

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
October 20, 2023
9:00 AM**

Office	Address	City	Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual	Virtual	<u>YouTube</u>

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Guy Hobbs, Chair
Punam Mathur
Jim McIntosh
Dr. David Jensen
Jason Goudie
Mark Mathers
Joyce Woodhouse
Dusty Casey
Paul Johnson
Kyle Rodriguez
Nancy Brune

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

James Kirkpatrick, State Education Funding Manager
Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent of the Student Investment Division

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Craig Burkett, Chief Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Tami Hance-Lehr, CEO and State Director for Communities in Schools of Nevada
Alex Bybee, Chief Strategy Officer with Communities and Schools in Nevada
Irene Bustamante Adams, Workforce Connections
Adrina Ramos-King, Workforce Connections, Strategic Initiatives Manager
Tina Quigley, President and CEO of the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Paul Moradkhan, Senior Vice President of Government Affairs for the Vegas Chamber
Nick Schneider, Manager of Government Affairs for the Vegas Chamber
Francesca Petrucci, CCEA
Brenda Pearson, CCEA
Tammy Malich, City of Las Vegas Director Youth Development and Social Initiatives
John Etzell, Executive Director of Boys Town Nevada
Dana Roseman, Senior Director, Boys Town, Nevada
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager for the City of Henderson

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chair Hobbs. Quorum was established. Chair Hobbs noted for the record that they are joined by Senior Chief Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

There was no public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA (*For Possible Action*)

Chair Hobbs stated this is probably an item that we'll have on our agenda from time-to-time asking the board to approve a flexible agenda that would allow us to take items out of order as may be necessary to track with a logical progression of discussion or as we'll be doing today and perhaps for our next couple of meetings. He suggested they create a 10 o'clock time for item 9. This was approved and they will be operating under a flexible agenda.

4. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 25, 2023, MINUTES (*For Possible Action*)

Chair Hobbs stated the September minutes will be available for approval at our November meeting.

Unidentified Speaker moved to approve the August 25, 2023 minutes. Unidentified Speaker seconded. Motion passed.

5. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) Update (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*)

Megan Peterson stated since their last meeting, the team has continued to work through the requirements for the request for proposals that will be discussed later today. This work has included reaching out to existing partners, so that we can leverage those relationships and hopefully get information timely. That way, the commission can make decisions and recommendations by the time that our contracts are officially approved and the information from those can be shared for additional recommendations pursuant to the letter of intents that we received from the legislature, as well as Assembly Bill 400 and Senate Bill 98. Once we receive the directions that will be discussed during agenda item 12 today, the team will work to finalize the scopes of work and submit the information so that we can move forward with the request for proposal as soon as possible. While conducting this analysis and research related to these items, we were in conversation with the Legislative Counsel Bureau and they did also provide additional clarification to us regarding the request to research and make a recommendation on online schools that are in school districts that are in the fiscal year 20 funding methodology. We did identify one school from Esmeralda County, but when you look at the weighted per pupil funding amounts that are identified for those districts, there is no fiscal impact as a result of those online schools. The result is still the same. Essentially, the analysis is that because they are on the fiscal year 20 methodology that change does not impact those schools and so the funding is the same. Additionally, we did clarify that there is an additional letter of intent that is requiring the commission on school funding to provide recommendations and analysis on the state special education funding model. We are already in contract with WestEd and doing that analysis, and so we'll be able to provide that information tentatively February of 24 and we are also continuing to re-review the information that was provided by Augenblick, Palaich and Associates who were the foundation with their 2018 report for the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. We are working to run some scenarios based on that recommendation as well as any information that WestEd will provide to us. That way, we can provide the information again to you tentatively in February. We have also been working with other partners in the community to identify opportunities from other states who are working towards a uniform financial management system in the way that we are and so we are having those conversations and look to provide some suggested frameworks in upcoming meetings. At this time, that concludes a brief summary of the work that we have been working on since the last commission meeting.

Chair Hobbs asked if she could summarize the status of any existing agreements they have with subject matter experts.

Megan Peterson stated the department has recently entered into a contract with both WestEd and APA for a change management contract that is assisting us with further implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. As a result, we have access to work that they're doing related to that that will help in form recommendations related to AB400 and SB98. They are helping us with the change management. They're looking to contact not only school districts, but they've been working with department staff to identify the different levels of understanding of the formula and then how we can better communicate not only the changes that have occurred, but any new changes specifically resulting from AB400 and SB98.

Chair Hobbs asked if the scopes are broad enough that, should we need assistance in any other areas we work through this, they might also be available through you all to provide that.

Megan Peterson stated yes, they tentatively have planned opportunities for presentations based on the information that they have learned to share in future meetings.

David Jensen asked what they are looking for them to evaluate on the letter of intent on the state special Ed funding.

Megan Peterson stated the request from the legislature was for the department to work with WestEd to identify if the methodology that we're currently using is the most effective specifically within the distribution for charter schools, whether treating them as single local education agencies or under the state public charter sponsor as a whole, but also requested analysis on making a recommendation on a weight. The formula does currently provide the per pupil funding for special education as a weight, but we currently have a methodology that maintains the maintenance of effort for school districts and then distributes new funding based on a per pupil amount, and so we're conducting analysis to see what the impact is when that weight is changed versus moving to a completely weighted methodology similar to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

6. COMMISSION PURPOSE NORMING (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*)

Chair Hobbs stated this item is one that we have been thinking about for the last several weeks and the notion is that we should have a discussion about the goals and objectives that will form the mission for the Commission on School Funding over the next several months to hopefully ensure that we're staying on target with our core mission and objective over that period. In the initial stages of our work together a few years ago, and even more recently, when we prepared our report on the funding targets and recommended sources of funding, we did this same thing. At the time, we called them guiding principles for the work that we were doing and these were essential to keeping us focused on our core mission and the various sub-elements of that work as we went along. The purpose of this item is to go through the same process and identify the guiding principles for the work ahead of us.

Punam Mathur stated she has been overwhelmed by the list of about 21 very specific metrics that are enumerated in AB400 and SB98. Every 53 years, we had to modernize the funding formula whether we want to or not, but what was so incredibly helpful is that Senators Dennis and Woodhouse first challenged themselves, frankly, to articulate guiding principles. Transparency, student-centered, geographic diversity, hold harmless, funds are most effective when directed to the classroom. Each had just a sentence of the explanation, but it really gave sort of a clarity in the theory of action that was fundamentally important to dealing with the complexity that is inevitable in that work. A secondary benefit was the why and the design principle in the formula, and that's important, especially when it comes to accountability, and so those are the guiding principles that really drove the modernization of the funding formula in 2019. We did it again as a commission in 2021 when we were looking at this behemoth topic of fiscal policy and funding that can get really mired in political considerations and all kinds of secondary, tertiary, important, but secondary and tertiary considerations. We said, what are the design principles that must be true to create something useful. We actually prioritized them then. We had four sufficiency, stability predictability, competitiveness and equity, both horizontal and vertical. The complexity is overwhelming, and the only counter to the complexity is to get really clear about the simple truths that will be

simple truths in our consideration of all of that. The fact that we articulated those principles and then since in description of the formula itself, or description of the approach to fiscal policy, it is a way to start conversations. It has allowed us to be credible in and continue the conversations. The accountability is the most complex for me and the most critical. Because if we're going to make a credible argument to the residents of Nevada to want to fund, we've got to get this right and so we haven't gone through the exercise of saying what are the simple truths. What are those principles that we will adhere to through everything. That's what I would raise. Are there those absolutely critical, borne out over decades of research, harbingers of kid's success? And can those be our six? I've been losing sleep around the accountability and it's so critical if we don't get this piece right in a way that represents desires, ambitions of our public with all of its diverse constituencies, the business community, those that are working full-time on economic development, those that are teachers, those who are parents, those who are kids. I know that in the past the principles that we challenged ourselves to adhere to and then subsequently did were incredibly beneficial, both to guide the work as well as to explain it to my neighbor.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks that it's simple for us to say to ourselves that the legislation provides us with certain mandates that we have to meet. He thought maybe they should have some flip charts or a whiteboard or something like that. He thought it might make sense to ask each member to provide something that they think should be considered as a guiding principle. We've had very specific things tasked to us by the legislation, and we will see those through, but I think why we are going through this part of it is exceptionally important, particularly as we try to take all of those things and aggregate them into something that makes sense to those who will be looking at it later.

Punam Mathur stated the fact that we don't have something that is viewed as useful by our publics means that the default will remain those national rankings, which tell us nothing in terms of decisions that we're making, investments that we're making. She thinks there's an opportunity for us, as has been the case since the formation of the commission. The legislature gave us the to do list, and we need to check it off and earn our gold star, and we will, but they've also entrusted us with the opportunity to offer a here's what is the best, which is hard for us to do. But we've done it with fiscal policy. We've done it with the formula construct itself. I fantasize about the day that we as Nevadans can come up with some consensus dashboard that behind it has all of the requisite metrics that yield for measures on a particular gauge that in aggregate, the public will have more confidence in than those national rankings.

Chair Hobbs asked James to jot down the comments that are made, so we can perhaps then go through them and try to assemble them. Maybe it all doesn't happen today, maybe we bring it back for adoption at the next meeting, but we begin to form up these guiding principles and statement of our core mission here beyond just having been assigned various things to do. If you're just running down a checklist, we're losing sight of why we're doing it and what we're trying to convey in doing it. He asked commission members to offer a statement that they think should be included in and among these guiding principles, and we'll use this as the jumping off point for trying to put that together.

Jim McIntosh stated he thinks the frustration for him in terms of having all this data thrown at us a regular basis, we talk about accountability and we talk about rankings. What decisions are we going to make based off of this data? He stated he's not sure how to put that into a guiding principle or what decisions we should be making based off of this data, whether the metric is high or low. He feels like sometimes that's lost. We're presented with data, and I'm not really sure what the next step is to say then this is who this needs to go to and here is the action that we need to take.

Joyce Woodhouse stated one of the thoughts that immediately came to mind for her, based upon what you've asked is, in looking at this list of 20 plus items to be addressed in the accountability and both of those measures, what's the connectivity between one to the next to the other in order that at the end we are addressing achievement levels of students?

David Jensen stated that connectedness comes back to clarity. Are we clear on what we are evaluating? What

becomes accountability for us? If we're not clear, then the individual districts and the charter authority are not going to be able to provide that information that we're expecting and our legislators are expecting. He stated he appreciated Punam's perspective on the dashboard. I don't know what comes first to me, but we talk so frequently about equity and nobody has any concerns with that fact that we have to be equitable. To him, the issue is sufficiency, the light behind equity, because in order to be equitable, we have to be sufficient, and sufficiency is going to look different. In his district, Winnemucca Grammar School in Central Winnemucca to Denio Elementary School, a 100 miles north, sufficiency and equity look different at those two locations and that has to be a point I believe from the commission's perspective that we keep in our processes.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks this is horribly simplistic based on what we've been tasked to do. Over the last three years, we spent a lot of time identifying what we felt was, largely in response to the legislation, identify optimal funding for education. In working through that, we came up with some measurements that were a bit more deterministic than whatever the word optimal may mean. We were able to quantify that, and we were able to identify sources of funding, notwithstanding how difficult all of those tasks may be, but we were able to identify things that would move us in the direction of achieving that. Along the way, we did more than just do that. What we also tried to provide was a sense of what the outcome would be if we failed to move in that direction. Now here. since the last legislative session and the investment of additional dollars in education, still well-short of what anybody would view as optimal. There is a strong sense amongst elected leadership that there needs to be a way to provide an indication that the investment of those dollars is a wise investment on an ongoing basis. That leads us to where we are. We have more than 21 things that were identified in the legislation that could serve as measurements of how we're progressing. One of the reality checks on all of this, and I think this is important for everyone to understand is, you cannot possibly come up with this in the next 12 months. Something that you implemented it in the 13th month, will give you an exact indication of the value of the investment of those dollars because it's something that's going to occur over time, and it'll have to be measured over time. In thinking about all of those specific things that are in the legislation, I think that we have to identify that there are clearly some things in there that we must pay attention to. But as we go through those, how clear are each of those and how much are they related to this mission of providing some indication of return on investment or that sounds too much like a business term than something that we should be used using when we're talking about our kids. Something that would clearly measure that. Are all of those pieces of data available, reliable, consistent over time, so you can use them on an ongoing basis? So you have a bunch of available data, what does it mean? Is it clear, measurable and meaningful? Now the meaningful part of it is the part where you take a bunch of numbers and then the real magic happens. You do the inferential work from the numbers. What does all of that mean? We have to come up with something that is meaningful at the end, not just a collection of numbers because otherwise they get lost in other numbers. Things that are truly meaningful when aggregated together, they could be put into a report, and over time, the results of that can be compared from year-to-year. So, the three words I would offer would be clear, measurable, meaningful just off the top of my head.

Punam Mathur stated she thinks they have buckets of research over many, many years that say there are a few things that are absolute reliable harbingers of futures for kids, third grade literacy. We know that that is a very reliable predictor of what's going to happen in the future and so if we say as a state, we're going to get obsessed about that one and that then becomes the gauge. Behind it, there's a litany of things that are going to have to be true over time to move it and so, do we have reading specialists? Do we have assesses that are conducive to third grade literacy? Do we have the other resources that districts need in order to be able to lift up a baby who's a little bit short to get him over the hump? My neighbor doesn't need to see all of the gauges or all of the metrics that comprise a result on that one gauge. But it would be handy to have that one gauge and some of the 21 things that we've been asked to do relate to third grade literacy. Let me take another example, career and college ready. We have declared that as a state for a long time. That's our ambition. If that's our gauge and the public's going to get a green, yellow, red, read on that gauge against whatever aspiration we set for the period of time, we set it. Behind there, there will be a ton, it will be a layer upon layer of different metrics that in aggregate will give us a sense of how we're doing. The other thing I think is really, really important for us at this stage in our journey is to really get focused on growth rather than absolute measures. I think there's a lot of expectation setting. It really scares me when I hear anyone in the public say we just put 2 billion bucks in, and the expectations are completely

unrealistic. For us, the challenge is, as we make a recommendation on a 10-year journey to get to optimal funding, we've got to have the ability to talk to the public and manage expectations to say growth is the thing. Growth in the number of educators. Growth in the retention and our ability to pay them and develop them and support them. Growth in class sizes. So that they're not then determining that investing money is a bad idea because they're not getting the instant big result that they're wanting. Do we make a recommendation that says here are the stages of our dashboard over the next 10 years? In the first stage, I think we've fairly recently implemented a Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. I think we've got an obligation to be able to report clearly that yes, money is following the pupil. In the immediate term, we've got an obligation to confirm that those are the things that are actually happening and so that's in the immediate term. We know that it's an HR problem, teacher vacancies, lack of special Ed, lack of math specialists and so we know that, and so is there a mid-level set of gauges or metrics that we focus on to say we are making some appreciable dents. There is growth in the HR problem, because ultimately if we don't solve that, nothing else is going to get solved. I don't know if it's a layered set of gauges that would be a recommendation or how we would do that, but I do think it's going to be important to have something that is staged. If we just keep looking at proficiency, it's going to be short. It's going to be red and I don't know that any of us have any expectation of proficiency by having the money that just been poured in, which is a magnificent amount of money. But by the end of the next school year, we're going to have proficiency in double digit increases and so we need to manage that expectation and I don't know how to do that.

Chair Hobbs stated what she is saying is extremely important and one part of that is prerequisite to everything else that we do and that is firmly establishing that the, under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, the funding is following the student. If that is not established as the case, everything else that we do is not directly measuring the value of having it follow the students. I think that's a prerequisite to all of the other measurements that we do is being able to make that affirmation.

Paul Johnson stated when you hear the working group report, it's going to be reflective of a lot of the discussion that we're currently having because we had a funding formula that was in place since 1967 and everything attached to it is dated at that point as well, the measures of accountability, the reports that are in statute. A lot of those things have been on the books for years who were great ideas at the time, but may not be great ideas under the lens of the new Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. A lot of the things that we're doing, and there's tons of information that school districts pump out, it's because we're statutorily required to do so not necessarily because it's useful data anymore. As I'm reflecting on this and hearing the words that maybe resonate with me, I think the most important word for me is authenticity. We want to make sure that what we're doing is authentic and that it reflects what actually is going on in the schools. We're all required to do district improvement plans that are evidence based approved by the Department of Education, but there's nothing that we have that reflects how well we're implementing those. Alignment, it must be aligned with what we wanted it to be aligned with, and to me, that's the Nevada academic content standards and support, and support. The current performance framework only measures three of the nine components. If we're going to have nine areas of content standard, we should have nine areas of measurement of performance, not just cherry pick a few and it has to be comprehensive. It has to be kind of an all-encompassing thing. I have a pretty good graphic that is my idea of what it is, where we are and where we need to go. The final piece that we need to be mindful of, we have the amount pretty much nailed down, we've triangulated the adequacy piece, we have the NAS piece, and we were able to come up with a financial dollar amount, we have the studies, we have the average from NCEES, so we kind of have that. What we don't have, what does that mean in terms of people, which is what Punam had mentioned. What are the pupil staff ratios in student support, staff support, school administration, so in addition to having a comparison with financial adequacy. I think there has to be an HR component to that as well and then capital. We need to really touch on the three phases that affect us, our financial human resources and capital, resources for a school district.

Chair Hobbs stated they look forward to the working group report, particularly how it may enlighten what we're talking about here. It's always seemed odd to me that everything to do with the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan is about (indiscernible) for schools. And nothing directly has any bearing upon capital and capital needs. I understand why because of the way that the tax apportionment systems work in the state but it seems

extraordinarily short-sighted to me. The other thing that came to mind is that the State, as least as best I understand it, does have standards about things like class size targets. I don't know what those mean if we're not measured against those and not achieving those. You have standards that the funding knowingly doesn't meet, or possibly your capital assets don't allow you to achieve. This commission has latitude above and beyond what was identified in the legislation. I know that the work that NAS has been doing, they're identifying things well beyond what were identified in the legislation, and we do absolutely have that latitude to fill in some of the missing nine that you mentioned, Paul, and I think that's extraordinarily important for us to remember as we talk through this. We need to have a core mission for this segment of what we do. Then guiding principles that fall under that core mission is to facilitate a system of measurement for the State to use reliably on an ongoing basis to gauge the change in. I don't know if performance is the right word, but something like that over time. We know we'll have the data to do, we know what that data means, whether it has stars attached to it, or numbers attached to it or whatever it converts into That's what defines what we're doing this time.

Punam Mathur stated just to make one additional layer of complexity, which is a decision for us, it's a soul search kind of moment. Our reason for existing is a Pupil-Centered Funding formula to fund K-12 education. If those are the boundaries, then theoretically everything we do should be K-12. However, if I look at the tried and tested harbingers of success, access to early childhood education is one of those and so the question philosophically for us is, how brave do we want to be? Do we want to stay within, here is K-12 and sort of a reaction to approach accountability, or do we want to seize an opportunity, to say to the governor and the legislature at the next session, here's for the entire system, something that includes that one gauge because as gauges go, that access of pre-K is a monster harbinger.

Chair Hobbs stated whether we're prevented or not, if there are things that need to be added to the conversation, we have the latitude to add those. Bhis commission, in some form, will have a life well beyond the current period that we're all appointed to deal with because the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. We all believe it will be an ongoing living thing and we'll need to have oversight provided for many, many years to come We went through the funding identification piece, we still have to activate on the funding. We're going through the devising of systems of measurement part of it right now, that will need to be monitored over time, but does that take care of all the issues? No, absolutely not. I think that's exactly what you're saying. He suggested that they take those points that have been raised and circulate them back to the commission for additional development into a mission statement and a group of principles.

7. WORKING GROUP REPORT *(Information)*

Paul Johnson gave a presentation on the working group discussions regarding accountability measures; Governor Joe Lombardo's State of the State Address in January 2023; working group considerations; NASS iNVEST - priority 1, 2, 3; framework pieces; new framework concept; and next steps. *(see "7.Working_Group_Report_FINAL_ADA.pdf" for details).*

Chair Hobbs asked who does what with this data.

Paul Johnson stated the school improvement plans, those are a result of the Nevada School Performance Framework and if you have a one or two-score school, you're required by law to fill those out. They have to be evidence based. It has to go to the Department of Education and be approved before you can even use it because they ensure that the stuff that we're putting in there is based on science, based on that is the state, the State of Nevada. Then we have district improvement plans to make sure that the school improvement plans are aligned with what the district is doing, and then state improvement plans to make sure that all of that is aligned with what the state is doing. That is a system of alignment. We don't have measures that identify the effectiveness of that system of alignment, which is something that we can work on and make a part of the comprehensive aligned system of measures. Each school district uses the information in their own unique way. Maybe David or some of the other guys that are on the panel might be able to identify some of the reports and how they use that if you want more of an explanation.

Chair Hobbs stated what he gets out of this is a lot of the data that we might need to facilitate the construction of a performance measurement tool over time probably exists in a lot of these reports. He stated he knows that these are required for you to do, and there's probably a lot of internal value to a lot of you for having this data pulled together, but it was required at some point for a reason. That reason probably was there was a state law that said there shall be a report done that includes the following information. But what impact do these reports have on those that are making funding decisions at the state level? Are they reviewed? Are they available to them?

Paul Johnson stated he doesn't use any of this information internally. What he creates has more meaning to him locally.

Joyce Woodhouse stated some of these are legislative because somebody wanted something. Some of them are coming from other areas. I know over the years the department of education has come to the table, school districts have come to the table, and said we don't need these and they will have identified certain ones, but always it's on somebody else's turf and there's no change. Maybe we get rid of one every once in a while, but not often. The other thing I would say, looking at this whole list, this is frightening to me, and two things. One, there's an impact on the classroom, and what teachers have to do, what they're told they have to do, and some of it isn't necessarily dealing with what the teacher is trying to do, and that is for their students to achieve. The other thing I would say is you could show this list to 63 legislators and the only one they know is the one that has the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 stars. The rest of it, now the majority of SB543 now. They can't explain it to you, but some can, but a lot of these are just words. They don't know what they mean. They don't know what they do, but it's hard to undo something that's been here a long time. It's something that as we go through this process in this year ahead of us, there may be a time where we'll say, as the commission, if we agree, there's some of these we can get rid of and we can back up the commission or back up the superintendent of public instruction to have a bill and to get it off of the plates of the school districts and off of the plate of principals and the department so that we really can address what's going on in the classroom.

Chair Hobbs thanked her for that perspective. Just a couple of these grab your attention, like acing accountability in Nevada report card sound like the kind of thing that we're trying to move toward. I would like to think that we could come up with something that's more inclusive, more performance space and maybe take the place of a couple of these.

8. DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUP REPORT *(Discussion and Possible Action)*

Jason Goudie stated his comment is on this presentation as well about the redundancy of information that's out there and that's required without a purpose. We've talked a lot about having a meaningful measurement plan, that is, one plan versus 15 different ones. We've also made the comment several times that utilizing the ranking score nationwide is not the right measurement tool and there's a couple reasons. One is the nationwide tools are still inconsistent because each state measures things differently, which makes it very challenging. Then if we're going to start to look at a truly meaningful measurement tool, that tool might just be Nevada based, which we just need to consider the fact that how we measure ourselves if we're going to truly do something that's meaningful for us, and we talk about growth, and we talk about what's really important, it may not have a national average to compare ourselves to. So, as we build these things, I think that needs to be one of the decision points that we make. Because we know there's inconsistencies within every district on how we report data and some of these reports and how we use them, how you use growth versus how you use the statewide measurement tools. I just want to make sure that as we start going down this path and start discussing these pieces. This came up in the discussion that I believe Ms. Peterson is going to bring up next that there are a number of challenges and having one measurement, but I think it's key and we just have to be very deliberate about the decisions that we make as it relates to that goal, because I think we will lose some comparability to other areas.

Chair Hobbs stated it would seem, as we go through this process to try to build the ideal machine to measure, the changes in performance over time, that would hopefully also then lead to additional investment over time. One of the outgrowths of that could hopefully be going back to the horrifying slide, reduction of some of the other reports in place of the one that we're hoping to produce. I would like to think that an outgrowth of part of the effort on

that would be recommendations along those lines as well. There are two things that we need to be mindful of. One is the source of the data and we know what data exists and what data doesn't exist because of all these different reports and we need all of that data, but as far as creating confusion about, well, gee, if I'm a legislator, what report do I look at to tell me something meaningful about a decision that I'm being asked to make? I don't know which one of those you look at definitively. I think that's really the goal here. I think we want to keep that in mind as one of our objectives as we go through this.

Paul Johnson stated they should be using the same reports. The same report that I use as CFO or my superintendent uses to determine how well we're doing things in our neck of the woods should be the exact same information that legislators are basing their decisions on or the state superintendent. It should be based on those improvement plans that we have designed. Based on the data that we're receiving that says here are the things that you need to work on. Here's the stuff you're doing good, keep doing that good stuff, but here's the stuff you need to work on and then it's up to us to identify how we invest those resources in order to be most effective for our group. There's going to be challenges outside of education that we can't control. We're going to have to work with poverty being one of those things, but yeah, you're exactly right and I would hope that in doing that, we're all a little bit more excited about putting that information together because I can tell you right now the reports that I produce, one of them, for example, deals with school construction were required by law. Every CFO in the state to provide recommendations and financing school construction, but I'm pretty sure nothing happens to that report, but I got to do it every single by every, every even numbered year. So hopefully through doing this, we will gain some efficiencies so that it maybe is less burdensome and onerous on school districts and school personnel and more meaningful.

Chair Hobbs stated he agrees with what Jason said. This needs to be what we and the state feels are the best measurements for Nevada and the uniqueness of Nevada, as opposed to following some of blueprint right.

Paul Johnson stated he agrees and not just meet minimum guidelines, but focused on optimal performance.

9. PRESENTATIONS BY COMMUNITY EDUCATION PARTNERS *(Information and Discussion)*

Chair Hobbs stated he wanted to acknowledge the fact that members Woodhouse and Mathur have put a lot of time into trying to facilitate this part of it and why we believe this is so important.

Punam Mathur stated this is a journey that's not an "I" journey, it's a "we" journey and we've been so grateful for so many organizations that have been with us from the days of the legislature in 2019, as we were enacting the thing to every step along the way. About a week ago, Senator Woodhouse and I literally just sent an email, and so these are incredibly busy people who, regardless of how busy they are, just drop what they're doing to make time to be here to offer perspective. What we asked them to do was to give us their perspective related to AB400 and SB98 and more broadly, accountability and so it's really just to keep the we going and have us benefit from perspectives that are anchored and come from our community education partners. So, thank you to all of you for moving on a dime, and never say no.

Tami Hance-Lehr gave a presentation on the Communities in Schools of Nevada. This included serving students K-12 in 1 in 4 Title I and high-needs schools across Nevada; what is integrated student support (ISS); evidence-based, equity focused, data driven and accountability oriented; and delivering results to kids. *(See "9a.CIS_CSF_Presentation_10.20.23_FINAL_ADA.pdf" for details).*

Irene Bustamante Adams gave a presentation on Workforce Connections. This included their agenda; the role of workforce connections; one-stop delivery system; EmloyNV Brand; community investment impact; Southern Nevada's industry sector partnerships (presented by Adrina Ramos-King); disconnected youths (presented by Cecil Fielder); Governor's Workforce Development Board; actual achievement rate and percent of DOL negotiated rate attained; and convener role. *(See "9b. Workforce_Connections_Presentation_CSF10.20_FINAL_ADA.pdf" for details).*

Nancy Brune stated AB400 requires a data point which reads the number of pupils who enroll in a vocational or technical school or apprenticeship training program that's required or that one of the required metrics for AB400. Currently NDE does not collect this data point. She asked if they and/or the other Workforce Connection hubs across the state collect could do that or do they collect that data point.

Irene Bustamante Adams stated if the individuals that we serve do choose that, yes, we do collect it and we do report it through Dieter and it does end up in the state empower longitudinal data system.

Nancy Brune stated she was pleased to hear them mention internships because in all of her work, it amazes her that they still don't track and collect internships in a systematic way at all, even at a single community college. She asked, with the EmployNV for youth, could you potentially start tracking all internships for youth, for employers across Southern Nevada? Or is there a way to start doing that because we don't currently have a centralized hub?

Irene Bustamante Adams stated the short answer is yes. Because what we do is we already track what we say is called the work experience. So, it could be paid or it could be non-paid. We, for the clients that we serve, yes. We've already tracked that. Now for the employers, we haven't gone into that space yet, but collectively, we could do it if it's aggregated in one location and be able to share that.

Joyce Woodhouse stated she has not heard as significant a presentation on Workforce Connections since 2019 when I was term limited. She stated she wanted to pull out and thank them for the work on the teacher pipeline, and especially for the school counselors as well. For years, we've dealt with this issue, but to see another agency that's helping us address this problem.

Paul Johnson stated one of the things that we have struggled with in the past, and hopefully that will be remedied in the future, is the high school connection with careers, which is why we've made a concerted effort to try and offer as many vocational or career to technical, career to technical education programs in the high school, so. Hopefully we can broaden that as we move forward and partner with groups like yourself so that we can make that connection whether it's certified nurses' assistants or it's carpenters or plumbers or the trades that we so desperately need because that, that is an emerging need and a kind of a dying art form.

Punam Mathur stated the metrics, all of the data, and hundreds of reports that are filed by each of the districts, many of them are lagging. They tell us after the fact what we sucked on. The partnership that is possible as we imagine an accountability system in the state of Nevada, it does not say please limit to only what districts measure and monitor. Our task is to come up with an accountability system. Let's just use optimal as our guiding North Star. Let's go big. The opportunity to get these kinds of leading indicators. If college and career exits, graduation on time is one of our gauges that behind it, there should be metrics that flow into giving us an indicator on that gauge that include leading indicators. Did I get exposure to jobs in middle school? Did I get internships later? We've got a lot of different partnering organizations, including our employer and economic development organizations that capture and track stuff. They're just not tied together in any overall architecture that keeps everyone equally accountable for submitting good and clean data. And what it denies us as a state is the ability then to have gauges that really measure real stuff.

Irene Bustamante Adams stated the Governor's Workforce Development Board are on that same trajectory as far as what key indicators. They just had a presentation from Minnesota and Tennessee and what they're doing to identify that dashboard. Chairman Hugh Anderson leads the group and five core partners of the brothers and sisters we're on the same page. We just don't have it collectively and we haven't pinpointed, not the lagging data, but what is it we're looking at forward.

David Jensen asked what they are doing for the north. There's a huge focus on the south, that's where the center of our population is. We do get supports in Humboldt with work-based learning through Nevada Department of

Education, but some of the pieces you identified are essential in rural communities, but currently aren't available. I know that at times funding is an issue, but I hope down the line, because one of the things as a commission, we also got to look at uniformity and the ability to collect information. So, some of the metrics that have been identified for Clark County are not equal in Humboldt County.

Irene Bustamante Adams stated the short answer is yes, because there is one of us in northern Nevada. We handle 14 counties, they handle the other 13, but, and we are a big supporter, we pilot a lot of stuff, and then support a northern Nevada in the same way, and so that dashboard that I sent you that I showed you about the data we're collecting, our goal for this quarter is to get northern Nevada workforce board on that same type of metric, and so, I know they have bigger territory to cover because it's 13 counties versus 4, but it's a conversation and an introduction because I know that they want it, they just have a bigger territory to cover, but we are constantly working on how do we apply what we're piloting and apply it to the north, and sometimes it's the other way around because they have a lot less population to, to work through, and so it is a very reciprocal and intentional conversation with them and they just received 13 million.

Tina Quigley gave a presentation on the accountability measures that they are going to be working towards to include J4NG's impacts on SB98 and AB400; the highly effective education to workforce model; the JAG advantage; impacts on GPA and post-secondary entry; Tesla career readiness case study: impacts on employment; and considerations for the Commission. (See "*9c. J4NG_CSF10.20_Presentation_FINAL_ADA.pdf*" for details).

Paul Moradkhan and Nick Schneider gave a presentation on reporting and accountability measures. (See "*9d NDE.COSF.CLV. Presentation_FINAL_ADA.pdf*" for details)

Brenda Pearson and Francesca Petrucci gave a presentation on CCEA. (See "*9e. CCEA_CSF_10.20_Presentation_FINAL_ADA.pdf*" for details)

David Jensen stated he feels like one of your comments was possibly directed at his role. Speaking on behalf of the educators in here, we have a global view, not a specific view. Decisions being made, I don't make them for Humboldt County. I make them for the state of Nevada. My grandchildren are yet in the school system. They won't enter the school system until I retire. Decisions that we're making right now are going to impact my grandchildren. My son is in his first semester as an ARL student. He's a special Ed teacher at French Ford Middle School, but I'm watching the challenges that he's going through right now. His education is not an education. It was in Homeland Security. Quite a discrepancy between what I'm asking him to do right now and watching him quite honestly flail and struggle, and as a dad, being the superintendent, I have to take a step back and say, go talk to your principal. No, talk to me. So that's a challenge. But when we talk about this conversation, we talked about the number of teacher vacancies in Clark County, but this is a systemic issue across the state. If I heard at one point, and my data is stale, I believe NSHE was graduating about 600 teachers per year. He asked if that was correct.

Unidentified Speaker stated it was closer to 800.

David Jensen stated that's not even sufficient for Clark County, let alone Humboldt County. I have two vacancies in one of my most at risk schools, McDermott combined, a high school science and a high school ELA teacher, I can't fill, and so we need to have NSHE at the table. Because when we talk about the pipeline, what are we doing in the state? I know there's a lot of very strong efforts right now to make education in each of our districts. We're making structural changes to the compensation structure to make this a profession that our students are interested in, but NSHE's got to be part of this conversation and they got to be at the table to talk about what are we doing to support, encourage, and do what we need to, to generate within the state of Nevada our own sufficiency for teacher vacancies.

Brenda Pearson stated she agrees and she is an ARL student, and that's how I came through the ranks and understanding my experience. It's very similar to what you are describing for your son. Luckily my mom was a

teacher, so I could lean on her but I would like to say that AB428 does incorporate the work of NSHE, and so we are trying to make sure that that is included within what we're doing. The NDE is working with us and making sure that this is a consistent and continual pipeline to address your issue.

Chair Hobbs stated the commission takes the concerns you identified as constructive. My time working with the commission and the people on this commission, one thing that I've come to recognize about everyone on the commission is they have recognized this, the existence of this commission to be a significant opportunity. Not given very often to continue the work that we started two, three years ago, identifying target values that seems to have resonated a bit, and I think in a positive way. I think all of us recognize the importance of the role that we now have to identify meaningful measurements of success over time and I believe that every member of this commission holds that to their heart. But I would like to think that every member of this commission recognizes the importance of the opportunity that we've been given, despite the colors that they may wear at their homecoming game or anything like that.

Francesca Petrucci stated they acknowledge the work and they've done objective clinical work in the past. It's just a recognition that your scope has expanded significantly and we are not ignorant of that, and we hope that we can be partners and helpful in whatever way is possible because it is a task that we have been as an organization ourselves deeply, intimately involved with for a long time, and it's complicated.

Chair Hobbs stated he recognizes that. He thinks they view them and all the other folks that have a stake in the outcome of all this as partners in this and that's the most positive thing.

Nancy Brune asked Dr. Pearson if she or anybody else has looked at the different types of teacher programs and their impact on teacher retention.

Brenda Pearson stated she has general data as to how many people enter the profession with those types of degrees and experience, but no, I have not been able to track them. I think that would actually be a great addition to what we're looking at.

Nancy Brune stated another question has to do with the series of metrics that AB400 requires us to collect or districts to report in to your point about, sort of having verification or second set of eyes. I was going to read your couple of the metrics and you would just let us know where you collect the data or have the ability. The first one is the number of schools that employ a license teacher designated to serve as a literally specialist and number of schools that failed to employ and designate such a license teacher. Do you collect that data or would you be able to?

Brenda Pearson stated the data that we have in house actually comes from CCSD or NDE. We don't directly collect that data. We cannot take our data and take a look at it in a different fashion, but no, not necessarily. We're not getting it from the school level.

Nancy Brune stated the data that we have that says NDE does not collect related to teachers. You don't collect either because you're reliant on the state or CCSD.

Tammy Malich stated in the City of Las Vegas, our Mayor and City Council members are committed to support of public education and their support comes in a variety of ways, but specifically as it relates to SB98 and AB400, we appreciate the requirement for the superintendent to establish the metrics of performance for each grade specifically prescribed forms, technical advisory and ensuring comparable information and standardization so that we're comparing the same kind of information. The growth and proficiency in literacy, math and science, college and career readiness, and retention and recruitment of teachers and support professionals, our city efforts around those include city sponsors, the reinvent schools, Las Vegas, where we support 16 city of Las Vegas schools in the urban core. We provide AmeriCorps service members to support academic growth and proficiency specifically in literacy, attendance, health and nutrition, and parent engagements. We also are the recipient of a

21st Century Grant, providing funding in seven additional schools to pay CCSD teachers extra duty pay to address academic support and support school focus on both literacy and mathematics. We provide before and after school programming in all 70 of our City of Las Vegas elementary schools. Our before and after school programming is a little bit unique from our counterparts in that the charge from our council and mayor has always been to provide an extended academic day, not just a safe place for kids to come and play games after school. Nothing wrong with that and I am not slamming that but we really feel it's necessary to focus on extended academic day and so we provide literacy through readers, theater and steam activity programming in all of our sites. At our middle and high school level, we support through our batteries included and batteries included next gen programs, which focus on college and career readiness, leadership development, character education, college tours, and support for higher education and stackable credential programs. Workforce development, both we support and support -- we support independent of CCSD and with CCSD through a variety of measures. We have supported multiple career fairs out in the community or encouraging and urging CCSD to bring the career fair into the community, handhold a little bit and walk people through the process. It's very complicated. I tried to help somebody one day and had to phone a friend. I spent 30 years in CCSD, so I had a friend to phone, but had I not been able to, if I was just a community member, it would have been very challenging. CCSD responded and it has done four career fairs to date in our community, each resulting in over a hundred hires on the spot from jobs from administration, substitute, teaching, maintenance, food service, you name it, where they actually walked them through the application process, did fingerprinting on site, so really supportive programming and partnership. We appreciate and really are excited about the opportunity for this commission to review academic progress, and consider strategies to improve accessibility and ensure equity. We specifically reviewing academic progress made by students, and how the progress relates to the new student funding model, also to make recommendations to approve reporting, tracking, monitoring, analysis and dissemination of the data with regard to student achievement and fiscal responsibility and accountability. Mayor Goodman has a plaque on her desk if you've been in her office that says inspect what you expect. She expects that to be in all of our offices, not just because it sounds good, and not because she's trying to claim that as her statement, but we do believe that increased funding should result in increased accountability. Money alone does not fix a problem. You're all finance people. You knew that most of you are finance people you know that better than most. We also are very committed to our efforts around the Strong Start Academy Elementary School, which is a city of Las Vegas supported charter school. We got on board with that following COVID and providing support to our community and in response, we take that leadership role very seriously. We provide a liaison and we have appointees to our board of directors for that. We appreciate that each school district and charter school would submit, will submit quarterly reports to this commission, identifying how their funding is being used, specific to academic performance, and including data showing or demonstrating those improvements. We also really like the fact that the governor will now exactly have the authority to direct remedial action. We provide to our council and mayor our maps and I ready reports comparative for the Strong Start Academy Elementary School as well as CCSD schools in the city. We like the ability and we like the fact that our council expects that level of accountability. Our City of Las Vegas Business and Finance also monitors and audits the charter school to ensure that funding in our school is utilized according to specific purposes, and they can connect it directly to academic performance, academic achievement. So again, we practice what we preach. We don't think it's great just for you. We, we also measure that. We appreciate the Early Childhood Literacy and Readiness Account and authorizing the department to award grants and the grants supporting program accountability that include age limitations, evidence-based practices, support for children with disabilities and a plan for reporting accountability. The city is committed to high quality early education programming. We've been in that space since 2019. We partner with a Head Start and Early Head Start provider to serve communities in brick-and-mortar facilities. We have six of those. We also provide direct preschool services through mobile programming. We have Strong Start Go mobile preschool program, graduation rates and employment rates, as well as the creation of the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship Program, similar to the teach Nevada scholarship with eligibility for underserved and economically disadvantaged populations, as well as critical labor shortage areas and the same kind of reporting requirements. We think that's really important as we look at a teacher pipeline, similar to some of the points that CCA made the impact of a licensed teacher in the classroom is paramount again in the Strong Start Academy Elementary School. One of our non-negotiable was that all, every teacher had to be licensed and TESOL endorsed. It's a dual language model school. We believe strongly that the quality of education impacts economic development as Tina quickly mentioned, the

strength of the school district and our school system, our K-12 model is the strength of the city of Las Vegas and all of our municipality partners. Their failure is our failure. Those are our -- that's our future workforce, our future, our future taxpayers, our future citizen base and so we think that's really important. Concluding with just a couple of, of numbers, just to give you an idea of how committed, it's easy to say that our mayor and council are committed to this. My department is based solely; it was created in 2016 by the city council and mayor at that time, created solely to address education initiatives and workforce initiatives, general fund about 5.4 million dollars the city invests in this. Our RDA education set aside. We commit 2.7 million dollars a year around education initiatives, some of the things I mentioned, our, our before and after school extended day programming three and a half million that is a revenue generating account, so it does offset itself, so that disclaimer. Grants 11.3 million, we have in federal grants right now, largely those are workforce and capital improvement for this year \$5.6 million. Most of those were capital improvement, save expansion at the Strong Start Academy Elementary School. So those are just some of the ways that the city of Las Vegas is committed to this work, and directly related to the accountability measures in both SB98 and AB 400.

John Ezzell and Dana Roseman gave a presentation on Boys Town Nevada, perspectives on SB98 and AB400. This included how they do it; a review of SB98 and AB400; Guinn Center education and social policy report for May 2023; teacher satisfaction of school support specialist; educational services provided; and CCSD teacher and administrator comments. (See "9. Boys Town Pres SB98 AB400 FINAL ADA.pdf" for details.)

Nancy Brune asked if she was correct in that they provide tier 1 support to 63 schools.

Dana Roseman stated yes.

Nancy Brune asked about if the school support specialist supports the school.

Dana Roseman stated the school support specialist is that tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 level support because they're there for the students to basically advocate for them to teach them some social skills that a lot of times lead them to the principal's office. So, we're there to help them really understand what it is that they should be doing and to replace some of those behaviors.

Nancy Brune asked if it was correct that they provide case management or sort of one-on-one with 5,000 students.

Dana Roseman stated that's the total amount of students that we supported last school year.

Nancy Brune asked if it was in the 63 schools.

Dana Roseman stated in the 63. And last year we were in 39. So, we added an additional amount this year.

Punam Mathur asked if there are common data systems that nonprofits use who are partnering with districts around the state and if they are using common data systems or are they tracking their own stuff.

Dana Roseman stated they track their own data, but get the data directly from Clark County School District. In regards to the teacher surveys, we do those surveys ourselves. We do provide those surveys, but the actual student attendance data, we get that from Clark County.

David Cherry stated evaluation and accountability are critical components of strong public education systems and are vital to ensuring that the investments are aligned and focused on outcome goals and objectives, setting benchmarks coupled with continual progress monitoring are also important ways to sustain momentum in moving forward towards reaching those goals. The City of Henderson and its residents place a high value on education. Since 2015, the city has invested more than \$15 million to support local public education infrastructure and programs and quality education is one of the city's five strategic priorities. Our community recognizes that student success benefits, not only our young learners, but it's critical to the future of Nevada in all the ways

articulated by the previous presenters. For this reason, the city engages regularly with education leaders to better understand their needs, provide support, and celebrated – celebrate successes, whether in our public schools or charter schools. With the historic investments in public education that were the product of bipartisan support in the last legislative session, ensuring that accountability measures are in place and expectations are clearly communicated, will be vital in not only monitoring the impact of these investments, but also in identifying where additional needs may still exist. The provisions for monitoring and public transparency in AB400 and SB98 are important components of ensuring that these investments support improvements in academic outcomes for students and boost the overall quality of public education. Accountability and financial reporting are also important for transparency within the community. Families with students in CCSD and the public at large need to know progress is being made and results are being delivered. It should be clear to everyone where funding is being invested so they understand what outcomes should be impacted. In addition, increased transparency and clear accountability metrics help city leaders and other community partners make data driven decisions for where investments should be made to ensure that they are aligned to the metrics and support existing initiatives without supplanting funding or duplicating efforts. Finally, specific and detailed accountability measures will also benefit state and local leaders as they work to identify those investments with the greatest impact in improving access to high quality educational opportunities for the students and families in Henderson and across our broader community.

Mark Mathers stated he is very interested in hearing the collaboration that appears to go on between city governments and the school district and Clark. He asked if he could explain what the \$15 million you referenced funded what programs or costs went to.

David Cherry stated they do have an education initiatives team. They are really experts in this matter. Also, we have an expert who's sitting up on the dais with us happens to be from the City of Henderson as well. All credit to the mayor, previous mayors, this mayor and previous councils and this city council they made a decision to take a portion of the revenues that we receive when we began to get a share of money from the sales of legal marijuana products in the City of Henderson and to dedicate those directly to education. What we do is we work with our local schools within the City of Henderson, and we determine what those needs are in conjunction with them and then we're able to make investments in classrooms and in schools that we find have had a direct impact on student success. It's really a collaborative effort. We use the feedback we receive from them. We go out and we say, what is it that you need? And how can we help deliver the results you're looking for? It's been very innovative. It's everything from technology to helping teachers by paying for some of them to teach during what would have otherwise been their prep period, those kinds of things. So, we really have tried to be as responsive to the needs of our local schools and local students as we possibly can.

Mark Mathers stated that's wonderful to hear and applauds the city for having a goal in their strategic plan about education. I think that really is progressive and innovative and I'm sure our commission member over here had something to do with it.

Jim McIntosh stated it's been a charge of ours and a strategic priority of our council to help fund those types of programs. We've done it also, not just with marijuana, we also have our 18% set of studies. I just want to throw this out there. There is 18%, and City of Henderson has multiple redevelopment agencies if you extend the life of the agencies, we are required to provide an 18% amount of that redevelopment funds to education as well. We have a significant amount of funding in those RDA funds, particularly in our downtown and our east side areas and these are areas that tend to be lower socioeconomic areas. Then we're able to pour those dollars specifically from those RDA funds back into education in some way. We have plans for that as well.

Chair Hobbs asked Jim if that is operating and capital.

Jim McIntosh stated that is operating and capital, yes.

Punam Mathur stated that if she talks to her neighbor, who then learns that there's other investments going on into

schools, they're really delighted to hear that. Secondly, asked if he could give her a picture that includes all of them. Because part of what we don't know as a state is, is a school better served when there's a Boys Town or communities of schools in it? Is it best served when both are in it? We don't know because there's no accountability system anywhere that sort of has a view that includes all of the investments. So, granted our job is a Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, K-12, that's our job. However, I get the opportunity for us is to get bigger in our aspiration of designing a really meaningful and useful overall accountability system, because all of those are other contributors, and we do three of the municipalities down here. She asked if those schools perform differently or better. Someday, let's hope that the same would be true in all of our rural communities as well, and wouldn't it be helpful to us to have an accountability system that said, if these kinds of partnerships are also there. Here's the ROI that we can expect.

Rene Cantu continued the presentation on jobs for Nevada's graduates (JAG).

Punam Mathur asked for the data keeping track of where kids end up, is that your own proprietary system? Is it in conjunction with Dieter?

Rene Cantu stated they have access to IC data for the day-to-day work that our specialists perform in the schools. It's limited to the students that they serve, right, through our MOU. We also make data requests from our district so that we can look at those data, but we collect data every day, both in terms of outcomes for follow students and also in terms of services that students are receiving every day. So, what are they being taught? Are they being taught resumes today? Are they engaging with employers, what are they doing? So, we have our own data platform that comes from our National Affiliate Organization, JAG that we utilize, and it's a Salesforce based system. You're absolutely right. It would be great if there were some sort of common way for nonprofits to measure and talk to each other with regard to data, but at this point, we have our proprietary system through JAG, and we use district data.

Punam Mathur stated she thinks she heard Workforce Connection say that we used to have our own platform. We and Dieter just didn't get off the table until we figured out a common platform that we could co-locate all info. So, there's a possibility, as we imagine building an ideal accountability system, we don't need to be limited with here's what we measure now, and here's the systems that we use now. Our opportunity here is to offer a recommendation for optimal. We may not make it, but at least we can aim it high.

Nancy Brune stated Punam reminded us that we can think outside of the box of what AB400 requires and SB98. She asked if they get students early enough so that they can enroll in CTE programs at whatever school you're at.

Rene Cantu stated with the change in CTE, where you can complete the program in two years, we're able to work with freshmen and sophomore students so that they can become credit proficient and be able to enter CTE programs as well as dual credit programs. For me, the idea of taking a bottom quartile student and having them do college coursework and enter CTE is a very powerful idea. So yes, when it used to be three years, we'd have very few who would be able to be ready on time, recovered enough to enter CTE programs.

Nancy Brune asked if they are proactively looking at how many of your students are on track to get the college and career ready diploma.

Rene Cantu stated he was having this conversation yesterday with our data analyst and the question was, well, we're collecting graduation data, but can you tell me what sort of diploma? Can you tell me about dual credit? We're not there yet. We need to get there. Just like we've gotten there with the post-secondary data, we need that data now. The superintendents like Dr. Jara have asked us, we want more young people to get the CCR diploma. And we're very much living in that space.

10. NEVADA COST OF EDUCATION INDEX REVIEW *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Megan Peterson stated agenda item 10 is in response, obviously, to the letter of intent that was provided by the

legislature, specifically in this context, addressing the Nevada Cost of Education Index, and the commission was asked to re-review the index and make a recommendation as to what direction to go with the index. And so ultimately whether to keep it, change the methodology, the data sources or possibly removing the index altogether.

She and Beau Bennett gave a presentation on NCEI. (See “10. NCEI_Review_FINAL_ADA”, “10a. NCEI_Summary_FINAL_ADA” and “10b. APA_NCEI_memo_FINAL-ADA” for details.)

Chair Hobbs stated he does remember most of those meetings where we’ve taken prior actions, and the input that we received back from APA. I thought we’d actually adopted a couple of more motions than what you had listed, Beau. I don’t think that anybody questions the intent of the cost of education index as it would apply in the formula. How you go about getting it has been getting to something that everyone finds to be representative of what the objective is, seems to have been the challenge. I don’t know that every stone has been overturned, and in light of what you said, Megan, about let’s maybe take the focus off of things like cost of wage index or housing or specific items like that, and look at it from a slightly different angle to achieve the desired result. My thinking would be that we would be well served to define a scope of services and take another shot at this before we turn tail and, you know, simply abandon its use, just to start the conversation. So, I would be more inclined to be supportive of the first bullet that we have on here.

Jason Goudie stated he thinks he’s always said that they, at least he agreed with the concept, but always felt very challenged with the application. I know everybody thinks Nevada’s unique and every state’s unique, and I’m sure we are in some aspects, but not as much as maybe some people think. One of the things, the way that we are built as a school district from a state perspective is by county, which is somewhat unique across the nation, which creates a greater disparity, certainly in size, especially in a state that has 75% of their population city in one city, and so I’ve always felt that coming up with additional ways that could address those challenges would be very, very challenging. I’m always open to looking at a different study. My fear is that we are going to have very limited resources financially. We have significantly more resources this go around than we did last time, which is nice, but we are going to limit and as we’ve talked about some of these other pieces around accountability, I’m fairly certain that we are going to well overspend potentially, we’re not going to overspend but we could going through those analyses and getting the support on those pieces, which I believe have a much greater impact on the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, and the educational value in Nevada than the NCI index would do. So if somehow we could do this extremely cheaply, that does not impact the ability to do these other areas, I would be supportive. I just know that these are not cheap, no matter how quickly you can get them done, and I would prefer to dedicate those resources to the accountability side to get as much done there knowing that we have addressed this, I don’t know 15 times and had a number of different presentations, and I’m not sure we’re still going to get to anywhere different. I don’t want to propose anything today. I think it may be worth just a shot of understanding what might be able to be done, and the cost of that, but I’d want to kind of make that decision in conjunction with the cost of the other pieces that I truly think we need that we have not yet explored that I think are going to be pretty expensive.

Chair Hobbs stated he supposed they’ll be talking a little bit more about that with scopes of services. We feel that we do have adequate resources to address those things that are primary to us, but we want to make sure that we keep enough in reserve to be able to follow up on any of them that we need to be able to do so. I agree that we need to be very cognizant of that. I think a way to approach this would be to try to develop a scope of services, bring it back to the next meeting. I think I can get a pretty good idea of what a scope of services like that would cost, given the fact that we work in that space, although we would obviously not be doing this, but I think I have a pretty good sense of what I would find to be, you’ve got to be kidding me kind of numbers or realistic. We could certainly do something like that. I wouldn’t say that we’re ready to say, yeah, go do it without looking at a scope that everybody was comfortable with and we don’t have that today, but we could have that by the next meeting. He asked if they want to proceed in that direction.

Punam Mathur asked if this is one of our honeydew items given to us by the legislature to come back next session with a recommendation on what to do with this. She asked those that work in the field if this is a pain point and if

this is in the top quartile, mid quartile, bottom quartile.

Mark Mathers stated they've looked at three sources of data over those two or three years. We looked at first the economists who did the initial study used American Community Survey data. Then we looked at Dieter wage data, which was more comprehensive, and in between there, there's also the Bureau of Labor Statistics regional price parities. So, if we talk about European currency changes or whatever, the regional price parities are actually the more, I think, definitive measures of cost of living. We looked at three data points, and I'll go back to something Jason said, and I probably have never expressed my appreciation to Jason and his statesmanship on this issue, but he's talked about application and that's where I think this really breaks down like first we can't even get to the point of agreeing on a measure, but, you know, one of my concerns was as a CFO, okay, this biennium maybe my cost of living and wages is the highest, and I get \$10 million more in funding. The next biennium, if it flips flops Clark, I lose \$10 million. That's a swing of 20 million. How, as a CFO, am I supposed to manage and budget around that volatility, and just by the nature of the size of our organizations, small numerical changes in that index can have huge swings like that. So that even aside from the differences we've had about what's our source of data, and how do we calculate it, I really don't think it's fair to a district to see that kind of swing happen to them. It's not our fault, there's nothing we did that made that swing happen, and so you're just at the mercy of a calculation, and that really troubles me. I don't know how I would deal with that. I don't want to cut 20 million out of my budget in that scenario. I don't think it's fair and right. I hear what Chairman Hobbs is saying. I guess in my scope, if we had to have a scope, if we really felt obligated to study this one last time, I guess my scope would kind of be more, not so much, well, a fourth calculation that we use, but just trying to address those kinds of, and use a word, you've used plumbing issues. Like, how do you construct this within our model so that you wouldn't have these huge swings. Unintended impacts on a district, and if you constructed an index that was separately calculated for all 17 school districts, you're going to have swings between. Some count as huge ones. So, I guess I go back to let's put aside for now how we calculate the methodology, but how would we even make this workable? I know there are other states who have it, and so maybe there's experiences there that would shed light on that particular concern. But at the end of the day, I'd rather not study it again. I think we came to a conclusion, this doesn't really work for Nevada, and what does it really do for us? It is painful. It separates us, and it moves us away from focusing on the important stuff. So, I hate to revisit it, but if, the commission feels the need, I would look more towards application or implementation issues, Chair Hobbs. I don't know if there's a better word you can think of, but I just don't even know how this really would work, even if we agreed to a methodology.

Chair Hobbs stated he would think that impact mitigation based on the kinds of swings that you're talking about is something that would absolutely have to be considered. If you can't find a method of measurement that would allow you to go forward with it, then you don't have to worry about mitigation.

Punam Mathur stated as a person that isn't grounded in the economics, here's how it looks. We want to try to add something that takes into consideration the real things that we've got to deal with around the state. So, we've several times looked and said here's one basis on which to create an index. There's been consensus, and we've been like, okay, let's try that. Then they come back to say then here's the numbers, here's the implication, and it all falls apart, but I don't get to in any other aspect of my life, pick and say in this moment when I'd like to apply the rule because I'm a net winner. Then in another year, I'm a net loser. So, we've either got to say, dumb rule, and let's just get rid of it completely, which is what I think I'm hearing you say, or we've got to say, this is an important element to have in a per pupil formula, and whether it serves us or hurts us, it's in the formula.

Mark Mathers stated at the end of the day, where he gets hung up on is what problem are we trying to solve with this one? On the other equity adjustments, I understand small district, small school attendance zone. There used to be a wealth adjustment. I get all those. This feels like a theoretical ivory tower concept, and I really don't know what problem we're trying to solve. What fundamentally is the issue that any district has that they need this adjustment?

Joyce Woodhouse stated after the last year or so of meetings on this and the pain and again, we're addressing the

pain of this topic on the pragmatic side of my life, this is a request of the legislature. So, I think we need to, and certainly our end result might be that we send in our report that we're going to stick with what we have, but I think we need to have an agenda item after we talk about the scope of work, what we need to bring in, in order to come up with whatever that decision is. Are we going to have a different document process, or are we going to leave it where it is right now? But I think for the legislature, we have to do something, and have it in our report to them. It's not something that I don't think we can say today, we're not going to do this. I think we have to spend some time on it, but we have a huge truckload of things to address, but I think this one we could decide in the scope of work what we want to do. Member Mather, I think you have served really good points that need to be discussed at that point in time, so that we can have a final decision and that's the recommendation of the commission, whatever it is we come up with, and then they deal with it from there.

Chair Hobbs stated he tends to think that that's sort of a no harm, no foul approach. If we put together a scope and decide not to go forward with it will probably have articulated our reasons why we aren't, right. Those reasons could be put into the report, in evaluating this, I'm sure that we'll find a nice way of saying it that looks like we went through a very deliberative process in arriving at a solution to either go forward with taking one more shot at a little bit of a different angle or looking at the scope and saying, this is no different than what we've looked at before, and we could expect no different results.

Paul Johnson stated he agrees with that, that very pragmatic way to do things, but to tie in Jason's point, if funding this is at the expense of something more important, it's something that we should identify as we are going to maybe fund that study at a later day because the things that we are talking about here with this benchmarks, and measures, and performance patricides that is going to consume all of the resources that we currently have available that's my hunch because it's pretty complex, but as long as that is kind of a subjugated priorities to the other one, I think that make sense.

Chair Hobbs stated this is the most important thing on the plant, so we want to treat it with that level of respect. But I agree with you, and I think one of the things that would be fair this commission to see and hopefully will be there at our next meeting if not then by our December meeting is looking at all of the buckets of tasks that we need to do, and evaluating them from a cost perspective based on what NDE believes this is going to cost what, the market, says these types of things should cost you all, we all as a commission should see the deployment of the resources that we have available because I agree with the concern that you're raising about applying whatever dollars we have to the highest and best use. Absolutely, we need to do that. So hopefully we could develop, I guess I'm moving ahead on the flexible agenda to future agenda items, but we can make note of that that when we think we have a pretty good idea of each one of these different buckets that we're going to be assigning to subject matter experts, bring that back so everyone can see exactly what we are looking to invest in each one of those areas. I think that's a very fair thing to do and a very important thing for us to do. So, on this particular item, I think the notion would be again looking to future agenda items. Bring it back and look at a possible scope, and have the more direct conversation about where to go from there at that point.

11. UPDATE ON CHANGES MADE TO WEIGHTED FUNDING CATEGORIES DURING THE 2023 LEGISLATIVE SESSION *(Information and Discussion)*

Megan Peterson gave a presentation on Weighted Funding through the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan and changes to the weights and per pupil amounts post the 23-session. *(See "11. Weighted_Funding_Changes_FY_24-25_FINAL_ADA.pdf" for details.)*

David Jensen stated the biggest pushback that he's hearing out there as he works with districts is around the at-risk population. The reduction of 210,000 as I meet with superintendents, they're going, where are we saying 210,000 kids are no longer at risk. The reality is every one of us in our school district said, no, there are. So, I go back to the conversation we had on number six about saying what we do should be clear, measurable, and meaningful. I'm not sure that we're there on the at-risk, I mean, I applaud the increase in the funding, and we talked about Zoom and Victory. Those are some critical pieces that now we're able to do, but the one area that

I'm seeing from a school district perspective is we are missing out on a population of students that need these services. So, the great thing about being a commission member and the commission as a whole is we have the ability to go back and say, we might want to re-tweak some things. It's my strongest recommendation that this is an area that we reevaluate because I think we've missed the mark.

Paul Johnson stated this is my NCEI, the at-risk factor, I think. In my opinion, it's, well, it's not as reflective as what I thought, and I go back to measures. I know we ditched the free and reduced lunch as a measure because the community eligible for it provision, which skews that, but I know in Kentucky, for example, which is information that this commission was reviewed from the Department of Education. I remember Heidi Hart talking about how Kentucky does things. They use the direct certification measure and those are those folks who automatically qualify for free meals from external sources and that information is collected uniformly among all 17 school districts. It's readily available and we can pull out of there. That figure is much higher than the number represented. Now what I don't know is how many of those are also EL or something else. But to go from where we were to a quarter of that population to me, I would really like to see the mapping of that data to verify that it is legitimate if it really is. Because my suspicion is you can make the progress on the weight better if the denominator is smaller, and I want to make sure if that's the case that it truly is reflective of what it is, and it's difficult if one of, one of our measures is transparency, how that information is extracted from, our information is probably the least transparent thing that we have that we're currently working with.

Kyle Rodriguez stated he'd echo the at-risk comments. I fully support that. I was going to bring up direct certification, so I won't beat a dead horse, but thank you. Then lastly, with the GT, so I would just there's a very different program with Gifted and Talented and at-risk and coming from a school district that's largely title. There's a possibility of gifted and talented students being captured in the higher weight of at-risk, and it's hard for the money to follow the students if we are moving into different weights, and it's just more of a burden on the general fund. So, I'd like to bring that up as a potential realignment moving forward.

Chair Hobbs stated the comments that he's heard and was aware of from prior discussions sound like this might form a future agenda item as well. Revisitation of the standards for at risk and I think part of that also has to include all of the fiscal impacts associated with that, with the way that the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan works, because I can't imagine that's a minor consideration in this.

Punam Mathur stated all of this, by far more frequently than any other topic, is around the formula. I then have an obligation to explain why we made the decision that we did, and not to pull back from it, because our confidence is going to be directly mirrored in the confidence, or lack thereof in the minds of the public. We made a decision to go with Infinite Campus; we knew it wasn't going to be opaque because it's a proprietary thing, but I've said to my neighbor, look, when Netflix offers you a film, do you call them and say, talk me through how you got the algorithm? No, we don't. We just say, thank you, you made it easier. I'm going to watch the show you're recommending. So, the use of AI, and so, I don't know if it's the right way, but the problem is we don't have the measurement figured out to be able to know, which is exactly why the accountability piece is so important is for the next 50 years as the commission, and its members sit here and every year look at the function of the Pupil-Centered Funding formula. We have to be able to know that when we make a decision, here's how we will, here's what we're going to track to tell us because no one's going to complain about it for all the things that we hear about. It's a smaller number. It's opaque. Those won't become issues. If those are identified move the fastest, then it wouldn't be an issue, but we don't have it like right now, we don't have the metrics to now say, I do think that for the immediate term, there's going to be an opportunity, maybe a responsibility for us to sort of stand next to the decisions that we've made, and sort of guide the conversation rather than be overly reactive to all that we're hearing from because this one causes veins and necks to get bigger and occasionally for spit to travel in the air.

Chair Hobbs stated they would make this a future agenda item, but I've struggled with this in the conversations that I've had with a couple of you. I remember the discussions that we had in the decision that we made here that I remember very clearly. I agree that the lack of better term, the optics of the outcome look difficult. I mean, they yes, absolutely, but I'm not sure. I haven't been completely sure if it's been something that's unfair versus

something that lacked the appropriate level of communication, and explanation. I've been sort of caught in that world because I'm certainly not a subject matter expert on what standard for an at-risk student should be. I don't know that. I know that when you change the numbers by 200,000, it has the appearance of being somewhat heartless on the surface, even though it might have been, and we think it probably was the valid thing to do because this commission voted to do it.

Nancy Brune stated she wanted to maybe echo what Punam said, but in a different way. I think I came in midway through the conversations, and I think there was a lot of heartburn when I joined and we had those conversations, but I think what we agreed in part because NDE had said we've agreed to this, so let's not change it again before we even see it hasn't even been implemented. So, we have no idea how off we're going to be. So, I think at the very least to Punam's point, we have to stand by our decision at least until we have some real data to look at and compare what we thought would happen versus an actual outcome. So, I would ask that even if we think we need to go back, let's at least see a couple of rounds of data first.

Chair Hobbs stated let me ask this. Just by way of clarification instead of having an agenda item to just discuss what we're already discussing here, should that agenda item wait until we have the additional information? Is that what you're suggesting?

David Jensen stated his point comes around to what you said, Chair Hobbs, is uncertainty of what and how? So, not necessarily saying that I'm advocating that we step back from our decision, we made a decision as a Commission, but now when I'm asked, I'm uncertain, I don't recall, and I'm not able to just point out and say to any school district or superintendent, if you go do X, Y, and Z, this is how you're going to get your number. So, uncertainty is where I'm saying I would like to go back and revisit and understand this once again, and maybe once I re-understand it, because it's been a while, we've dealt with an awful lot of things, my perspective may change again at that point going, you know, we did make the right decision. I need to understand it again.

Chair Hobbs stated his is an issue of clarity.

Jason Goudie stated a lot of the discussions around is this the right way to go. I am 100% behind the way this is done. This is analytically driven in how you define the grad score. I understand that's not transparent, but I don't need to understand, like the, the millions of data points that they use to show that these are the kids that don't graduate. So, I am emphatically agreeing with the concept. I think the pieces is 64,000 truly the right number of at risk. I think we all know that number is low, but part of it is because the way the weights flow. We do not multiply weights. If you multiplied weights, I think we might be having a different discussion because there are a huge number of EL learners that are probably at-risk by the definition per grad score, but they get pulled out. EL is one of the factors, I know it is. Poverty is one of the factors. I completely disagree that poverty is the only factor we should be using to determine whether a student is at risk. There's just, there's no way that's true.

Unspecified Speaker asked if anybody mentioned that it would be the only factor.

Jason Goudie stated no, that's what I mean. But when we go back to free and reduced lunch, that was. I'm saying, not the new way, but the way that we used to have it, it was purely free and reduced lunch. Then that just, you know, that by definition is driven by poverty. So, I think that the big question for me comes down to, and we've talked about it, is the 20% criteria the right criteria? To Dr. Brune's comments, I don't know if it is or is not, but I can 100% guarantee that the vast majority of that 220 down to 60 came out of Clark. I use my kids as an example, they were included in there, and I know a bunch of other kids that go to these schools that were getting free and reduced dollars that have no need for it. I think that it more narrows the dollars. Did it narrow it too much? Possibly, and I think that's the piece we need to look at. Should that 20% be 25%, should it be 30%? That's where we should be going. I don't want to go back and say the calculation's not right. That's mathematically proven, but there's some pieces of this I think we could revisit over time to try and get to whether or not that that criteria is enough to truly address all the at-risk students.

Mark Mathers stated he's right on in line with Jason's comments. That's my biggest concern. It's not the methodology, it's the cutoff and, and I get we had to do something. I mean, I totally respect that. I just would like to revisit that. I want to go back though to something, I think Mr. Rodriguez was noting and it's a concern, I know of our board at in Washoe and that is the fact is this probation in SB543 that you can't receive more than one weight. I know that probably made sense at the time. I think Jason, you've alluded to this too, but I think what Mr. Rodriguez was kind of trying to explain and it's the case in Washoe to some degree too is, okay, if you have a child who's EL and GT, you're going to get all the EL dollars for that child, but you won't get any dollars to put them in a gifted and talented program, which then forces you to use general fund money, i.e. base funding, to fund those gifted and talented programs. That's really not the right way to do it, but you're left with that problem of, okay, there's not enough funding for the gifted and talented programs that should exist for those students. What do I do? Either I don't fund GT at all because I'm not getting any GT dollars or I have to steal, basically, base per pupil funding from someone else. I don't mean to be critical of the, again, the initial concept of just going with the highest weight. I think I understand why that was done. I do think that should be revisited, though, as a concept, but I don't think it's fair for certain students in these weighted categories. So that would be my only additional comment.

Chair Hobbs stated to the point Mark makes, because I wondered about that at the time, but I recognize that based on the availability of overall funding and when, what, you know, the encroachment on the base funding for you guys, okay, that made sense and probably in the fiscal environment that we're in today, it probably still does. Optimally it does not. What I'm trying to figure out here, because we have one more item to go before we start losing some people, is what direction to take with a future agenda item. I was hearing earlier and agree with more data probably leads to a more productive discussion. So, it's not necessarily a next meeting item, per se, but it's on our docket of items to readdress as we have some additional data. He asked if that was fair and everyone agreed.

Paul Johnson stated he is going to disagree with the perspective that we made a decision is machine learning problem solved. We don't have to address it again. I think I agree with David. The uncertainty thing when you have that drastic change in a factor, I think we need to make certain we understand why that change happened. I don't know that we need to know it to what level specificity. I know that's each individual's comfort level, but if we're in a system that's designed to have dollars tracked to the student, and we can't identify which students are at risk students, that's a problem because that was our legislatively mandated charter. So, if we have a program that just provides us with a bunch of money, and then we have to identify at risk students that may not be consistent with the program, I don't know how that gets connected, so.

Punam Mathur asked if the at-risk weights they sent to a district was a lump sum for all at risk kids, or is it per pupil. Because I've heard it different ways, not today, but elsewhere.

Megan Peterson stated asked if she was talking about when the funding is distributed to the district or the actual counts within the system.

Punam Mathur stated either or.

Megan Peterson stated when the funding is determined and we provide it to the school districts, it's provided on a monthly basis, and so we take their total allocation divided by 12 and send it out within the payments. In terms of the counts, we received those during the October 1 validation day counts. That information, however, is live and available to school districts and charter schools. Now, they can go in the system, look at every child in their system, and see what their grad score is. What we have to work on and we're doing that, it was a learning opportunity for us. Absolutely was that when we run the counts on October 1st, we need to know what that actual cutoff score is. Then share that with school districts and charter schools so that way they can go into the system and identify where the students fall into those groups. So, we are working on a memo training and information and providing based on what we used previously, last year 2022. Providing those counts and those students to the district so that way they can go back and validate and see how that actually plays out. As I mentioned, that was a

learning opportunity for us that we are definitely addressing, and we'll have available with this next set of counts, but we're also working to go backwards and identify those so that way they have the through line of where those students fell when we determined the funding.

Chair Hobbs stated they would be bringing this back. I think a lot of good points were raised today as far as why we need to do that. I absolutely sympathize with any of you that have to explain it, and the anxiety that goes along with that.

12. CONTRACT(S) SCOPE OF WORK REVIEW; *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Megan Peterson gave a presentation on contract for proposed scope of work. This included best practices; alignment; measurements and standards; and outcomes and ratings. *(See "12. Contract_Scope_of_Work_CSF_FINAL_ADA.pdf" for details.)*

Chair Hobbs asked how many of these fit under the scope of work that you have with WestEd or APA or any other consultants at this point.

Megan Peterson stated this really looked at just creating a single scope of work with four different focuses. WestEd, I think can do a good chunk of it, but there's also a perspective of what other national experts may have been seeing in different areas of the country, and again that could be WestEd. I think that we would have to see what the response is when we go through the RFP process and go from there.

Chair Hobbs stated that question was asked more out of concerns that were raised earlier about the efficient use of dollars if NDE already had somebody on board that could attack parts of this and reduce the amount that subject matter expert would have to do independently, that would be great. Can you see this as one RFP with four sub deliverables?

Megan Peterson stated they'd like to move in that direction so that way, it's an all-encompassing subject for us to work with, subject meaning vendor. It's quicker to move through the process, but if it through the process they identify that there's an area they're not able to deliver on, we'd certainly look to acquire a different contract.

Chair Hobbs stated based on the wording he saw earlier, these would also include some metrics that have been identified by thinking about the document that Dr. Jensen shared with me where NAS came up with some additional points at Paul in his bubble gum chart, he was identifying some, so it's adaptable enough to include other metrics other than those that were specifically identified in the legislation.

Megan Peterson stated that is their goal. We're trying to be as efficient and effective in the amount of time we have with the available funds.

Chair Hobbs stated given the importance of getting a scope of work out there, I know that being short on time at the end of the meeting, I'm not going to press anybody into saying, hey, let's make a motion for approval and go forward unless, of course, you guys feel otherwise, but the sooner we get going with this, the better off we are. I appreciate the work that you've done to get it to this point. I'd like to throw out and you can tell me it's a horrible idea, is take a close look at this, identify any other areas of scope that we should be considering, and maybe if need be before our next meeting, we could pull together like a one item zoom meeting or something like that to approve a scope of work because it is an instantaneous to go through the procurement process, and the notion of sitting around waiting for 60 or 80 days or something like that to get through that, and then having to wait for several more months, which we really don't have, is a little frightening to me. I think we need to try to get this out as quickly as humanly possible and then of course, Megan, there are some other areas and I can't enumerate all of them that were in 400 or 98 or, the memorandum from the legislature that aren't included in this, you know, those that specifically had to do with things like instructors or numbers of instructors, things like that. So that's not included in this. There were other things that were included like small school capital and in that area, those that are financially oriented, I think we can handle those internally. I'm not worried about going out to a subject

matter expert on those, but are there additional requirements that we have that will also need a separate set of scoping done for them above and beyond what we have here?

Megan Peterson stated at this moment, she believes that this is pretty inclusive and especially because in terms of, for example, special education, we've already procured that. We're already going through that process, or actually we've been engaged with the vendor for some time and we're, like I said expecting some final information to be available to present in February. So those are already active and engaged. We do have the question for NCEI, obviously, that we haven't addressed quite yet in terms of whether we need another scope of work there, but we do have other options potentially in play that depending on the direction we go, we can utilize them. It'll just require a little more refinement in what the expectations are.

Chair Hobbs asked if she thinks she basically has everything captured at this point, other than NCEI, which we'll have on every agenda.

Megan Peterson stated yes.

Jason Goudie stated given the sensitivity of time, given the fact that Ms. Peterson believes that this is pretty inclusive, and I think we all think it is, would we be able to approve to move forward with this, and then still give us some time over the next week or so to submit feedback, and if anything significant comes out of that, Chair Hobbs, maybe you could then call an emergency meeting to add to the pieces just to give the NDE just maybe a couple more weeks to start working on this.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks that's a great call. The other thing that comes to mind, too, is you can go out for an RFP and then you still have to negotiate the agreement with the provider, you have a little bit of room to fine tune the scope at that point. So, I think we have a couple shots at it. Let's say by a week from today, if you've had a chance to review and comment and get back to Megan, any additional elements that should be included in this, otherwise, Dr. Jensen.

Jason Goudie made a motion to approve to move forward and give time over the next week to submit feedback. David Jensen seconded. Motion passed.

13. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS *(Information and Discussion)*

Chair Hobbs stated they've already identified a few during the course of the meeting today. So, we'll follow up with those.

David Jensen stated the only other thing, Punam, and I think I saw some conversation with community feedback, the Nevada Association, the school superintendents, we're doing a little bit of some work in addition to what's been presented. NAS would be willing to come if we continue that type of a format to present at the next meeting.

Chair Hobbs stated they would love to have him and have the benefit of that work.

14. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There was no public comment.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned.