

TITLE I COMMITTEE OF PRACTITIONERS

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 19, 2019
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations:

Video Conference

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

Call to Order

Chair Valerie Dockery called to order, from Carson City, the meeting of the Title I Committee of Practitioners, at 9:04 a.m. on Thursday, September 19, 2019.

Roll Call

Valerie Dockery conducted a roll call. **Quorum was established (17 members present).**

Committee Members Present in Carson City:

Karen Barreras
Valerie Dockery
Randi Hunewill
Candi Ruf
Mary Stach

Committee Members Present in Las Vegas:

Sara Jorgensen
Gabby Lamarre
Annette Dawson Owens
Somer Rodgers
Melissa Schroeder
Kelly-Jo Shebeck
Teresa Stoddard

Committee Members Present Telephonically:

Teresa Dastrup
Holli Else
Karen Holley
Brian Prewett
Laura Tibbetts

Nevada Department of Education Staff Present:

Kristina Cote (Carson City), Colin Usher (Carson City), Rhonda Hutchins (Las Vegas), Mindy Montoya (Las Vegas), Alberto Quintero (Las Vegas), and Tina Winquist (Las Vegas)

Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge of allegiance was led by Chair Valerie Dockery.

Public Comment #1

There was no public comment from Carson City or Las Vegas.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for May 9, 2019

Chair Dockery asked for a motion to approve the May 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes. Melissa Schroeder motioned to approve the May 9, 2019 Title I Committee of Practitioners Meeting Minutes. Kelly-Jo Shebeck seconded the motion. Somer Rodgers stated that her name was missing the letter “d” in “Rodgers” in the minutes. The Meeting Minutes was approved with the amendment as stated by Member Rodgers.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Chair Dockery asked for a motion to approve a flexible Agenda. Karen Holley motioned to approve a flexible Agenda. Laura Tibbetts seconded the motion. Motion carried and a flexible Agenda was approved.

NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates

Ms. Gabby Lamarre, Title I Programs Director and Federal Liaison, provided the updates for Agenda Item 5. She stated that the Department is still in the process of hiring for a McKinney-Vento EPP position and clarification around the McKinney-Vento Title I will be forthcoming when they do hire the new McKinney-Vento EPP.

Ms. Lamarre stated that one of the Department’s goals is to help districts more effectively plan for that required Title I set aside to support homeless students in their education. According to the Community Mentor Guidance Guide that was put out by the Feds a few years ago, using those funds for Title I McKinney-Vento supplemental should be a last resort and those set aside funds can be used for homeless students in non-Title I schools.

Ms. Lamarre stated that the Title I Community Eligibility Program letter will be coming out soon. It will help clarify any points of confusion and can be revised in the future if needed, but NDE worked in collaboration with the Nevada Department of Agriculture on that.

Chair Dockery asked when they would be able to expect access to any carryover funds that they might have from FY19. Ms. Lamarre said the grants team goes through that and finalizes all that information for Federal grants sometime in November, so sometime by the end of the calendar year is when they would be able to access that.

Chair Dockery said she had concerns for that timeline since they have to have their final financials in so much earlier than that. They had to have them in in August and getting access to those funds that late makes it hard to spend those funds down, and they need to be spent down by the end of the fiscal year. She said if there’s anything that NDE can do to speed up that timeline that would be great. Ms. Lamarre said she would convey that to the grants team.

Ms. Lamarre moved on to the new Title I technical amendments. She assured Members that the Title I team from the US Department of Education said the amendments are truly technical and there’s nothing that they need to worry about as far as implementation of the program.

Ms. Lamarre stated that the Title I team did an update of the SNS Guidance Document based on the final US ED guidance document and that is available on the NDE website.

NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates (continued)

Ms. Lamarre stated that there are some pilots going on right now. One is the Title I LEA Planning Tool Pilot that a couple of districts are a part of. Two is a 9 question survey that was sent out to all districts' ePAGE users that wants stakeholder feedback on the enhancements that they have for FY20 in ePAGE, the consolidated application, and that is due back September 27.

Ms. Lamarre stated there's a pilot that is just starting off in a couple of districts on dealing with Title I funds and evidence levels using West Ed's evidence-based improvement toolkit to determine evidence levels of Title 1 interventions the districts are using. Updates will be provided.

Ms. Schroeder added the US Department of Ed will be releasing an updated non-regulatory guidance for equitable services for Title I at the end of the month.

Chair Dockery asked if the updates Ms. Lamarre just shared could be included in the next Title 1 newsletter. Ms. Lamarre said yes.

Chair Dockery asked about the pilots for the ESSA evidence levels in regards to the requirements for FY21 in the ePAGE applications. Ms. Lamarre stated that is the idea. Chair Dockery said she thought that that needs to get out sooner rather than later so people know that as they're planning for next year and not to find out about it in April or May because obviously not everyone is in the pilot, and if that's something that's coming down the pike, they need to get a lot of information because in the past they were told that that wasn't going to be a part of Title I applications. She said the more information they can get out on that now, the better. They can start working with their schools now. They can't wait all year to start having those conversations with the schools about forward planning with Title I and ESSA evidence.

Ms. Lamarre said the idea is that they are going to work with their partner, West Ed, because they do have these tools. She said they need to build out a process and more specifics on that. It is a possibility that perhaps FY21 would just bring on more districts and not require it for all, but that would depend on how the process goes. They do have some calls set up in the next few weeks to discuss it more in-depth. And to Chair Dockery's point: she understands the importance of getting information out as soon as possible.

Chair Dockery thanked Ms. Lamarre and said she thought the earlier people know what's coming down the pike the better, and this is a good time to start with their schools and review what they are doing now and figure out does that lead to evidence. She asked what other things they can do to demonstrate their program's strengths that would "count" as evidence.

Chair Dockery asked Ms. Lamarre if they are going to be continuing with eNOTE this year FY20. Ms. Lamarre replied yes and stated the Department is looking for a new desktop monitoring tool because eNOTE is going away and is not supported. She said Dennis Roy, a project manager, has been hired with this work, and he is on the fiscal team. He has been tasked with collaborating with OSSS on this, and new leadership is making a requirement that all offices in the Department have a universally uniform desktop monitoring tool, so that has held up the process. Ms. Lamarre said she would keep in touch with the Committee as they continue to work with the project manager to adopt the desktop monitoring tool.

Chair Dockery said as they look at whatever tool they are using for desktop monitoring, it needs to happen in the fiscal year when they're asking to upload those documents. Coming into the next fiscal year for approvals is too late. Ideally, they should get that approval before June 30, before the end of their fiscal year.

Mr. Prewett from Washoe County and Ms. Barreras from Nye County agreed with that timeline.

NDE Title I Policy/Program Updates (continued)

Chair Dockery said everyone is really busy and they're all on timelines, so maybe that can be part of the process of looking for a new vendor is how easy it is for you on your end to be able to complete your process.

Ms. Cote said she had a question circling back again from a district perspective, from a requirement. She asked if it would be more helpful to have smaller milestones for the timeliness of when some of these compliance items might be collected and monitored.

Ms. Else said she did like it when requirements were broken out and they had the separate timelines. They could get half of it done and approved early and then have the second half, so she preferred that method.

Ms. Lamarre said one thing that she did forget to mention is that part of that process will be getting formal district feedback on the desktop monitoring tool, so that would be an opportunity to request the smaller milestones.

Chair Dockery asked if there were more questions, and there were not. She then asked Ms. Hutchins for an update on the Distinguished Schools process.

Ms. Hutchins said the ESEA Distinguished School Program was revised, so this is their pilot year. Eleven schools were invited to apply for the three categories. She talked to the NDE Adam Team about making recommendations or suggestions for changing their data for next year, and that means their work group will probably need to get back together in January or February to determine next steps. They are expecting applications to be returned by October the 10th, and then they have an NDE review team that will review those applications October 11th through 20th. They will conduct interviews with the final six schools and then make their recommendations for two national ESEA Distinguished Schools and four Nevada ESEA Distinguished Schools. She said the intent is to invite them to the spring Directors Meeting to talk about best practices and what worked for students in Nevada. She said a flowchart was sent out from Rich and Mary so they can see how the work will flow.

Chair Dockery said this was really a wonderful effort, and it's great to see that they are going to have a broader stroke in terms of recognizing schools in Nevada.

ePAGE FY20 Pilots: District and Evidence Level

Kristina Cote presented a PowerPoint presentation on ePAGE, FY20 Pilot Overview and spoke on the Overarching Vision, 3 LEAs identified (Nye, Douglas and Washoe County School Districts), Pilot Specific Sections/Features, and Pilot FY20 Q1 Updates.

NOTE: Due to technical difficulties, the video recording during the ePAGE FY20 Pilots PowerPoint presentation was not captured.

Gabby Lamarre stated at this time there are no further updates on the Evidence Level Pilot, but she will keep the Committee abreast of any updates.

Family Engagement Guidance Document

Alberto Quintero, Nevada Department of Education, provided information on the District Planning Tool pilot. He said that the District Planning Tool will assist and support districts in meeting requirements and implementing best practice at the same time. The handbook is designed as a guide, as a compass, for Nevada schools and district staff, Title I Directors, Coordinators and Family Engagement Coordinators through the process of developing and maintaining an effective Title I Parent and Family Engagement Program. The requirement piece is a very small portion of the handbook.

Family Engagement Guidance Document (continued)

Mr. Quintero stated that the majority of the handbook has tools and resources schools and districts can use to meet those requirements and surpass those requirements and help in that process. He stated there are six sections in the handbook and Section One contains the overall purpose of Title I, some of the Federal definitions within the Every Student Succeeds Act, general responsibilities by the SEA, being the State Education Agency, Nevada Department of Education under ESSA. The handbook highlights the changes from the previous law to the new law, and the way it was designed, the way that it was used. There is language that was used previously in No Child Left Behind and then also the current language printed in green. The color green is also used terms of new language in the law as well.

Chair Dockery asked Mr. Quintero if the plan was to leave the format with the green ink and the black strikeouts and the lines in there. Mr. Quintero said that's the way it is now, but he is open to feedback from the Title 1 Group in regard to changes to be made. Based on feedback from the Title I Committee of Practitioners and other stakeholders in regards to use and overall usability, they will decide what the best timeline for the cycle that the document gets updated to best meet their needs.

Chair Dockery said she would prefer some kind of final document instead of one showing editing marks and print in different colors. She asked what others thought.

Ms. Holley said she did like to see the differences to be able to compare policies, compacts and things like that, but when it goes out to staff, she would like it to look like a finished document also.

Ms. Else said she thought it was helpful to have it this way at first, especially when you take it out to staff who had been working with it before. They could see the exact changes from the way things used to be done, but at some point, you could go ahead and take out all the strikeouts and just have it be the actual new law.

Ms. Hunewill said based on her background of doing the Office of Civil Rights Review for CT funding, they need to add a non-discrimination statement somewhere in the document to make it compliant.

Mr. Quintero continued with Section Two of the presentation. He stated that this overall section was included in the handbook to provide schools and districts exposure to various ways to receive input, either through survey, through group facilitation or open discussion forum. Included are some templates for surveys for elementary, middle and high school, plus survey examples. Those resources can be altered or amended to best meet each district's needs and school's needs. This section provides examples of different ways to evaluate the Parent and Family Engagement Program, school or district policy and then also different tools that schools can refer to when trying to evaluate. When it comes to the family engagement piece and Family Engagement Programs, underneath Title I evaluation is a requirement. These are just some tools to help fill that need. Within that section there's a summary evaluation method, the focus group surveys, open discussion forum, the pros and cons in regards to those specific types of evaluation methods and some pieces of advice when it comes to that piece and also the templates.

Mr. Quintero continued with Section Three of the presentation. He stated that Section 3 deals with the policy portion within Title I, Part A, Section 1116. He stated that this policy shall be incorporated into the LEA's plan and establish the agencies or establish the districts' expectations and objectives for meaningful parent and family engagement.

Family Engagement Guidance Document (continued)

Mr. Quintero explained there are two types of templates: the traditional one that guarantees to meet the requirements with no bells and whistles, and the innovative template that enables schools to demonstrate their Family Engagement Policy is meeting the Federal requirement, but then also making it accessible and meeting more of the intent of what the policy and its purpose.

Mr. Quintero pointed out in this section, the School and Family Engagement Policy, there's a Guide to Quality. It references specific legal descriptions and gives users the ability to see if their program is in line with requirements and has some suggestions in terms of how schools and districts can make improvements. A school can use the district's Family Engagement Policy and amend it if necessary, to meet the requirements. It's jointly developed for both the Family Engagement Policy for the district and the school.

Ms. Ruf thanked Mr. Quintero for including the innovative opportunities for districts to look at and stated it's often difficult to envision how to create a document like that and it's very helpful to have a jumping off spot, a creative springboard.

Chair Dockery said it would be great if they could have the templates up on the website so their schools could utilize them.

Mr. Quintero continued with Section Four of the presentation. He stated that section 4 deals with the School-Parent Compact. Every school that receives Title I's shall jointly develop with parents for all children served a School-Parent Compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the state's high standards. He reminded Members that a few years ago they took the School-Parent Compact and made that a requirement for all schools and that became the Educational Involvement Accords. NDE has updated the Educational Involvement Accord to be a little bit more parent and family friendly. There's an updated form that's available in English and Spanish of the Accord, along with guidance document for frequently asked questions. Title I schools may use the Accord as the School-Parent Compact since the Accord is required by NRS to comply with the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Mr. Quintero stated that Title I schools are still required to seek parent input on the Accord and take into account any parent feedback. If any changes are to be made to the Educational Accord that's something that has to be approved by that district's Board of Trustees. He stated that in the future, the Advisory Family Engagement Council is going to look to change some of that language, and during the next legislative session when it comes to the Educational Accord to provide more flexibility and give that power back to parents and families and schools when it comes to developing that Parent-School Compact. If a school or a district has their own parent compact that's not the Accord, those changes and updates don't have to go through the Board of Trustees. It just means that with the Accord itself, if any changes to the Accord wanted to be made by a school or district that has to go through the Board of Trustees. If schools just want to use the Accord as their School-Parent Compact and not have another document on the side, that's the process they would currently have to go through, but if schools or districts have a School-Parent Compact in addition to the Educational Involvement Accords, then that doesn't have to go through the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Quintero continued with Section Five of the presentation. He stated that Section 5 is the building capacity section of the law, Section 1116. In here there appropriate ways to use the Title I funds, the family engagement funds when it comes to building the capacity of parents and family members. It shows alignment with the Dual Capacity-Building Framework. That's a framework that is research based that was recently updated in July that provides schools and districts or anyone who has a family engagement initiative or program, a lens on how to approach family engagement, and that's something that was created by Dr. Karen Mapp, leading family engagement researcher who currently teaches at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Family Engagement Guidance Document (continued)

Mr. Quintero stated that this section shows how the Building Capacity pieces of the law align with the National PTA Family-School Partnership Standards, which the Nevada State Board of Education adopted in 2015 as its Family Engagement Policy. That policy is more of an endorsement of family engagement standards and is not a family engagement statewide policy or approach. He said that another reason why he saw a great need for this handbook was to make sure schools and districts were creating the policy and also meeting the requirements underneath Title I. Included in this section are descriptions of the Crosswalk and the Building Capacity portion of the law, and that's probably the shortest section.

Mr. Quintero continued with Section Six of the presentation. He stated that Section 6 covers the Annual Title I Parent Meeting. It outlines the requirements of the Title I Parent Meeting and includes information that needs to be covered throughout that meeting. Included are a couple of templates in terms of how those are conducted.

Mr. Quintero said the plan moving forward is once they release the handbook (this is the final version for this specific year), then they will solicit stakeholder feedback and input before revising the handbook based off that feedback and then finalizing it for annual release in the following year.

Ms. Rodgers said from a parent perspective, this is something that is discussed at every single SOT meeting at her son's school -- family engagements and how to get families engaged in their child's education. She said she appreciated everything in this resource, especially the surveys. Most of the time they just assume why parents and families are not showing up, but they don't really know the answer because they're not asking them. She said she was excited to bring this, and the other resources, back to the SOT team and the principal at her son's school. She thanked Mr. Quintero and his team for their hard work.

Ms. Owens said she also appreciated the way that the team laid it out and their compliance with the numbers there was really great. She said she noticed in Section Four it's still called School-Parent Compact. Is there a way to add School-Parent/Family Compact? And then in Section Six as well it's called the Parent Meeting. Is there a way to have Parent/Family Meeting so it's consistently relaying that sentiment perhaps?

Mr. Quintero said yes, those changes can be made. Just for the reason for those titles, those are the ones that are directly involved, but there's no reason why they can't add the family portion to that as well.

Mr. Quintero asked the Committee when the best time to release the handbook on an annual basis is.

Ms. Owens said in her view, this would be a valuable resource for them in September at the start of the school year. New teams are coming on and so forth.

Chair Dockery said she would actually like to see the handbook earlier in May or June so that they have time in the summer to review at the District level and then get out to their sites and do some education around it. If they get it at the start of the school year, it's harder. A lot of things have happened already. Parent meetings have happened, those kinds of things. So they can use this one now going forward as they prepare for the rest of the year and going into next year, but if there is an update, she'd like to see it May or June at the latest so that they can really be ready as they hit the ground running in the fall.

Ms. Barreras said she would like to see it even earlier than that. They will use this one going forward, but she would like to be able to introduce it to the principals before school ends and remind them that it's coming over the summer so that they're ready to get on board right away as soon as school starts. Chair Dockery said she would concur. That would be the best.

Family Engagement Guidance Document (continued)

Ms. Rodgers said she would agree that at least by July or August so that schools have time to prepare and thought it was important to start the year out with this information.

Ms. Stach said she thinks that it needs to be released earlier when schools are planning or when districts are planning their professional learning for the next year. They usually have that already figured out in April or May, so if they could get this in January or February, they could look through it and then bring it to our district representatives or bring it out to the entire district at professional learning opportunities.

Mr. Quintero said it sounded like January or February would be best, so that will be the target month unless the Committee lets him know otherwise. And just to add to Member Owens comment in regard to bringing it to the SOT, if you have a school parent committee, a perfect activity for those groups is to take on building that Compact, building that school policy, looking at it as a way to start that early on in the year.

Mr. Quintero asked if the Committee would be open to being the public body that provides feedback on the handbook on an ongoing basis, bringing the handbook to the Committee prior to the new release in the early part of the year for feedback.

Chair Dockery said she thought this was a great idea and if there were any updates or changes that could be sent electronically before the meeting so the Committee members could review ahead of the meeting, and then follow up with Mr. Quintero. The Chair said she thought that would be an appropriate mission for the Committee.

Ms. Stoddard said she thought that would be great for them to look at it and give input for any changes that need to be made at a good time for the schools to be able to look at it.

Ms. Stach asked if the family engagement definition that has been developed by the Birth to Grade 12 Framework might be part of this document. This is the ESSA Title I, Part A document for helping people, but to still align across different initiatives with the state since they've come up with a new definition for family engagement that maybe that should be part of this document too.

Mr. Quintero said yes, the handbook will definitely include the family engagement definitions. He stated that in regard to the Birth to Grade 12 Framework, that document was created prior to the definition being finalized, and it's a lengthy document, which goes through a lengthy ADA remediation so that wasn't included, but in the next version, it will definitely be included.

Mr. Quintero asked if they could recommend any districts that might volunteer to have their Family Engagement Policies reviewed by the state's advisory council for family engagement. He stated that's part of the purview of the Family Engagement Council, and so the Advisory Council is going to use the Guide to Quality in the handbook to start looking at and reviewing and providing feedback to districts and the Family Engagement Policy. He asked if the Title I Committee of Practitioners wants to recommend a specific district to have their Family Engagement Policy looked at and give feedback.

Chair Dockery said the districts represented at the meeting could communicate with Mr. Quintero offline outside of the Committee if they would like to participate in that manner.

Mr. Quintero thanked the Committee for giving him the opportunity to present on the handbook. He said if there are any questions, feel free to contact him.

EDT Compliance (SEADing Equity Literacy: It's a Matter of Degrees)

There were four individuals introduced for this Agenda Item: Dr. Silvana Gorton, Title IIA, EPP, Dr. Will Killins, SIG EPP, Dr. Tina Winqvist, CSI/TSI EPP and Rhonda Hutchins, Title I EPP.

Dr. Gorton started with a little bit of context. The equitable distribution of teachers and resources which is the part that's been added (which is also the State Equity Plan) is required for the state and districts to describe how low income and minority children in schools that are assisted by Title IA are not served at disproportionate rates according to three metrics. And the three metrics are ineffective, out of field, and the third one is inexperienced teachers.

Title IIA funds are intended to support identified interventions and strategies to address that equitable distribution of teacher and resource strategies. So, the most recent Equity Plan is dated 2015 and there have been several efforts to update and/or revise this plan and the current effort is what they are engaged in right now. They are working to meet compliance requirements and emphasize that this work should be annual and ongoing, however, the US Department of Education has shifted from strictly compliance to be more inclusive of the importance of technical assistance, and that has created an opportunity for increased collaboration across many aspects.

Step one that they have identified is to start with common language. So their team is asking the Committee to reflect on and provide feedback about the Nevada Equity Literacy. Equity Literacy relies on Nevada's ability to cultivate in all critical understanding about how students are treated by one another and by institutions in addition to a deep appreciation of the diversity that places equity rather than culture at the center of equity commitments, embracing a framework for creating equitable conditions and outcomes for all students.

Chair Dockery asked if they were asking for the Committee's feedback now on that statement.

Dr. Killins said yes, they are asking for some feedback on the statement. What they would like to share with everyone is that even at the Department, the definition of equity is fluid. They are really looking at the social justice piece of equality. What they're asking is that the Committee take a deep look at this definition and share their thoughts on what they see and if they're headed in the right direction.

Dr. Winqvist said part of the task that the equity core team has is to help gather as much information about this topic as possible from stakeholders and the Title I Community of Practitioners. They wanted to get the Committee's thoughts around the work that they're doing with regards to this project. The intent is to look beyond, trying to stretch as much as possible the requirement by ESSA and the Feds on equitable distribution of teachers to also embrace some of the work being done by districts and schools to include equity measures with resources, with their human capital, with decisions, with results that are student driven and how that factors in. They are "trying to really get a broad stroke and cast a wide net" around this work. The way they are gathering data is via a brief survey that looks at the literacy definition and asks for responses.

Ms. Owens noted the definition says, "equity literacy relies on NDE's ability to go cultivate in all a critical understanding about how students are treated." Ms. Owens suggested a switch in the language to how students are treated by institutions.

Dr. Winqvist thanked Ms. Owens for that feedback and said that's exactly the kind of feedback they are looking for.

Chair Dockery said she agreed with what Ms. Owens said. The Chair said she thought the definition needed to include some of the comments Dr. Winqvist said earlier. Some of the points she made actually should be part of the definition. It needs to be really clear. That will help at the district level when she can say in writing that

staffing needs to meet these requirements. It's helpful for when the Chair goes out and meets with HR people, when she's meeting with principals, and when she's talking with leadership. The points that Dr. Gorton made regarding inexperience, unqualified, out of field, that those things should be part of that definition. It helps drive the work they are doing.

EDT Compliance (SEADing Equity Literacy: It's a Matter of Degrees) (continued)

Chair Dockery asked a follow-up question. When can they expect a plan from NDE that they can then base their district plans against? They're talking about their Equity Plan right now and revising it, but when can they expect to see NDE's completed plan?

Dr. Gorton said they are moving this work along as quickly as they can and they are certainly trying their best to keep to a reasonable timeline. She said probably by the beginning of 2020, they would hope that this would fall in as one of the pieces in terms of what the Department wants to put out regarding refreshed guidance focus areas, et cetera.

Ms. Hutchins put on record a reminder to districts that there still is that monitoring requirement in whatever desktop monitoring tool they decide to move forward with. So, districts should either be pulling their data or revising their current plan. They will still be looking for those items during monitoring.

Future Meeting Date and Agenda Items

Chair Dockery reminded Members that they voted to have four quarterly meetings, so the remaining meeting schedule is November 19th, February 13th and May 12th, all at 9:00.

At the November meeting they will probably be looking at a membership update and also asking members about required attendance and if attendance should be part of remaining a member of the Committee. They must make sure that they have a robust group that is regularly at the table to provide support and feedback. The Chair reminded everyone that future Agenda items need to be submitted to the Chair within 30 days in advance of the next meeting so that they have time to consult and create the Agenda.

Public Comment #2

There was no public comment from Carson City or Las Vegas.

Adjournment

After thanking everyone for their participation, Chair Valerie Dockery adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.