

**Reporting and Monitoring Work Group
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
Friday, October 11, 2019
9:30 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
Jim McIntosh
Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler

Work Group Members Excused:

Jason A. Goudie

Department Staff Present:

Megan Peterson, Business & Support Services

Others Present:

Amanda Brown, WestEd
Lindsay Dalley, Community of Education Advisory Board
Meredith Freeman, HOPE 4 Nevada
Linda Jones, Clark County Education Association
Alexander Marks, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA)
Amanda Morgan, Educate Nevada Now

Agenda Item #1 - Call to Order

Work Group Lead Jim McIntosh called the meeting to order at 9:35a.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 Commission Chair 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 Commission. Public comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Commission's jurisdiction, control, or advisory power.

No public comment.

Agenda Item #3 - Approval of Flexible Agenda (For Possible Action)

No formal action was taken.

Agenda Item #4 – Reporting and Monitoring Work Group Organization and Key Tasks (Information and Discussion)

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. The Work Group will review its charge and identify key related tasks and responsibilities.

Review of the Charge

Lead McIntosh reviewed the charge of the Reporting and Monitoring Work Group and invited discussion from the Work Group Members to identify key tasks for the Work Group.

Member Andrew Feuling indicated it would be helpful for the Work Group to provide a visualization of the formula's impact and changes that would be accessible and understood by a variety of stakeholders.

Lead McIntosh referred to the template that would help the Work Group translate its conversation into key tasks, deliverables, and dependencies to culminate in a project plan to be shared with the full Commission. He indicated Member Feuling's recommendation would be added as a key task. Lead McIntosh shared that he believes the two key tasks of the Work Group are the comparison of the old formula and the new formula and monitoring the implementation of the formula. He suggested that the Work Group focus on the reporting component for the purposes of this meeting because it is the nearer term deliverable and monitoring is a longer term concern.

Key Tasks and Deliverables

Lead McIntosh shared that the first key task in the draft project plan is a review of the reporting requirements of NRS 387 and the Work Group Members concurred with the addition of the task to the project plan. Members Casey and Feuling indicated that the deliverable should include a comparison of current reporting requirements and new requirements under Senate Bill 543. The task includes identifying the critical elements of reporting at the state, district, and school levels and documenting the business processes and assumptions that govern the new plan. The Work Group concurred that the support of Applied Analysis would enable them to complete the task.

Member Feuling suggested another key task would be to create a central database of each school with information including enrollment, staffing, demographics, facilities information (square footage, age), etc. This information might not be used immediately but would be beneficial as the Commission considers the impact of different models. Lead McIntosh asked whether the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) already has this information

Megan Peterson, Management Analyst, indicated that some, but not all, of the information Member Feuling referenced is covered in NRS 387 so it is not readily available to the Department and would have to be requested from districts.

The Work Group Members concurred on the need to look at potential impacts of the Commission's work at not only the district level, but also the school level when projecting the distribution of funds under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

Lead McIntosh indicated that Member Jason Goudie, who was excused from the meeting, had shared concerns with Lead McIntosh in advance. The concerns included aspects of the ending fund balance; administrative and operational expenses; the intersection of SB 543 and Assembly Bill 469; funding for magnet students and special programs that are not in SB 543 as weighted categories; student weights; privacy with regard to principals knowing which students are eligible for free-or-reduced price lunch; and the purpose and definition of the budget comparison districts are required to create.

Member Feuling stated that the intent of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP) to have money follow the student is a worthy goal, but may be very difficult to implement and monitor.

Member Lisa Morris Hibbler asked for clarification on the difference between the charges of the two work groups. The Work Group Members discussed the interdependencies and distinctions between their work and that of the Formula and Distribution Work Group; they established a common understanding of their charge and acknowledged that they will have to be mindful of the order in which tasks are completed.

The Work Group discussed their review of the Applied Analysis PCFP model and their interest in understanding the underlying business rules, processes, and assumptions that contributed to the model and, once they have that understanding, they would like to hear from other subject matter experts, for example APA Consulting, on whether the Applied Analysis model was optimal.

The Members discussed identifying a task regarding monitoring the implementation of the PCFP and identifying subject matter experts to support that aspect of their work. Member Morris Hibbler indicated it would be helpful to see what other states that have similar types of funding models are using as monitoring rules and said that it is important to set districts up for success with the necessary mindset shift. Member Casey added that it is important to track whether the reporting is feasible and accurate and understand what NDE is going to outline as the allowable administrative costs of implementation.

The Members discussed that the PCFP has the potential to change how districts operate and that a simple comparison of general fund dollars across the Nevada Plan and PCFP may not account for other changes, for example, money that is applied to student weights that supports districts with dollars for English Learners or children eligible for free-or-reduced price lunch.

With regard to monitoring implementation, Member Casey suggested that making a determination about whether the funding model is "working" is subjective. Lead McIntosh said that whether the plan is working should align with whether it's meeting the guiding principles of Senate Bill 543, including transparency, student-focused, accounting for student and

geographic diversity, etc. Member Morris Hibbler offered that the Work Group can develop a tool or structure to help NDE conduct that monitoring.

Agenda Item #5 – Project Plan Status and Updates (Information and Discussion)

The Work Group will create a project plan to guide their work and ensure that they are positioned to make timely recommendations and reports to the full membership of the Commission on School Funding to meet the deadlines outlined in Senate Bill 543.

Lead McIntosh recapped the Work Group's discussion regarding the key tasks ahead and the resources and supports they anticipate needing to complete those tasks.

Goal: Project the distribution of public school funding of the PCFP under the current biennium

Key tasks:

- Review the current reporting requirements in NRS 387; presentation by Applied Analysis
- Identify the critical elements that need to be reported at the NDE, district, and school level under the PCFP; presentation by Applied Analysis
- Aggregate information from districts including enrollment, staffing, age and number of buildings, on each school in a central database; created by NDE
- Document business rules, processes, and assumptions that govern the PCFP; presentation from Applied Analysis and presentation from APA Consulting regarding their recommendations for components of the model
- Ensure the business rules, processes, and assumptions are working as designed
- Review a detailed reconciliation of the funding outcomes for the school districts under the new plan (level of detail to be determined); review by consultant to ensure Nevada is optimally implementing the PCFP
- Identify the critical processes at the NDE, districts, and schools to ensure the plan is implemented faithfully and ensure NDE, districts, and schools have the resources needed to implement the plan
- Gather information from other districts and states with pupil-centered funding models

Goal: Identify the critical elements to evaluate the PCFP

Key tasks:

- Identify the critical elements and processes that need to be monitored
- Create benchmarks or guidelines about what will be monitored
- Presentation from subject matter experts on best practices of how other districts or states have implemented pupil-centered funding
- Examination of the capacity of NDE, districts, and schools to implement PCFP and the resources needed to do so; deliverable not defined
- Support the final report by Commission of the recommendations for improving the implementation of PCFP and highlighting deficiencies in the implementation of the PCFP

Agenda Item #6 – Future Agenda Items (Information and Discussion)

Lead McIntosh requested recommendations for future agenda items.

The Work Group concurred to request a future presentation by Applied Analysis to include:

- A detailed breakdown of the assumptions made and the methodology behind the model;
- An explanation of how the guiding principles are incorporated into the model; and
- Recommendations as to how the Commission would create a model to compare the Nevada Plan and the PCFP.

Lead McIntosh provided an overview of future meeting dates of the Work Group and Commission.

Agenda Item #7 - 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 #8 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:23a.m.