

Title I Committee of Practitioners

Meeting Minutes

Thursday November 5, 2020

9:00-11:00 AM

Meeting Location: Due to the COVID-19 response and in accordance with Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006; Subsection 1, this meeting was conducted via ZOOM.

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

Chair Valerie Dockery called the meeting of the Title I Committee of Practitioners to order at 9:00 AM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and roll call was conducted. **Quorum was established** (16 members present).

Committee Members Present:

Valerie Dockery
Teresa Stoddard
Teresa Dastrup
Brian Prewett
Karen Holley
Holli Else
Karen Barreras
DeAnna Owens
Candi Ruf
Kelly-Jo Shebeck
Somer Rodgers
Renee Fairless
Sara Jorgensen
Gabby Lamarre
Randi Hunewill
Mary Stach
Kevin Roukey

Others Present:

Carl Wilson, Ms. Miller, Jill Murdoch, Maria Sauter, Cassandra Stahlke, Silvana Gorton, Rhonda Hutchins, Kristina Cote, Daina Loeffler, Yvonne Morris, Emily Champlin, Chris James, Mark Rich, David Boggesson, Dennis Roy, Megan Peterson.

2. Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

3. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for August 13, 2020 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Chair Dockery asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made on the Minutes. Kevin Roukey corrected the misspelling of his name. Kristina Cote corrected the misspelling of her name.

Motion: Approve Meeting Minutes for August 13, 2020 with Corrections

By: Kevin Roukey

Second: Karen Holley

Vote: Passed Unanimously

4. Approval of Flexible Agenda (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Motion: Approve Flexible Agenda

By: Karen Holley

Second: Kevin Roukey

Vote: Passed unanimously

5. NDE Title I Program Updates/Proposed or final State rules or regulations pursuant to Title I Part A (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director and Federal Liaison informed the Committee that they will be receiving the Title I A revised allocations the following month and that there are no major changes. Ms. Lamarre discussed Title I allocations and the USDA waivers and how state allocations will be affected. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that the USDA is currently working on guidance that has not yet been put out but the information she's received from other states points to the fact that this will likely affect next year's within-district allocations as all districts in Nevada are currently using FRL or FRPL as their poverty measure.

Chair Dockery informed Ms. Lamarre that she would like to circle back to this topic when discussing the next agenda item regarding CEP and FRL.

Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that the English Language Development webinars are taking place by the Title III team. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that under ESSA, there were several requirements to support EL students that were transitioned from Title III to Title I.

Mr. Kevin Roukey asked if the webinars were something the committee should sit in on or listen to.

Mr. Carl Wilson explained that the webinars are to share information regarding the English Language Development Standards framework, which is to help teachers in designing instruction to meet the needs of English learners and developing language and accessing content. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee of the dates and times of the webinars and explained that both contain the same content.

Chair Dockery confirmed whether the webinars were two different webinars or just one webinar being presented twice.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Mr. Carl Wilson responded that it is, in fact, one webinar being presented twice.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre commended the school districts for their great work with progress updates. She informed the committee that SSPs were due on November 3rd and that a memo had been sent out with the Title I newsletter along with instructions regarding the Big Horn System. Ms. Lamarre then informed the Committee that the agency will be engaging in the annual process for reviewing CSI school plans starting later in the month and that the process does take a couple of months. Ms. Lamarre informed the committee that districts can expect to receive feedback and begin district-specific meetings possibly in December but more likely in January.

Mr. Roukey asked for some clarification regarding the acronym CSI.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre explained that CSI stands for Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools, which are some of the lowest performing schools across the state.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre reminded the Committee that a handful of districts and the department will be engaging in late January and early February and that the involved districts have been informed and some have been scheduled already. Ms. Lamarre urged Committee members whose district is part of this monitoring who wish to connect to reach out to her for connection and support with the process.

Chair Dockery informed Ms. Lamarre that Carson City has not yet connected with anyone. Chair Dockery expressed her concerns about the deadline being the day after Thanksgiving and asked if it was possible to move the deadline closer to the actual visit.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre informed Chair Dockery that she would be happy to reach out and advocate for an extension again. She cautioned the Committee that she had been told before by the US Department of Education that the existing deadline could not be extended, but informed the Committee that she was happy to try again and advocate for an extension.

Mr. Carl Wilson introduced himself and his background and gave an update on equitable services and other Ombudsman information. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that in September, the Nevada Department of Education made some changes regarding the terms for Ombudsman and private school supports for the state of Nevada, at which time Mr. Wilson was asked to serve as the ombudsman. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that Melissa Schroeder will continue to provide leadership for the state of Nevada around opportunity scholarships and issues related to private school licensing and compliance.

Mr. Carl Wilson discussed the responsibility of the NDOE to prepare a public release of information related to the amount of funding set aside for equitable services under the Student Needs Act. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that the report has been prepared and will be posted in the coming days. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that a similar report will be posted on the NDOE website regarding ESSER funds. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that districts are beginning consultations with non-public school regarding the 2021-22 school year and reminded local education agencies that those need to be scheduled prior to decisions about funding being made.

Mr. Carl Wilson explained that there were concerns regarding the guidance the US Department of Education released regarding ESSER and the CARES Act. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that early in September, the courts ruled that the existing guidance was not in harmony with the law and the final rule was vacated. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that on September 24th, Superintendent Ebert sent an email notifying districts that if they had set aside sufficient funds for the

Meeting Minutes (continued)

equitable services under the US Department of Education's interim final rule which exceeded the amount in setting aside the funds under the Title I equitable services formula that those funds could now be transferred over and used for public school students, teachers, and families, that only the amount under the Title I funding formula was to be required. Mr. Wilson continued on to say that subsequently, the US Department of Education released updated guidance which does reinforce that LEAs are to use the funding mechanism designed by Title I as outlined in Section 117 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the purposes of determining the non-public school equitable services share of funding. Mr. Wilson informed the Committee that a number of districts worked with their non-public schools that were interested and eligible for funds under the interim final rule and included some expenditures that went beyond the minimum amount required under the Title I formula and that the guidance from the US Department of Education does highlight that there is not a requirement to repay. Mr. Wilson did say that the response to that subject is a local decision.

Chair Dockery welcomed Mr. Carl Wilson and publicly thanked Ms. Melissa Schroeder for her time serving in the role in which Mr. Wilson is now serving. Chair Dockery asked Mr. Wilson if the same templates would be used that were provided by Ms. Schroeder or if there would be updates for the 2021-22 school year.

Mr. Carl Wilson responded that the same forms would be used that have been used for the last couple of years.

Chair Dockery asked Mr. Carl Wilson to please clarify the state guidance regarding flow of the money from the district where the private school is located versus from the district where the student lives, and requested some written guidance on this subject.

Mr. Carl Wilson explained that this is an area where the ESSER funds did depart from the Title I wherein Title I indicated that they would work in partnership regarding out-of-district private-school students with the private school's district to rectify this situation.

6. Title 1, Part A Allocations to School Sites (CEP, FRL, Provision II) Update (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director and Federal Liaison discussed the draft survey that she sent out in a past newsletter for feedback. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that no decisions had yet been made as the feedback had not yet all been received and once the information was received, the process would be finalized.

Mr. Kevin Roukey asked for clarification on the acronyms CEP and FRL.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre responded that FRL stands for Free and Reduced Lunch and CEP stands for Community Eligibility Program.

Mr. Brian Prewett asked if there had been any hold-harmless discussion based on the CEP and provision-2 percentages that are anticipated to be lower than usual this year because everyone is getting FAD (phonetic).

Chair Dockery echoed Mr. Prewett's concern and asked other Title I directors from other districts to weigh in on this subject as well.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Ms. Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee that this same question has been raised in other states like Ohio and Oklahoma and that all states, including Nevada, are right now waiting for guidance from the US Department of Education as this is not a decision that can be made at the state level because the funds in question are federal. Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that the US Department of Education is aware that this is an urgent concern and is hopeful that they are prioritizing it.

7. Q&A with the NDE Grant Management Unit (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Marko Markovic, Office of District Support, Grant Management, Unit Support Services

Chair Dockery acknowledged the frustration around budgeting and changes and asked the Committee to be respectful of Mr. Markovic and his time.

Mr. Marko Markovic opened the discussion by acknowledging the concerns regarding the number of revisions that were listed. Mr. Markovic assured the committee that these were listed as a recommended number of revisions and not as a limit of the allowed number of revisions. Mr. Markovic explained that this number of revisions is solely a reference to the number associated with the risk score assessment, and as such, the Department of Education wants to make sure that everyone is successful and not getting a high risk score in this category, which is one of 24 or 25 categories on the risk score assessment. Mr. Markovic discussed defining what should count as a revision for the district versus a revision against the district. Mr. Markovic explained that throughout the process of getting corrections in a budget and waiting for final approval, those changes to the budget are not counted as revisions. Mr. Markovic further explained that any revision requested by NDE will not be counted against districts and that when NDE receives adjustments from the federal government on locations, NDE then asks districts to adjust their budgets accordingly. Referring specifically to Revision 0, Mr. Markovic assured the Committee that NDE is working with program counterparts to ensure that everyone is on the same page, and that anything and everything that may arise is covered and will not potentially be counted against districts. Mr. Markovic explained that NDE is working with their E-Page vendor to add check fields that will provide NDE the ability to override the actual number that is associated with the revision with the goal of the final report at the end of the year showing actual NDE-initiated revisions and actual district-initiated revisions. Mr. Markovic expressed his hope that this will be done by the end of the calendar year and assured the committee that once this is passed as an NDE Rule of practice, districts and district grant offices will be informed. Mr. Markovic requested patience of the Committee as NDE works to get a system that cannot support these changes to a place where they are supported. Mr. Marko informed the committee that any emergency relief funds grants revisions will not be counted at all, that this is a decision that was made at a high level, and encouraged the Committee that he will be happy to place any concerns in the history log in E-Page.

Chair Dockery requested that Mr. Markovic and the Grants Management Unit to provide this information in writing to the committee. Chair Dockery stated the importance of this information being disseminated to Title I directors and grants managers and not just superintendents as currently superintendents are overloaded and information is not currently flowing down smoothly.

Mr. Mark Markovic acknowledged that NDE is aware that information is not trickling down from superintendents to staff and that NDE will be changing their line of communication to ensure that everyone is informed about any changes taking place. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that the rule of practice will be shared in writing, and asked for the Committee's patience as this goes through the proper channels in NDE. Mr. Markovic assured the Committee that once there is approval from NDE, the information will be shared with everyone and that Mr. Markovic will then share the information with his grants counterparts in each district so they will receive the information in a timely manner. Mr. Markovic then informed the Committee that NDE will be going through the first few months where nothing was in place to offset the NDE-initiated revisions and marking them to a later date so that they are not counted against districts.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Ms. Karen Holley commented her agreement with Chair Dockery's statement that communication has been problematic between the superintendent, the CFO, and the grants department and concurred that the Committee needs to be included in the timely dissemination of information.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre interjected that she was monitoring the chat and sees that other districts were agreeing with Chair Dockery and Ms. Holley's comments. Ms. Lamarre informed the committee that Cassandra Stahlke had recommended that a quarterly meeting would be beneficial and invited Cassandra Stahlke to comment.

Ms. Cassandra Stahlke reiterated the fact that she felt a quarterly meeting would be beneficial specifically because of the lag in communication.

Chair Dockery concurred that quarterly meetings would be beneficial, and then returned the focus to Mr. Markovic.

Mr. Mark Markovic informed the Committee that he would be happy to coordinate quarterly meetings, and asked for some time to finish issuing the sub-awards first. Mr. Markovic indicated that meetings could probably start early next calendar year and informed the Committee that he would be interested in hearing the Committee's ideas, suggestions, and concerns so that NDE could help the Committee navigate through various processes.

Mr. Kevin Roukey asked specifically who would be attending these meetings.

Mr. Mark Markovic responded that because these concerns were directly related to the grants management, it was his assumption that the grants staff and/or grants directors would be the primary audience with room for expansion. Mr. Markovic reiterated that he was open to suggestions and as these quarterly meetings would be open to each district, the districts could then identify who should be present as well as program professionals from NDE so that any questions or topics that might arise would be covered.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee that within the chat, she could see that EPPs would like to be included in these meetings. In addition, Ms. Lamarre informed the Committee that Jill Murdoch from Washoe had a question regarding how revisions would be counted within the consolidated application.

Mr. Marko Markovic responded that the agreement from the meeting the day before was that if several revisions were performed for each of the titles, up to four district-initiated would not put districts in the high-risk category. Mr. Markovic reiterated that if the revision was associated with the Title I allocation of additional or fewer funds, that would count as an NDE-initiated revision and would not count against districts.

Chair Dockery informed the Committee that there had been discussion at the previous day's meeting about pulling apart the Consolidated App for specifically those reasons. Chair Dockery asked Mr. Markovic to address substantial approvals.

Mr. Marko Markovic acknowledged that he too has heard several districts express concern regarding the Consolidated App taking too much time to get approved and indicated that NDE is in agreement with this completely given that each of the Consolidated Applications involves multiple types of grants. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that there is ability for HMB to somewhat separate the Title grants within the Consolidate App by redoing the system so that each grant would have individual approval. As such, districts working on multiple Title grants would not be held up waiting for approval for all grants at one given time. Mr. Markovic cautioned that this is currently just an option and awaiting feedback and input from the Title directors and districts.

Ms. Lauren Olin (phonetic) from Washoe County School District expressed her approval for this idea.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Chair Dockery also expressed her approval for this idea from the small-district perspective.

Mr. Marko Markovic reiterated that prior to this happening, NDE needs to have internal conversation with Title directors to make sure that this is allowable prior to going forward.

Chair Dockery informed the Committee that the general consensus within the chat was agreement that this would be very helpful.

Lauren Olin discussed that there is currently no retroactive approval of grants, only substantial or final approval and the date of either of those is how districts move forward. Therefore, if a district does not get substantial approval and only gets final approval later than July, the districts cannot then go back and collect money or pay people with Title funds prior to that date and therefore the districts then need to make those payments out of another funding source. Ms. Olin expressed her opinion that final approval would be fine, but if it didn't happen, then she expressed her hope that NDE would be prepared to go with the substantial approval model as a Plan B as of July 1.

Chair Dockery asked Mr. Markovic to inform leadership that the Committee would like their next meeting to be specific to this topic of substantial approval and requested that it be more of a conversation rather than a dissemination of information so that the best approach could be strategized. Chair Dockery expressed her concern that everyone needs to be on the same page because although NDE is allowing for leeway regarding this topic, the audit team may not be, and this makes this an urgent concern that needs to be addressed soon.

Mr. Mark Markovic assured Chair Dockery that he would bring this concern back to the leadership team and inform them of it. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that what GMU could do to help is to open the FY'22 application the moment the FY'21 consolidated is approved. Then GMU could give a \$1 allocation and let districts work on their applications, input all the information, and then give additional time to have everything in the system prior to even receiving the amount that would be awarded the following year. That way, Mr. Markovic explained, if this is open effective January 1 and districts have everything in by end of March or April, everything can be reviewed and approved by July 1 so that districts are not experiencing this delay.

Mr. Brian Prewett informed the Committee that budget and staff planning in Washoe County take place in January and February because of an overage period, and earlier planning allows the district to get ahead of this overage period.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee that NDE receives anticipated allocations from the federal government roughly in the spring, but does not receive the Grant Adjustment Notification (GAN) until exactly July 1 and therefore, the agency cannot provide final approval until the GAN is received.

Mr. Marko Markovic reiterated his suggestion that GMU could give a \$1 allocation and let districts work on their applications, input all the information, and then everything can be reviewed and approved by July 1 so that districts are not experiencing this delay based on the idea that NDE has a relatively good idea of what the fluctuation in allocation is from year to year.

Chair Dockery indicated that within E-Page, a budget can't be submitted with only \$1 allocated as the system will not push the budget through.

Ms. Maria Sauter commented that federal monies do not necessarily disperse to the state on July 1; the dispersal date is completely dependent upon when the federal government actually signs the budget. Ms. Sauter countered the idea that allocations do not fluctuate much from year to year and used Title II as an example. In addition, Ms. Sauter indicated that with a new administration coming in and the possibility of Ms. DeVos no longer serving as Secretary of Education, there could

Meeting Minutes (continued)

be changes and upheavals in the education budget and therefore flexibility is needed given that there is currently the possibility of major fluctuations at the federal level.

Chair Dockery reiterated the need for another meeting with the GMU in order to create solutions to these potential issues.

Mr. Marko Markovic concurred that budgets cannot move forward to full approval with a \$1 budget but informed the Committee that the GMU can view budgets in draft mode and then once the allocations are received, it should be a very straightforward process to approve said budgets. Mr. Markovic reiterated that this hinges on having everything ready to go by July 1 so that the grant applications can be moved from draft mode to submission mode. Mr. Markovic further stated that if GMU has all the districts' information by April or May, all corrections, adjustments, and clarification could then be done and ready for the district to submit at the moment the full budget is received.

Mr. Brian Prewett commented that based on the amount of work when working in E-Page, the sooner districts can begin, the better, even if they are not able to submit their budget based on the \$1 allocation.

Ms. Karen Holley agreed with Mr. Prewett's comments and added that the dollar allocation will make for a much shorter amount of time if adjustments do need to be made once the actual funds are allocated.

Mr. Marko Markovic informed the Commission that he will be working with OSSS leadership on determining when to open up the application and reiterated that from GMU's perspective, sooner is better than later with the understanding that yes, changes may need to be made upon final allocation of funds. Mr. Markovic explained GMU is working as fast as possible to push everything through and that although this year has been challenging for everyone, GMU is looking for ways to improve their processes and work more efficiently with districts for a better outcome in the future.

Mr. Marko Markovic finished the conversation by informing the Committee that the GMU is working on creating a timeline and tracking blog for all submissions and hopes to have it up and running by the beginning of the next calendar year. He informed the Committee that the link is on the public website, allowing everyone to be able to see where in the application process they are, approval, and the length of time it is taking GMU to approve it. Mr. Markovic informed the Committee that the goal of the GMU is to have a five-business-day turnaround time for approving initial budgets and a two-business-day turnaround for revisions.

8. District and School Performance Plans (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director & Federal Liaison explained that NDE has been working with UPD Consulting on this process for several months and there are three main teams for process and redesign: 1, the strategy team, consisting of district leaders and NDE representatives; 2, the core design team consisting of NDE leaders and district representatives; and 3, the design collaborative team consisting of NDE officers and districts across the state. The strategy team is helping to build out the strategy for the big picture of how this will move forward. The core design team is the group that is taking feedback, setting up focus groups in school districts and NDE, and using best practices to create and build tools such as the SPP template, the district performance plan template, and the comprehensive needs assessment. The design collaborative team will be working on prototype testing and applying the developments of the core design team's tools to better assess districts' strengths, weaknesses, and needs. The design collaborative team will meet once the core design team has information to share or tools ready for testing. The timeline is still a work in progress but NDE hopes to have a pilot in place for the following school year.

Ms. Maria Sauter commented that she is a member of the design team and that her team is meeting once and sometimes twice a week, so the process is moving quickly. Ms. Sauter clarified that her team is prepared to begin observations of and

Meeting Minutes (continued)

receive feedback from people using the tools starting the first week in December. A location and exact date has not yet been chosen. Ms. Sauter also clarified that her team is working not just on tools and templates, but that it is actually an entire process for continuous improvement that is aligned across state and LEAs and schools.

Mr. Brian Prewett asked Ms. Lamarre and Ms. Sauter if there was any new information regarding district performance plans.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre responded that this planning does include the District Performance Plan and the Comprehensive Needs Assessment as well, and that currently the SPP and Comprehensive Needs Assessment are the priority at this time.

Ms. Maria Sauter added that the belief is that the DPP will naturally flow from the SPP design and that everything will come out together and reiterated Ms. Lamarre's comments that the current focus is on the language in the SPPs and the needs assessment.

Chair Dockery, who is a member of one of the teams, indicated that this work is about the process of school improvement planning rather than the completion of a document.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre added that at the end of the process, PD will be provided for the new process and tools that are designed as well as guidance documents and training for using those tools.

9. Federal Program Risk Assessment (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Maria Sauter, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Student and School Support informed the Committee that the purpose of the risk assessment is to identify some areas where both the NDE and the LEAs and other sub-recipients might have weaknesses in their systems when it comes to grant management, both on the program and the fiscal side. Ms. Sauter explained that risk assessment is a requirement at both the state and federal levels for receiving funding. Ms. Sauter explained that all sub-grantees were scored in July and then a report was created. The report includes each entity's scores and results, and that becomes a finalized report for districts or other entities. The report is being finalized and reviewed by upper leadership. The reports are anticipated to be complete in the month of November.

Chair Dockery clarified that November's report is for the years 2018-19 and suggested that this needs to be posted on NDE's website so that people will understand the report is from two years earlier.

Ms. Maria Sauter confirmed that the report in November will be for FY'18-19 and that the next report will be for FY'19-20.

Chair Valerie Dockery asked how going back two years and having only four amendments on a grant would affect the scores from something that happened many years before it was a requirement.

Ms. Maria Sauter explained that through this process, the risk assessment identified areas in which NDE also needed improvement, and as a result, seven indicators were removed for FY18 and FY19, one of which was the amendments and revisions for grants. Next Ms. Sauter showed the Committee what the actual scoring results look like in the report with each of the indicators and risk levels. Ms. Sauter explained to the Committee that once the final score was tabulated, instead of 100 points, each indicator could be scored a maximum of 64 points.

Ms. Megan Peterson confirmed Ms. Maria Sauter's assertion that the points totaled either 63 or 64 based on deferred indicators not being included this time.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Ms. Maria Sauter indicated to the Committee that there are different entities such as community-based entities and university entities that receive grants but don't always meet all the indicators so the final score fluctuates depending on the indicators. Ms. Sauter explained to the Committee that the four-year audit schedule is attached along with the scoring process, the rubrics, an explanation of how each of the indicators is scored, and an appendix with definitions of the indicators so that everyone will know exactly how and when their entity will be audited by NDE.

Chair Dockery asked Ms. Sauter to please forward her slides to Rhonda so that they could be included in the official record of the meeting and accessed by other Committee members.

10. Desktop Monitoring Tool (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Megan Peterson, Division Compliance Coordinator, Business and Support Services

Ms. Megan Peterson indicated to the Committee that the previous year, the legislature approved the department's assistance in procuring management software to replace the end-of-life E-Note. Ms. Peterson informed the Committee that at that time, Mr. Dennis Roy Junior (phonetic) was brought on board to assist in procuring the software. Midas is the vendor that was identified to provide the new desktop monitoring tool software. Ms. Peterson explained to the Committee that desktop monitoring gives the ability to verify and do grant compliance checks through desktop computers; it is not a monitoring software. The intent, Ms. Peterson explained, was to help reduce the impact on sub-grantees when complying with state and federal monitoring compliance activities, to help eliminate silos among NDE team members and offices and sub-grantees, and to decrease in-person monitoring visits where allowable to help save some resources and time. Ms. Peterson discussed the benefits of the new tool including: it is web-based and therefore can be used from any computer anywhere; no special downloads are required; it would allow NDE staff and grant analysts to request documentation to track grant monitoring and compliance; it would allow documentation to be requested in questionnaire form or in any format, including Excel or pdf; graphically displays monitoring status and upcoming deadlines for sub grantees and NDE staff; moves programmatic monitoring out of less stable software solutions that other staff are using, such as Outlook, and reduces the need to print or maintain paper copies of the compliance criteria that can go along with grants.

Ms. Megan Peterson informed the Committee that in March, the contract was awarded, and Mr. Dennis Roy Junior has since been working with department staff and sub grantees to ensure that all needs are addressed. This process involved much coding and development in the background. Ms. Peterson informed the Committee that her team was able to begin using demos of the software in September and that within the last week and a half, training has begun for department staff on the new software. Following the training, staff were then able to begin entering the data for their grants for the current year. Ms. Peterson also informed the committee that within the next week or two, Mr. Dennis Roy Junior would be providing sub-recipients with more in-depth training on how to access the software and then the next steps would be to work with offices so that the software meets their needs.

Ms. Sara Jorgensen asked if there was a projected date that the software was anticipated to go live.

Ms. Megan Peterson responded that the soft date for going live was the last week of November, right around Thanksgiving. Ms. Peterson also informed the Committee that the go-live date also depended on the needs of each office and their current grant processes and as such, Ms. Peterson explained, the actual roll-out date was dependent on a process that worked best for everyone.

Chair Dockery expressed her hope that the new program would be live before Christmas and discussed the issues the previous year with not yet having a system in place that she hoped could be avoided this year.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Ms. Megan Peterson confirmed that the system would indeed be live before Christmas and that the target to go live was the end of November.

11. Early Childhood Program and Resources (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Kaitlin Lewallen, Mia Pace, Emily Champlin, Daina Loeffler, Office of Early Learning and Development

Ms. Kaitlin Lewallen shared a tool with the Committee and asked them to share it with their early childhood programs. The site included updated upcoming trainings, past recordings of webinars, reopening resources and recommendations, distance learning recommendations, family engagement and support, and a variety of other resources. Next Ms. Lewallen addressed the transition to kindergarten. Ms. Lewallen informed the Committee that oftentimes events thought of as one-night events such as back-to-school night are really intended to be a year-long process of intentional planning and collaboration. Ms. Lewallen indicated the importance of this work to the Committee as national and statewide trends are showing a large dip in kindergarten enrollment. Ms. Lewallen explained that her office has launched a statewide project with Education Council to improve the transition-to-kindergarten system and practices. Ms. Lewallen informed the Committee that the project began with a transition-to-kindergarten webinar to start the conversation and the next phase of the project includes holding focus groups to learn more about the current challenges, successes, and opportunities within the existing system. The planned end result of this project is to create a Nevada Kindergarten Transition Guide to help support districts and communities in strengthening their transitions.

Ms. Gabby Lamarre informed the Committee that the link provided by Ms. Lewallen had also been published in the Title I newsletter.

Ms. Emily Champlin discussed the quality rating and improvement system with the Committee. Ms. Champlin informed the Committee of the existence of a QRIS, a Quality Rating and Improvement System for childcare centers and some local education agencies, that is independent of a school's star rating. Any Title I classroom that is co-located with a Nevada-ready state-funded pre-K classroom has the opportunity to receive coaching and participate in QRIS. Although rating is a part of the system, the intent of QRIS is to be a supportive system that helps programs identify training needs, understand best practices, receive intentional coaching, and improve overall quality. Ms. Champlin pointed the Committee to a link on her website to a webinar discussing how to think about quality considerations in an early childhood setting amidst a pandemic. Ms. Champlin also indicated that a spring report was attached to her presentation, which would give the Committee an idea of the standing of early childhood programs currently participating in QRIS. Ms. Champlin indicated that there are some Title I programs participating, and they can be found on page 4 of the spring report.

12. Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items

Chair Dockery reminded the Committee that the Committee meets quarterly and remaining meeting dates are scheduled for February 11th and May 13th, both of which are a Thursday, from 9 to 11 a.m. Chair Dockery informed the committee that Rhonda Hutchins will send out calendar requests and agendas as the dates approach and that meetings will continue on Zoom until further notice, likely for the remainder of the year. Chair Dockery requested that any Committee members who would like to add items to the agenda notify the Chair, one of the other officers, or Rhonda Hutchins at least 30 days prior to the meeting date in order to have time to appropriately publish the agenda. Chair Dockery thanked Vice Chair Karen Holley, Secretary Sara Jorgensen, and Membership Officer Holli Else for their participation and commended everyone at the meeting for the high attendance turnout.

Meeting Minutes (continued)

13. Public Comment #2

There was no public comment.

14. Adjournment (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Motion: Adjourn the Title I Committee of Practitioners November 5th meeting at

By: Chair Valerie Dockery

Second: Kevin Roukey

Vote: Passed Unanimously.