

# STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2024  
2:00 P.M.

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	BristleCone Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	N/A	<a href="#">Virtual Livestream Link</a>

## SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE MEETING

### COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

1. Joe Girdner (via videoconference)
2. Denise Trakas (via videoconference)
3. Adam Young (via videoconference)
4. Pam Teel (via videoconference)
5. Jennifer Black (via phone)

### DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

#### In Las Vegas

1. Daisy Marglin

#### In Carson City

1. Heather Crawford-Ferre
2. Megan Peterson (Deputy Superintendent, Financial Services)
3. Amber Reid

### AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE (via videoconference)

1. Ben Dickson (Director NWRPDP)
2. Jarrad Barczynsyn (Assistant Director SNRPDP)
3. Annie Hicks (Director NNRPDP)

### 1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Chair Adam Young. Quorum was established. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by NNRPDP Director Annie Hicks.

### 2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

There was no in-person public comment Carson City or Las Vegas and no public comment via email.

### **3. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 18, 2024, MINUTES**

Chair Young asked if there was a motion to approve the January 18, 2024, meeting minutes.

**Member Trakas moved to approve the January 18, 2024, meeting minutes. Member Teel seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **4. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION REGARDING RPDP BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS TIMELINE**

Chair Young asked Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson to give the Council an overview from the departments perspective and if she would answer any questions the members may have.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said the State of Nevada has a biannual budget build that happens every two years. It starts with an agency request budget which opens to the department and all other state agencies on March 26<sup>th</sup> and is required by law to be submitted no later than September 1<sup>st</sup> at 5:00 pm of that same year. Their goal at the department this year is to attempt to submit by August 1<sup>st</sup> that way they have time to beat the crowd and get ahead. As part of the agency request budget, they go through and start with what is called “base” which was the FY25 appropriated funding approved by the legislator. From there they add or subtract adjustments to account for ongoing costs or one-time costs. During that time is also when they add enhancements for new costs that were not previously accounted for. They call those decision units or enhancements. She equated those costs to adding on a new room in a house or a new stereo system, something that had not been part of a regular budget. In the case of RPDP that might be because they plan to expand the program, incorporate raises, or something along those lines. As part of the budget build process for the agency they are required to submit no more than two times what their base budget was. So, any enhancements that exceed that amount are available to be put forward through what is called a special consideration budget that they then put forward as their agency request to the Governor’s office. After September 1<sup>st</sup> they enter into what is called the “gov/rec” phase of the budget build. That is where the Governor will go through and look at all agencies budgets. Not only the agency request but also the items for special consideration and then make a decision to approve or move forward budgets that align with their goals and missions. During that process that occurs after September 1<sup>st</sup> through the second week of January when the Governor presents his budget for the State of the State address. During the “gov/rec” phase it is confidential and it is a misdemeanor to divulge information from any conversations had with the Governor’s office at that time. As part of that process, they go through and ask several questions to try and understand the requests and make sure they have the full picture. About the second week of January the Governor will announce their budget through the State of the State address then the agencies begin the pre-session hearings where they present the budgets as aligned and determined by the Governor to the committees for session. Then the first Monday of February session begins and they go through that process and work with legislators. They have to wait for economic forum projections to come out and that generally has the greatest impact on what eventually get approved. In the Nevada constitution they are required to submit balanced budgets. They cannot pass budgets that exceed what the projected revenues are to be. They have five appropriation bills that are passed during session. The first being the K-12 funding bill. Once that passes then all other budget builds can pass and that is when they learn what is actually approved during the legislative session. Also,

just because an enhancement did not make it into the governors recommend budget does not mean it won't move forward. The legislature has the ability to come back and make decisions and add or subtract funds as they see fit based on their goals and missions from their constituents.

Chair Young asked if there were any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the information shared by Megan Peterson.

Director Annie Hicks (NNRPDP) thanked Deputy Peterson for her overview and mentioned that she believed it was critical that everyone was on the same page about the budget, the process, and what it takes to request and enhancement and how those move forward.

Chair Young said with the increase in revenue that went to the school districts in last biennium most school districts, particularly the three who are the fiscal agents for the RPDP's, negotiated salary increases for their employees. One complicated factor with that for example once the Elko County school district concluded their negotiations the NNRPDP was obligated to pass those salary increases to their staff, which limited the amount of programming they were able to do because the corresponding revenue that went towards Elko County school district did not go to the NNRPDP. They are funded at a flat rate through the biennium where the school district received an increase. He asked what remedies might be possible for the RPDP's to receive interim enhancements so that they don't have to cut their funding in order to keep pace with the contractual obligated salary increases.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said that is something that the department and agencies of the state are frequently faced with. There is a process by which agencies can go to the interim finance committee. It is the fiscal body of the legislature that meets when the legislature is not in session and they have the authority to approve increases to their budgets. They refer to it as IFC. It is a contingency fund request that they can submit. It follows very much the same process as the budget build in terms of going through and identifying the revenue, which in most cases would be the contingency funds, the general fund back up, and then the expenditures associated with the request. In your example it would be personnel and salary. They would work with the council to identify what the short fall was and then present that to the interim finance committee. The one challenge with that is that there is a small pot of funding that is available but it is for the whole state for one fiscal year. While they may know that something is needed for a future fiscal year i.e. FY25 they have to wait until FY25 IFC in order to request those funds. That is the process by which they can amend the budget and request additional funds as needed.

Chair Young asked if her office had received communication from the Northeast and Northwest RPDP's about an enhancement for FY24 and if she could make a recommendation on what their three directors could do going into 2025 so that they don't have to cut personnel in order to balance their own budget.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said they have been working with the RPDP's trying to evaluate what options were available in FY24 and they are working with them to address how they will move forward in FY25. She didn't have the answer but ensured him that they are working on it. She said the best advice she could give would be to be the first in line at the end of the fiscal year. She mentioned she had her Director Celeste Arnold and her Assistant Director Rachel McFarland working with RPDP to put the information together and get that request in.

Chair Young asked when the first fiscal meeting for FY25 would be.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said there is an August 14, 2024, IFC meeting. To be on that agenda they would need to have the information submitted to them by June 7, 2024. The IFC meets every other month so the next one would be October 9<sup>th</sup> with an August 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline.

Member Trakas had a question about the budgets that they would be approving on today's agenda. She wanted to know if those were just budget amendments or were they budget amendments that are to take place to offset the increases of salaries in the districts that are the fiscal agents.

Director Ben Dickson (NWRPDP) said the FY25 budget that they are bringing forward has been adjusted to reflect the salary increases. They had to move money out of operating in order to cover the raises for their staff in four different districts. They moved the money that was originally allocated to them. There is no new money.

Director Annie Hicks (NNRPDP) echoed what Director Dickson shared. The budget that are putting forward for FY25 is essentially based on the flat amount that they were allocated but it reflects the increased salary and benefit costs. That needed to be enhanced to increase what was negotiated with their fiscal agent. You'll note on their budget 98% is for salaries and benefits while 2% has been left over for operating funds. It does not reflect an enhancement. Although they are working on putting together a contingency request to submit to NDE before the June deadline.

Member Trakas asked the state, if the RPDP's were able to make those adjustments within their existing budgets will that impact their case for special consideration in the interim finance meeting.

Deputy Superintendent Peterson wanted to clarify the question. She wanted to know if Member Trakas was asking based on the amendments that were made to reduce the subawards because of the changes this fiscal year, does that hinder their ability to be approved for FY25 if they were to go to IFC.

Member Trakas said correct that was the question she was asking.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said no it would not impact that. If anything, that can be used as a point of reference as they put the request forward to say here is the result and here is the impact it had. When they go to IFC to ask for funding to the extent that they can demonstrate a consequence and be clear by not approving this, this is the impact. That through line is very beneficial. Usually, those who have clearly delineated that are more likely to receive approval.

Chair Young asked the Directors if they felt comfortable with the process as outlined in order to seek that contingency fund enhancement for FY25. He thanked Deputy Peterson and her team for the constant communication around this issue. As a rural superintendent, they rely so much on their RPDP's. Most of them are based in Elko so if they don't have the ability to travel to White Pine that makes things pretty tough. A 2% operational fund does not seem like it's going to allow for much travel and that causes him concern because they rely heavily on the RPDP's to support their educators and the work that they do.

Director Ben Dickson (NWRPDP) wanted to thank Deputy Peterson and her team for walking them through the process. He said he now has a better understanding about how they would go about the contingency funds.

-Member Trakas asked about the administrative funds. She wanted to know what the committee should be doing. Are they going to request additional funds, can Deputy Peterson provide guidance on a timeline for the administrative funds that they manage and go through the RPDP's.

Amber Reid wanted to clarify if she was asking about the approval of the FY25 funding for the upcoming fiscal year and the subawards associated with that.

Member Trakas said that was request.

Amber Reid said one of her roles is she supervises their grants management unit. She is the Director of their Office of District Support Services within the Student Investment Division. Every year they go into their launch of the new fiscal year to get all their new subaward agreements in place. Ideally before July 1<sup>st</sup> because their state fiscal year starts on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Some of their grants come with a potential blackout period if they don't have a subaward agreement in place at that time. In this case we are talking about state dollars, because of the way these funds are managed by the council and the council's approval those budgets are required, when she goes to issue a new subaward for the new fiscal year if the council has not voted and approved those budgets before July 1<sup>st</sup> her ability to allow those subrecipients to start spending their money on July 1<sup>st</sup> is limited. The request to accelerate the timeline to get a few more months in advance up stream on that process is so that they can get the information they need to begin the process of collecting all the subaward materials. The more time we can give each other on the front end so they can get as much of that taken care of before July 1<sup>st</sup> just increases the amount of time their subrecipients have to spend those dollars. If they wait until September or December to approve those budgets that decreases the amount of time available for folks to spend those dollars. What they required to start that process is an allocation memo. Director Chang cannot give them that allocation memo until the council has approved those amounts. The date of their approval is the earliest she could go back for the start of that subaward funding period. If that approval comes in the prior fiscal year, which is what they are asking and hope that the council does, then the subawards start date will be July first. They would be able to work with the programmatic team to ensure that they have all those things in place well in advance of July 1<sup>st</sup>. If for some reason there was a wrinkle in the matrix and they don't have all the subawards in place by July 1<sup>st</sup>, because the council approved those funds prior to the start of the state fiscal year she has the ability to allow for a retroactive start. Their goal is to give their partners as much time as possible to utilize these important public dollars and get them to the people with the greatest needs.

Member Trakas thanked her for answering her question clearly.

Chair Young asked if the council wanted to formally request more than the amount of the \$100,000.00 that has been allocated over the years, per year for these administrative funds training. He mentioned that he believed Member Trakas was also asking about that. For the first time this year they had more requests than they had funds for. He thought that that was a good problem to have because it means that the council is taking place and there are providers who recognize that and want to help the leaders across our state. He asked Deputy Superintendent Peterson what the process would be or would it be the same process if the council were to vocalize some type of increased enhancement from \$100,000 to something higher than that.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said it would very much follow the same process. Ideally you have one enhancement per concept and potentially be looking at an enhancement for increasing salary to stay relevant with the COLA (cost of living adjustment) and potentially an enchantment related to travel and increasing the ability to do that. You could look into another enhancement to increase the amounts. There are strategies and with any strategy there are pros and cons. She mentioned that they can work with the council to determine based on the environment that they are feeling which one they think will be most successful. It's something they work through consistently as an agency in terms of how they choose to package their enhancements but essentially anything

that is funding more than just maintaining the cost of doing business is an enhancement that goes through the same process.

Chair Young wanted to clarify that the enhancements that are being sought for salaries and travel, those are going to come from the three RPD P's in conjunction with your office. Whereas the \$100,000.00 administrative funds goes directly to the council, that would be a separate enhancement sought would be from this council. His thinking was the council would want to prioritize the enhancements that are coming directly from our RPD P's and probably not want to submit something that could potentially compete with that and force the IFC to split the funding or choose one over the other. He welcomed feedback from the council.

Member Trakas said she concurred at this point with that request. She thought they needed to look at the State Board of Education in 2020 that had numbers with forecasting both teacher and administrator retirements. She felt it would be worthy for them to look at that information over the next couple of years and think about what our state needs to truly ensure our students have the resources. Not only our educators but administrators that can deal with the ongoing challenges we are seeing in the classroom.

Chair Young thanked Deputy Peterson and her team for joining the meeting.

Assistant Director Jerrad Barczyszyn (SNRPDP) said he believed they were the only one who had a FY24 amendment. The Clark County School District and the bargaining unit settled on the salary advancements for teachers and that affects their staff. So, they finally have an amendment to put forward and that just adjusts that to account for the salary increases.

Member Trakas asked about the administrative funds. She wanted to know what the committee should be doing. Are they going to request additional funds, can Deputy Peterson provide guidance on a timeline for the administrative funds that they manage and go through the RPD P's.

Director Amber Reid wanted to clarify is she was asking about the approval of the FY25 funding for the upcoming fiscal year and the subawards associated with that.

Member Trakas said that was request.

Amber Reid said one of her roles is she supervises their grants management unit. She is the Director of their Office of District Support Services within the Student Investment Division. Every year they go into their launch of the new fiscal year to get all their new subaward agreements in place. Ideally before July 1<sup>st</sup> because their state fiscal year starts on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Some of their grants come with a potential blackout period if they don't have a subaward agreement in place at that time. In this case we are talking about state dollars, because of the way these funds are managed by the council and the council's approval those budgets are required, when she goes to issue a new subaward for the new fiscal year if the council has not voted and approved those budgets before July 1<sup>st</sup> her ability to allow those subrecipients to start spending their money on July 1<sup>st</sup> is limited. The request to accelerate the timeline to get a few more months in advance up stream on that process is so that they can get the information they need to begin the process of collecting all the subaward materials. The more time we can give each other on the front end so they can get as much of that taken care of before July 1<sup>st</sup> just increases the amount of time their subrecipients have to spend those dollars. If they wait until September or December to approve those budgets that decreases the amount of time available for folks to spend those dollars. What they required to start that process is an allocation memo. Director Chang cannot give them that allocation memo until the council has approved those amounts. The date of their approval is the earliest she could go back for the start of that subaward

funding period. If that approval comes in the prior fiscal year, which is what they are asking and hope that the council does, then the subawards start date will be July first. They would be able to work with the programmatic team to ensure that they have all those things in place well in advance of July 1<sup>st</sup>. If for some reason there was a wrinkle in the matrix and they don't have all the subawards in place by July 1<sup>st</sup>, because the council approved those funds prior to the start of the state fiscal year she has the ability to allow for a retroactive start. Their goal is to give their partners as much time as possible to utilize these important public dollars and get them to the people with the greatest needs.

Member Trakas thanked her for answering her question clearly.

Chair Young asked if the council wanted to formally request more than the amount of the \$100,000.00 that has been allocated over the years, per year for these administrative funds training. He mentioned that he believed Member Trakas was also asking about that. For the first time this year they had more requests than they had funds for. He thought that that was a good problem to have because it means that the council is taking place and there are providers who recognize that and want to help the leaders across our state. He asked Deputy Superintendent Peterson what the process would be or would it be the same process if the council were to vocalize some type of increased enhancement from \$100,000 to something higher than that.

Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson said it would very much follow the same process. Ideally you have one enhancement per concept and potentially be looking at an enhancement for increasing salary to stay relevant with the COLA (cost of living adjustment) and potentially an enhancement related to travel and increasing the ability to do that. You could look into another enhancement to increase the amounts. There are strategies and with any strategy there are pros and cons. She mentioned that they can work with the council to determine based on the environment that they are feeling which one they think will be most successful. It's something they work through consistently as an agency in terms of how they choose to package their enhancements but essentially anything that is funding more than just maintaining the cost of doing business is an enhancement that goes through the same process.

Chair Young wanted to clarify that the enhancements that are being sought for salaries and travel, those are going to come from the three RPDP's in conjunction with your office. Whereas the \$100,000.00 administrative funds goes directly to the council, that would be a separate enhancement sought would be from this council. His thinking was the council would want to prioritize the enhancements that are coming directly from our RPDP's and probably not want to submit something that could potentially compete with that and force the IFC to split the funding or choose one over the other. He welcomed feedback from the council.

Member Trakas said she concurred at this point with that request. She thought they needed to look at the State Board of Education in 2020 that had numbers with forecasting both teacher and administrator retirements. She felt it would be worthy for them to look at that information over the next couple of years and think about what our state needs to truly ensure our students have the resources. Not only our educators but administrators that can deal with the ongoing challenges we are seeing in the classroom.

Chair Young thanked Deputy Peterson and her team for joining the meeting.

**5. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FY24 BUDGET AMENDMENTS PUSUANT TO NRS 391A.130**

Assistant Director Jerrad Barczyszyn (SNRPDP) said he believed they were the only one who had a FY24 amendment. The Clark County School District and the bargaining unit settled on the salary advancements for teachers and that affects their staff. So, they finally have an amendment to put forward and that just adjusts that to account for the salary increases.

**Member Teel made a motion to approve. Member Trakas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

**6. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARGING FY25 BUDGETS PURSUANT TO NRS 391A.130**

Director Annie Hicks (NNRPDP) shared that their FY25 budget just reflects the increased salary and benefit costs along with the reductions to our operating funds so that we can maintain our budget as required by law.

Director Ben Dickson (NWRPDP) wanted to echo Director Hick's comments theirs also reflects that.

**Member Teel made a motion to approve. Member Black seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

**7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FY25 ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING RFP**

Chair Young asked if there were any questions, comments, or concerns with the RFP. He stated that it is the same one the council has used for the past four or five years with adjusted dates.

**Member Teel made a motion to approve. Member Trakas seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

**8. FUTURE SWCC MEETING DATES**

Heather Crawford-Ferre said the council worked together to propose the following dates for the next years meeting: September 26<sup>th</sup>, October 17<sup>th</sup>, January 16<sup>th</sup>, March 13<sup>th</sup>, and June 5<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 pm.

Chair Young mentioned that the council is only required to meet four times a year but planning five meetings gives us a little bit of flexibility in the case that they don't have a quorum for one they won't need to scramble to try and plan a meeting on short notice.

Member Trakas mentioned she believed there was a request for budgets to come in a month earlier, instead of September 1<sup>st</sup> she thought it was August 1<sup>st</sup>. She asked if the June 5<sup>th</sup> date gave them enough time to approve budgets.

Director Annie Hicks (NNRPDP) she believed the request about having an earlier meeting in each academic or fiscal year came about because last fall salary negotiations had begun and, in some



cases, there was a desire to have revised budgets approved and those amended budgets approved so that fiscal agents could make the changes internally. She thought as they look ahead to the upcoming fiscal year there wouldn't be any reason why the September date would be too late.

Assistant Director Jerrad Barczyszyn (SNRPDP) said those dates work for them. He mentioned they worked with Chair Young and Dr. Crawford-Ferre to suggest some dates that would work well for their amendments and the times of year for their fiscal agents.

## **9. FUTURE ADENDA ITEMS**

Member Trakas thought it would be great for the council to think about and discuss the February 3, 2025, legislative opening date and begin to find updated information about future projections for teacher and administrative turnover to look at being proactive and seeking additional funding not only for the RPDP's but also the administrative grant. This should be discussed at the June 6, 2024, meeting. She thought it would be helpful if someone could do a presentation and share information on what the council can do to support the RPDP's, if they wish to request additional funding.

Chair Young said he would work with the NDE staff to see what kind of data they have and who might be available to provide the council with some of that information.

Heather Crawford-Ferre wanted to highlight that the administrative fund RFP proposal that the council approved today has presentations scheduled at the next meeting. It will be on the agenda. With our decision today to move forward on the timeline what that means is you will not have heard reports from the recipients this year who received funding prior to hearing presentations about new proposals. She asked if the council if they would like her to reach out to our currently funded FY24 grantees and have them first present their outcomes of their work at the next meeting prior to hearing any presentations about future potential candidates for funding.

Chair Young said yes that would be very appropriate.

Member Trakas said she just wanted to make sure that would also be an agenda item for action to approve those meeting dates.

## **10. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

There was no in-person public comment Carson City or Las Vegas and no public comment via email.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Young Adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.