with this organization for X amount of dollars.

Commissioner Morris said he didn't know that they received any funding, but if they did, then that was legislatively appropriated and this goes back to kind of what they were talking about at the beginning in terms of the Commission's relationship with the legislature. NACOM is legislatively authorized, and has to report to the legislature. If the legislature decides to appropriate funds, that's a legislative prerogative. The Mentor organization is sort of the only player on the national level when it comes to mentoring programs, and they provide a lot of the research and a lot of the sort of academic and scholarly resources for commissions like us that we need to sort of take advantage of.

Ms. Kasina Douglass Boone shared some history. Two years ago she and Assemblyman Thompson hosted a mentor affiliate brunch to kind of talk about what the organization was and how it ran, and after that meeting, Assemblyman Thompson thought that it would be a great idea to bring the information back to the Commission. And during that time, they presented it at the very first meeting, so if you can go back, everything that they offer is embedded in that first meeting agenda after the conference. This was something that Assemblyman Thompson really wanted to do with Mentor.

Dr. Killins said a lot of thought went into Assemblywoman Neal's outline, and he can clearly see how these particular components align to moving the initiative forward. The work comes now with itemizing where they put particular pieces of her outline into the scope of work. Their focus areas are family engagement and wellness, juvenile justice and employment, and finally academic capacity building.

Dr. Killins reflected on some of Assemblywoman Neal's thoughts. He liked her points about the methodology that some of the grant organizations would come with. He agreed that the charge of the Commission is actually to support existing organizations and new, which comes with a workload of technical assistance, seminars and things like that. NACOM should be creating some type of technical assistance platform so that they can raise up grassroots organizations and make sure that they're fully functioning and help them dive into a particular methodology for mentoring. He said he heard her talk about the in-kind donations, that is also part of the bill where it talks about the Commission is able to partner with any private or public entity of its choice. The Commission is also able to identify volunteers, public servants or consultants, non-paid, to do this work. So if you are a Commission member and you are doing this work outside of the Commission, wouldn't it be great to be able to do in-kind work to help build the Commission with your organization? In regard to a rubric, it has to be a tool where they can identify certain conditions and really see where organizations fall on them. And then determine how to build capacity into them. Assemblywoman Neal said if you apply for the RFP and don't get it and want to reapply, what do you do. Dr. Killins said that's a great opportunity for capacity building, going back to technical assistance, professional development, and what he sees as a culmination of all of that leading into a Nevada certification for mentoring. And then finally, Dr. Killins thinks the Commission should exercise its ability to operationally define what affiliate means to the Commission and how that definition can add value to identifying the work or organizations to do the work.

## Work Session (continued)

Dr. Garner said first, they need to get a handle on what their availabilities are within the affiliate. NACOM is an affiliate now so they need to start reaching in and finding out what they have access to in terms of that affiliate process.

Ms. Douglass Boone suggested that she send out an email to all with the Mentor presentation. That way everyone can look at it to see what Mentor presented, and pull things out for the Commission as they start to build capacity for the mentor affiliate. They will know what Mentor is supposed to do or be giving to NACOM for that \$125,000.

Dr. Killins said if money's been paid, there should be some type of running record in legislation, a receipt itemized, talking about what it is and who was paid and why. So that's got to exist. They've got to identify that moving forward.

Dr. Maxwell agreed and said they need to find out if there was something that was locked in when that negotiation took place at \$125,000. They may say this is what you get and that's it. And then the Commission can respond to that. Right now NACOM is in a position of reacting instead of being proactive. They need to find out exactly what was involved or included in that \$125,000.

Assemblywoman Neal said she would reach out to fiscal staff to track down what was agreed upon, if there was a contract, because clearly nothing has filtered down to the Commission. Because something had to be sent over in order for them to be paid. The Assemblywoman said she would track down the documents, and then email them the details.

Dr. Maxwell expressed his appreciation and asked if the Assemblywoman could also find out from the beginning if they started at a million what in the world were they supposed to get for a million, and then ultimately what do they get for the \$125,000.

Dr. Maxwell suggested pulling up the Minutes from the meeting where the presentation was made. They could then examine the proposal or the presentation that was delivered at the first meeting. They know ultimately no matter what happened with that \$125,000, they're going to ask Mentor to be a support for the Commission.

Dr. Killins said he would like to volunteer to take Assemblywoman Neal's outline and kind of put it into the large buckets of the tasks that are identified for the Commission, and do that prior or while Assemblywoman Neal is digging out the literature around the payment to that organization group because that might be work that they do. But at least they'll have the ball rolling on their end in the event that it is not.

Assemblywoman Neal reflected on their conversation and what she heard: the Commission is working on the four areas of focus or what is called the focal points, tiered process for capacity, help dive into a methodology, in-kind donations, creating a rubric, determine how to build capacity, how to reapply if you are denied the grant, technical assistance and operationally define affiliates.

Dr. Maxwell said the Minutes from the December 2018 Strategic Planning Meeting documented that they had started discussing those items the Assemblywoman mentioned. Dr. Maxwell said he thinks they need to do another round of strategic planning, but that does not necessarily mean they have to have a strategic planning meeting. He wants to establish a work group. He does not want to put it all on NDE. They can align the outline together with what was done in December during the strategic planning meeting, and from that they can formulate a document, a working document, a strategic plan, for what they're going to do this year, where do they see ourselves in five years, and they've already started talking about some of that. The Commission has talked about a certification for mentoring organizations. That's something that will take two, three years to put together. But it starts with some of

## Work Session (continued)

the work that they do this year. So they need to have an actual strategic plan with short-term goals and going out long-term. It is critical to draft that strategic plan.

Dr. Maxwell asked if there were volunteers for the work group. Volunteers were: Dr. Killins, Dr. Maxwell, Tiffani May, Kasina Douglass Boone, Mollie Latham, Antonus Pullum, Cameron Miller, and Assemblywoman Neal. Dr. Maxwell said because it is going to be a Subcommittee, they would have to follow Open Meeting Laws and so forth. He will put it on the agenda for the next meeting for the work group to discuss their goals.

Ms. May asked if they would be identifying grant resources that are specific to the need, not just a program? Dr. Killins responded that's part of the technical assistance. So coming up with some equitable process that allows an individual or an organization, whether it's a billion-dollar mentor organization or \$15 mentor organization trying to grow, they should be able to create, and this goes back to create process that build capacity. What they need to do now is have a game plan. What is the action plan moving forward.

Dr. Maxwell said with the formation of the work group, he thought they would definitely have an action plan by the next meeting. They will have that strategic plan based off of the foundation that they've already built.

Dr. Maxwell gave an overview of the program that the city of Las Vegas uses for YNAPP (Youth Neighborhood Association Partnership Program) grants. He said it is a roadmap for mini-grant distribution. They can replace "youth" in the definition with "mentoring organization." So NACOM is encouraging mentoring organizations to invest in their communities by addressing a need for mentoring. They can develop those parameters. To qualify for funding, projects must meet criteria NACOM sets. Groups must fill out an application using ZoomGrants which is a grants management software that NDE has. There are already experts that can walk folks through ZoomGrants if there are ever any questions. Groups can qualify for carrying mini-grant amounts, set by NACOM. And Number 3, Item II (a) sub item 3, defining specific focus, project narrative, what is expected. Other questions: What should be considered for demographics? Is it just going to be the mentoring group itself? Is it going to involve family members? Do the youth have to be involved? What are those parameters.

Ms. Douglass Boone shared her experiences using ZoomGrants. She said it is very easy and user-friendly. If the Commission is looking to utilize ZoomGrants for those organizations that are actually applying for grants, this will be a great way for them to get into the system and kind of have some understanding as to how it works. So it's a great idea.

Dr. Maxwell said they would have to figure out what their Board process would be or what their Board formation would be. They could establish a Board and once the Board is established, they would have their protocols and criteria. The Board goes through the criteria. If everyone is in agreement, this is what we're looking for, then each of the applicants actually comes and does an in-person presentation. They need to get into the habit of making some formalization of the process and things that they will be using later on, and they're talking about mentoring groups.

Dr. Maxwell walked through several of the YNAPP projects including: Vikings Care Projects, CC Ronnow Leadership for a Family Fitness Night, LION's Pride Clothing Closet for a clothing closet at the school, and Leaders in Training, they had Little Leaders provide free tutoring.

## Work Session (continued)

Dr. Maxwell showed Members how to access the application online and explained how Zoom Grants tracks everything as far as mini grants are concerned. Everything is put into this system and it's all there for everybody to track. It's transparent.

Ms. May said from her experience with ZoomGrants, everything is pretty much built into the functionality. There are frequent indicators that you get for reporting. In reporting you can upload documents that you need, receipts, all that kind of good stuff. And with each report, there's a requirement. Step requirements could be having your volunteer contributions, your in-kind donations, purchasing requests, holding you accountable to what you actually put in your grant in the first place and aligning with what you're actually done. So all that reporting is within ZoomGrants as well. ZoomGrants can also be used for an application process; that is also a database that can be used for that.

Ms. Lamarre said she and Dr. Killins would have to look into which department in their NDE office specifically uses ZoomGrants and get the details on it. She said if ZoomGrants doesn't work out, they also have their own grants management system at the agency that they use, and probably the Commission could use that.

Dr. Maxwell said ZoomGrants would also be a tool to help organizations reapply in the event they are not awarded the first time around. They're already in the system and the Commission can give specific feedback on their applications.

Dr. Maxwell said once they have the criteria set, they will have management software (either ZoomGrants or another system) to move forward with it. So it's a matter of them deciding how they are actually going to do the mini grants, and that will come out of some of the work that the work group does. Between the YNAPP and using ZoomGrants, they have the operational management ready to go. It's just a matter of tailoring it to NACOM's criteria.

Dr. Killins said he was pleased that there were ways they could leverage and navigate things that already existed with organizations, things that are in the city, to bring into the infrastructure for NACOM. They don't want to repeat work that's already been done, so they will be looking to identify existing structures for the fiscal piece. They're going to look into the affiliate relationship cause that's going to help determine the work going forward.

### **12. Update of Employment of NACOM Mentorship Coordinator as required by AB 144**

#### **Section 5 (e) (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Dr. Killins said part of their charge by Bill AB235 is to participate and kind of facilitate the process of identifying a Coordinator to the Commission. Dr. Killins then introduced Ms. Gaby Lamarre, the Title I Director for the Nevada Department of Education, to share some details.

Ms. Lamarre said that to date, three people have applied for the Coordinator position. They look like they could be a really good, strong fit for the position and have skills and community experience, that passion for mentoring, for working with the youth the Commission is particularly interested in serving. NDE has blocked off three days - July 24<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 to 4:00, Thursday, the 25<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 to 4:00, Friday, the 26<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 to 4:00 to conduct interviews.

### **13. By-Laws Review (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Commissioner Morris detailed the by-laws changes that needed to be made because of AB235. He said he would do a quick overview for meeting purposes and would send out a detailed email later. The changes could be adopted at the next meeting. The changes are:

**Article I.** Need to add subsection (3) just clarifying that the by-laws are adopted pursuant to NRS385.7701, and they constitute the rules and procedures of the Commission. In AB235, that's in Section 2, and subsection (1). "At the first meeting of each calendar year the Commission will elect from its members a Chair, Vice-Chair, and a Secretary and shall adopt the rules and procedures of the Commission." They would add subsection (1) 3 saying that the by-laws are adopted pursuant to that section and constitute the rules and procedures of the Commission. The second change would be all of the references to AB144 would be removed. They just need to take those references out because AB235 is the most recent legislation. Commissioner Morris suggested to just replace those with NRS 385 which is the chapter that governs NACOM.

The second section would be in **Article III** which deals with membership. One of the big changes in AB235 was the membership of the Commission and so subsections (f) through (i), those need to be amended to reflect AB235's changes about not having a legislator be appointed.

There are also changes to 3.3, the terms of membership. They should just say that the terms of service are in accordance with NRS385 because they had three-year terms and now they have two-year terms that are staggered, and just for simplicity they should just say that the terms of membership are in accordance with the statute, NRS385.

There's also in subsection (4) a rotation of terms. Previously they said there would be no rotation of membership and Commission members may be reappointed for additional terms. They just need to add that there are no more than two consecutive terms. That was in 8235, Section 1, subsection (3). They need to add no member may serve more than two consecutive terms.

On Article V, subsection (2), attendance. AB235 states that if a Commission member fails to attend two consecutive meetings of the Commission, that person is going to be removed. The by-laws need to reflect that new requirement. They may want to have in the by-laws a provision that says that excused absences for illness or things like that will not constitute a failure to attend.

Section 5.5 deals with proxies, and it says no proxies are allowed. The Commissioner thought if they could add proxies, that might help them with their quorum challenges.

The last change would be for the Article VII. NACOM adopted the Commission's ability to create Subcommittees and working groups, and one of the things they previously discussed was whether or not they should have a standing Subcommittee for the grant administration. Commissioner Morris thought that was a good idea. One of the great things about having Subcommittees and working groups is that if you can only get a couple of people together, then it doesn't prohibit the Commission from taking action. So they may want to think about adding a standing Subcommittee on grant administration, a standing Subcommittee on strategic planning like Dr. Maxwell was talking about earlier or a working group, and a standing Subcommittee on by-laws changes so that they don't have to keep reappointing those subcommittees at successive meetings and have those as agenda items all the time. If they created the Subcommittees in the by-laws, then they can have folks out there doing the work subject to ratification by the Commission, and they don't have to wait every quarter or however often the full Commission meets. So, that's just an idea to create those standing Subcommittees in the by-laws.

## **By-Laws Review (continued)**

Dr. Maxwell thanked Commissioner Morris for his hard work on the by-laws and said he appreciated that he would be putting everything in draft form for Members to review. Dr. Maxwell asked the DAG if they would be able to vote on the recommendations if they have it on the next meeting agenda? Deputy Attorney General Gardner said yes, they could.

Dr. Maxwell asked about proxies. What was the norm? Deputy Attorney General Gardner said typically when they do proxies, it's kind of a one and done thing, and it tends to be at the approval of the Chair. That's how most of the Commissions handle it.

Commissioner Morris said he thought they could add that specific language in the powers of the Chair so that they don't abuse the proxy provision, but the Chair can approve proxies. It's particularly important for the two superintendents because those positions are not removable positions. They're fixed in the statute. And so for example, if a superintendent misses two meetings, there's no real mechanism to replace that person because the Commission is made up of those positions. They're not appointed. And so it's really important to facilitate that statutory mechanism that they can send a proxy. If you look at Section 1 of the bill, the two superintendents are not appointed positions, and so if they're unable to attend two meetings, it kind of puts NACOM in a Catch 22. So the by-laws should state that the superintendents are able to send proxies and all proxies from whoever have to be approved by the Chair.

Deputy Attorney General Gardner said that the superintendents are exempt from that section of the by-laws just because they are not appointed.

Ms. Douglass Boone brought up the topic of the two youth representatives on the group. They were having difficulty attending meetings due to the time and location of the meetings. When they could attend, they felt lost in the shuffle of what's happening in the room.

Dr. Maxwell thought if they could change their meeting time to 3:00 to 5:00 instead of 2:00 to 4:00, that might help. And then also they could actually assign one of the Commission members to be a mentor for the two youth members. It would almost be a formal mentor relationship with the youth members so that they are developing, and Commissioners are actually exemplifying the mentoring that they are supposed to be supporting in the first place.

Dr. Garner asked if both of their youth members returning? Ms. Boone said neither of them would be returning. Commissioner Morris said when the Commission goes around again and does this process; this is Section 1, subsection (c) of AB235 that the Commission is able to pick two members between the ages of 16 and 24 years old. And so they may want to just emphasize that at the next round, make sure that they know that there's a time commitment, find out what their school plans are, what other activities they're involved in, but try to pick young people who are able to devote the time to be a part of the Commission.

### **14. MENTORING Nevada (Information/Discussion)**

Discussion took place during work session following Agenda Item 8.

### **15. National Mentoring Summit 2019 (Biannual) Delagates Presentation (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Dr. Maxwell said in the interest if time, they would have this discussion at the next meeting.

## **Mentoring Nevada (continued)**

### **16. End-of-Service Communications to Past Affiliates (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Dr. Killins said he wrote a drafted version of a letter for the end of service communications; this draft was in the Board packet. It's pretty short and simple, so the Chair of the Commission can embellish or add specific details to tailor it to the recipients.

Commissioner Morris said he thought the letter was great. He wondered if they could adopt a letterhead for NACOM correspondence.

Dr. Maxwell said it would be great if NACOM had their own letterhead. He wondered if there was a precedent for that as far as advisory Committees or Commissions? He said they didn't actually have to get an answer right now; they could get an answer in the interim before the next meeting. It is important to get the letter out, so at the next meeting they can definitely approve it. And in-between, Dr. Maxwell will get word as far as letterhead, and if the Commission approves it, then they can get those letters out right after the meeting.

### **17. Results/Election of Secretary (For Possible Action)**

Dr. Maxwell said they could not elect a Secretary at this time. No quorum.

### **18. Agenda Item considerations, date, time and location for next meeting (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Dr. Maxwell said he would put the topic of the three new Subcommittees on the next agenda. They will need to get reports out at each meeting from those three Subcommittees. They will have the by-laws to approve. Dr. Maxwell said basically anything that was mentioned today that's recorded, those items can be added to the next agenda. The next meeting is already set. It is August 23<sup>rd</sup>, from 2:00 to 4:00.

### **19. Public Comment #2**

Dr. Killins said NDE hosted a post-legislative session, and it was designed to make everybody at NDE who was working with a particular bill become more intimate with that bill by creating SMART Goals. And it was designed to have participants look at those SMART goals and the process toward getting there and look at where there is common ground amongst other bills and other work.

Dr. Killins took the initiative to develop a culminating SMART goal for NACOM. He also created a whole step-by-step packet. He itemized every portion of the task, the charge on Page 6 of AB235, and then wound up with a culminating SMART goal creating the infrastructure for them to go ahead and get started with their work. The SMART goal reads: "The Nevada Department of Education and NACOM will create a Nevada Mentor Guidance document." That was the culminating takeaway that Dr. Killins saw, through the specific duties and tasks assigned to the Nevada State Mentor Coordinator. So when this person comes in the door, this is one of the things they begin to work on immediately.

"To address each of the measurements for success, identify for completion at 100 percent of an established rubric by NACOM." Assemblywoman Neal talked about metrics. If you go into that document, you'll see they actually added a few measurements and specific goals to meet, and some timelines along with that. But again, the culminating thing is the Nevada Mentor Guidance document.



## Mentoring Nevada (continued)

“Completion is operationally defined as submission of all indicated documents and associated details through a published mentor guidance document, and associated state webinar.” So all of the processes that they are talking about, all of the procedures that they are talking about, should culminate into a state guidance document that will also be in webinar form.

Dr. Killins said he was supposed to talk about the geographic locations for identifying students, so now he would. He had everyone look a table in their packet. At the very top it says geographic locations. There are four conditions that were identified by the bill. Those four conditions are written across the top of that bill. These four conditions are in the bill for identifying geographically where they’re supposed to be doing the work:

1. Individuals disproportionately at risk of being deprived of opportunities to develop and maintain competitive position in the economy.
2. Individuals disproportionately at risk of failing to make adequate yearly progress in school.
3. Individuals that have been involved in the criminal justice system either as a victim or an offender
4. Individuals currently on the child welfare system. The bill identifies an over 700,000 population, so that’s CCSD. Under 700,000 but over 100,000, that’s Washoe. So, it almost tells you where the work pretty much has to be centralized. If the work is centralized like that, if they know that there are four conditions and they know that they have buckets of foci that they have to speak to and they know that the geographic regions are up there, why not, if academic capacity is one of the charges to the Commission, create activities directly aligned to that in these geographic areas which means they’ll be supporting Washoe and CCSD in some way.

They need to do it in a way that’s directly beneficial to the school because that sometimes gets lost. So if they focus directed activities, they name them. Then the identified mentor groups may have to say hey, I can align to that.

Dr. Maxwell said he thought they could align this with the strategic plan, the Nevada mentor guidance stuff. And then on top of that, through the strategic goals, the thing that they have for that year, those are the things that are specifically measurable things that will be up there for that year. And then that folds into the annual report that’s supposed to go to the legislature in February. This also aligns with Dr. Jara’s plan as far as mentors in CCSD. So they can actually say they are aligning themselves with the work that Dr. Jara is doing for CCSD. Dr. Maxwell said he was excited about the prospect of having a formal document to be able to put in front of people and say here’s where we’re going, here’s who we are, what we do, why we’re doing it, and where we’re going.

## 20. Adjournment

Dr. Maxwell thanked everyone for their participation and their hard work, and adjourned the meeting.