

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
December 6, 2024
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	YouTube

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Guy Hobbs, Chair
Joyce Woodhouse
Punam Mathur
Nancy Brune
Jim McIntosh
Dusty Casey
Mark Mathers
Paul Johnson

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent of the Student Investment Division
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent of the Student Investment Division

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Amelia Thibault, Nevada State Education Association

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hobbs. Quorum was established. Chair Hobbs noted for the record that they are joined by Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott.

2. **Public Comment #1**

There was no public comment.

3. **Approval of Flexible Agenda** *(For Possible Action)*

Unidentified Member moved to approve the flexible agenda. Member Brune seconded. Motion carried.

4. **Consent Agenda** *(For Possible Action)*

Information concerning the following consent agenda items has been provided to Commission members for study prior to the meeting. Unless a Commission member has a question concerning a particular item and asks that it be withdrawn from the consent list, all items are approved in one action.

- a. Approval of November 8, 2024, Commission Minutes Summary & Transcription

Member Woodhouse moved to approve the flexible agenda. Member Brune seconded. Motion carried.

Chair Hobbs announced the resignation of Member Johnson. He and members reflected and commented on their time with Member Johnson.

5. **Nevada Department of Education Update** *(Information and Discussion)*

The Commission will receive an update on the progress made by the Nevada Department of Education since the last meeting.

- Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment, NDE

Megan Peterson gave an update on the NDE's progress since the last meeting. She stated they officially submitted the recommendations from the Commission on November 15th. They've been working to finalize the recommendations that were proposed for next biennium and working on a presentation to one of the committees on education accountability. They are also working on a grant to continue analysis of the Pupil Centered Funding Plan.

6. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORT** *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

The Commission will receive a presentation on implementing a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing equitable services, practices, and resources to every learner based upon responsiveness to effective instruction and intervention. The presentation will discuss how high-quality instruction, strategic use of data, and collaboration interact within a continuum of supports to facilitate learner success and operate within support of an optimal education.

Pursuant to NRS 387.12463(1)(b) the Commission shall monitor the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan and make any recommendations to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education that the Commission determines would, within the limits of appropriated funding, improve the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan or correct any deficiencies of the Department or any school district or public school in carrying out the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

- Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement,

NDE

Christy McGill gave a presentation regarding the MTSS. A discussion took place and questions were answered.

7. **Systems Strategy Return on Investment** (*Information and Discussion*)

The Commission will receive a presentation on types of return on investment analyses in education and proposal for a multi-year implementation pilot for return on investment analysis in Nevada.

- Amelia Thibault, Director, Office of Division Compliance, NDE

Amelia Thibault gave a presentation on types of return on investment analysis in education and proposal for a multi-year implementation pilot for return on investment analysis in Nevada. (*See “7. ROI Analyses in Education” for details.*) A discussion took place and questions were answered.

8. **Future Agenda Items** (*Information and Discussion*)

Items not appearing on the agenda may be considered possible topics for the Commission to hear at the next meeting.

- Guy Hobbs, Chair, Commission on School Funding

Chair Hobbs stated the Commission would have an executive summary coming. A meeting has been scheduled on December 16 with one of the legislative committees and others coming up to explain their report.

9. **Public Comment #2**

Chris Daly with Nevada State Education Association gave public comment. There was an email comment from Sarah Adler with Silver State Governance Relations read into the record. There were no other public comments.

10. **Adjournment**

Chair Hobbs adjourned the meeting.

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
DECEMBER 6, 2024
9:00 AM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual	Virtual	YouTube

TRANSCRIPT MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Guy Hobbs, Chair
Nancy Brune
Dusty Casey
Paul Johnson
Punam Mathur
Jim McIntosh
Joyce Woodhouse
Mark Mathers

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent of the Student Investment Division
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent of the Student Investment Division

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Amelia Thibault, Nevada State Education Association

Chair Hobbs: We are joining in person as well as by livestream on the Nevada Department of Education's website, which is recorded for public record. Will the secretary please call the roll?

Secretary: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Here.

Secretary: Vice Chair Woodhouse.

Joyce Woodhouse: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Mathur.

Punam Mathur: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Brune.

Nancy Brune: Present.

Secretary: Commissioner McIntosh. Commissioner McIntosh.

Chair Hobbs: Commissioner McIntosh sent me a text that he might be a few minutes late, so we'll let you know when he's arrived so you can mark him present.

Secretary: Thank you, Chair. Commissioner Jensen.

Chair Hobbs: His last meeting with us, the November meeting was his final meeting as a member of the commission.

Secretary: My apologies, Chair. Commissioner Casey?

Dusty Casey: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Mathers?

Mark Mathers: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Johnson.

Paul Johnson: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Rodriguez.

Chair Hobbs: I received a note from commissioner Rodriguez that he would be away on vacation and would try to link in if possible.

Secretary: Thank you, Chair. And Chair, you have a quorum.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. I'd also like to note that we have Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott with us, and we all know that it is never a good time without Greg being with us. As we get started with the

agenda, just the few normal housekeeping items. Some participants, as we've noted, may join the meeting virtually. As always, we ask for your patience if we have any technical difficulties associated with that. I also want to remind our audience that the Commission on School funding meetings can be viewed via YouTube with closed captioning. Remind participants to turn off their microphone or mute when you're not speaking, and remember to turn on your microphones or unmute when you'd like to make a comment. Of course, remember that you're on video and being broadcast via YouTube on the NDE website. Today's meeting materials are available on the commission's webpage, and I trust that when commission members are not actively engaging on their screen with us, they're reviewing materials. We all have screens in front of us, and I know we'll have presentations today, so a lot of us will be looking at that on our screens. That brings us to public comment period number one. I'll remind the audience that comments are limited to those items on the agenda. Members of the public who attend in person and would like to provide public comment should fill out a comment card and provide it to the secretary when called for comment, turn on the microphone and begin by stating your name for the record. To provide comments or testimony telephonically dial area code 312-584-2401. When prompted, provide meeting ID 19042398 and then press pound. When prompted for a participant ID press pound. If you're unable to attend in person but would like to provide public comment, you could submit a written statement to nvcsf@doe.nv.gov before the close of the meeting. We limit public comments to three minutes, and the time will be kept by the secretary. And we'll take public comment in Carson City first and then here in Las Vegas. Mark, do we have anybody up there that wishes to make public comment?

Mark Mathers: No, it would appear not.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Any public comment here in Vegas?

Female Speaker: We have no public comments in Las Vegas.

Chair Hobbs: Do we have any written comments to be submitted?

Secretary: There are no written comments at this time.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. That concludes public comment period number one. We're going to take a couple of items here before we get into the presentations, approval of flexible agenda. Is there a motion to approve?

Unidentified Speaker: So moved.

Nancy Brune: Second.

Chair Hobbs: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. The consent agenda. Hopefully our commission members have had an opportunity to review the consent agenda and the supporting materials. As a reminder, commission members are asked to review all materials and request clarifications in writing. The questions, and subsequent responses are then added to the meeting materials posted for the public prior to the commission meeting. Any individual item may be polled. Does anybody wish to poll any items for separate treatment? Hearing none, we could take a motion on the consent agenda.

Joyce Woodhouse: I will move approval of the consent agenda.

Nancy Brune: Second.

Chair Hobbs: Motion, and second. Any discussion? Hearing none, signify your approval by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. That takes us to agenda item number five, but before we do that, I want to pause for a couple of moments. We had some sad reflection at our last meeting when we had to say goodbye to a couple of members of the commission that had served from the very beginning. And we have a similar type of thing to deal with today. I want to talk about someone with a tremendous amount of passion, knowledge, experience, dedication, tremendous work ethic. I can go on, but we're going to talk about Paul. Paul Johnson has been with us from the very beginning and has been an outstanding contributor. And something else that comes to mind. There's some words like, acquiescence, cessation, capitulation. Those are all words that Paul doesn't know the meaning of, but there's about a thousand other words that Paul also doesn't know the meaning of. But as I reflect back on the five years of working with Paul, it's been a tremendous personal experience for me anytime. And this was rather frequent, embarrassingly frequent that there was something I needed to get more background on because I haven't worked in this area. Paul was the first call and he was always available to answer and did so, and in tremendous detail, when we needed to turn something around, even if it was just something that he and I were talking about. Paul put everything else aside to make that happen. His dedication, not only to his school district, which is, which is extremely evident, the number of conversations I've had with him about his affection for his school district and what they do and how they do it, and what they need, is unparalleled other than the fact that Paul also sees it from a statewide standpoint, and doesn't limit it to just what's best for White Pine county school district. And that's such an important point to make because all of us that come to this, and particularly those that come from a particular school district, have this balancing act that they have to deal with, making sure it's good for the school district, but remembering too that the hat that they're wearing here is for education on a statewide basis. And Paul has worn that hat extremely well. I said this about Dave as well last time and Jason. But over the five years, Paul has not only been a tremendous resource to this, a tremendous source of energy for everything that we do, but he's become a darn good friend too. I actually really enjoy the guy and I hope to continue to be able to call on him, joke around with him, get his opinion on all kinds of things, whether I ask for it or not, get his opinion, well into the future because that's how much I've enjoyed the relationship with Paul. So this is Paul's last meeting with us. And as is our custom or has become our custom, we do have something that we want to give you in recognition of that time. But before we do that, I want to invite other members of the commission to also provide their reflections, comments, comments, funny or serious, please.

Jim McIntosh: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jim McIntosh for the record. Paul, I'm glad getting to sit next to you for this. And I'm sorry to hear that you are leaving the commission. I've known you for a very long time, all the way back when I was chief Financial Officer even prior to that, at the Clark County School District. And I want to just reinforce everything that chair Hobbs has said that, I am continually amazed by your knowledge of state law, the school system, and your ability to synthesize that information, for this commission. I think it's been very helpful, but it's also clear your passion for kids, your passion for wanting to do what's best. And I think you represented, I think, in many ways, much like Dr. Jensen. We think about the Clark County School District a lot because it's the largest one in the state. And I think you brought that voice for the others, and I think you did it very well. And so I much like Chair Hobbs, glad you -- I consider you my friend as well. And it has been a pleasure to serve with you on this commission. Sorry to see that you're leaving.

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. For the record, Member Mathur. Paul, I'd seen you before we ort of got thrown into this, I think I'd seen you wheezing around the building, the legislative building maybe. And I remember just sort of being struck by what a happy, jolly, likable fellow was, sort of what -- how it began then. We've spent an awful lot of time doing some really important and serious stuff, and I've been humbled by how many times whatever the topic is, begins with, well, at the beginning, here's what it was, and it's you recounting

firsthand the memory of doing the same hard work 20, 30 years ago. It is one thing to care a lot about education and to do it because the CFO of a district, which you've done for over a quarter century, it's another thing to internalize a priority to make things better for kids in Nevada, in every cell of your body. And that is you. It is an extraordinary commitment. And you're also that likable, jolly fellow. I mean, I think levity and hard work, sometimes things get so intense that it's not good for us. And so I have always really appreciated and adored the good humor that you bring to things. It's an important balance as we continue to do the hard work. And so, for all of the efforts, and I've only seen some of them, but I know there's a lot more that every major education related, anything that's happened in the last 25 years in the state, you've been there. And so, I don't even know how -- I don't know what size trophy that requires, or how many golf balls are necessary. I have no idea. Just endlessly grateful. And you've also done it with a real servant's hearts. You're not a guy that needs to be front and center. You're a guy who derives the way it looks, deep personal satisfaction out of making things better. And so, thank you for being that man and what an honor and treat it's been to get to hang out with you for the last few years. I wish you nothing but good. I know that you're not going anywhere because there's still good to be done and you're not. I know you're not going to disappear. But I will be really sad to not see you once a month here in your mov colored awesome gear. So I'm grateful to you.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Member Woodhouse for the record. Mr. Johnson, Paul, my friend, my colleague. I -- it's, it's really difficult when we have so many years of experience working together, and being friends and all of that to have you retire. But I know that, I know that we can count on you for counsel, for some good ideas, push our buttons to say, no, you're going the wrong direction with this, and I appreciate that. For those who don't know, I think probably the first time I met Paul was in 2018 when we started working on a new funding formula. And when we called in the superintendents and the CFOs from all of the school districts, Paul was there for every meeting. I remember that. And then as we progressed through the legislative session and finally had some language ready before the bill was ready to drop, we started sharing it with interest groups. And one of those groups was the CFOs, the superintendents. And Paul was there again, with his really good questions to Senator Dennis and myself, as well as our fiscal and legal staff of, maybe we should take it this way, or maybe we could look at this great idea. And sometimes we don't always agree on everything, but we still respect each other. And I think that is really, really important. And you are the epitome of that. Respectful gentleman who works hard with all of us. And that is so appreciated. Your expertise is just unparalleled, and we will miss you. But I know that I have you on my cell phone, I could call you so I can text you. But the other thing that maybe not everyone knows is, when we were putting together the individuals who would serve on the commission on Innovation and Excellence in education that was passed last legislative session, we reached out to Paul and he said, yes, again. And so, that group is finishing up the first round of their work next week. And Paul has been, again, an integral person, in the work groups that he's been serving on with that commission. And that is not school funding, that is reform of K-12 education across the state of Nevada. And so, just as Member Mather said, Paul is one of those individuals who doesn't stay in a very narrow track, he looks at the big picture. And that is so important. So I appreciate you so much, Paul. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: So either Dusty or Nancy, either of you wish to say something nice about Paul or something honest.

Nancy Brune: I just have a question, I guess, Chair Hobbs. Is there a way to make a motion to reject his resignation letter? I would just echo all of my other colleagues and their accurate comments about Member Johnson. And I know he will continue doing the work that he so enjoys and is amazing at on behalf of the kids in the state of Nevada. So, I know this one could be goodbye, but I know I speak up, my phone is blowing up because no one knew this was your last meeting, Paul, and I think everybody is. There's a collective sort of moan out there. Just know that, it's been channeled to my phone. So please know that our education advocate community also recognizes your important work on this commission and your value. And we're all a little sad.

Chair Hobbs: Dusty.

Dusty Casey: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. I would also obviously echo everyone else's comments, but one of the things I love about Paul and I have come to really respect about him is his good nature and character. I think every board or commission needs someone who's willing to be the butt of all the jokes and the jesting. And Paul has rolled with that the last five years, and it's really lightened the mood and really kept everything in perspective. And so, Paul, first of all, I really appreciate that. But aside from that, Paul to me is like an encyclopedia of school finance in Nevada. When I first joined the commission, I leaned heavily on Dr. Jensen, as I said last time, but Paul as well, I had a lot to learn about the history of school finance in the state, and Paul was literally like an encyclopedia. I mean, I learned more from Paul than I did Googling things and looking up reports and reading past studies. And I really leaned heavily on him, and I really appreciate that. I think for any anyone else who didn't know, if they were listening into one of our meetings, I think they could easily assume Paul was the CFO of one of the largest districts, or a superintendent of one of the largest districts. I mean, he has that kind of level of expertise, and experience, and I think it's just brought an enormous amount of value to this commission. He's just super sensible and logical as he approaches problems and definitely will be sorely missed. Big shoes to fill, to say the least. So, Paul, thank you. And I hope we can stay in contact.

Chair Hobbs: Anyone else? Mark?

Mark Mathers: Yeah, thank you, Chair Hobbs. Yes, my comments kind of go beyond the Commission on school funding, just to the school district landscape here in Nevada. Paul is, I think the last of the Mohicans, the last of the old guard that had worked under the old Nevada plan and had endured years of underfunding and made it all work. And I don't know. There are a couple other people I worked with that have preceded Paul's retirement. Mike Schroeder, for example, at Washington. But I said to Mike, would apply to Paul. I don't know how they did it for as long as they did it, but I'm glad they did because as one of the prior commenters said, he's a walking encyclopedia of knowledge. And Paul's knowledge and wisdom and humor all combined just made for a contribution that we can't overstate both of this body, but just again, helping everyone along the way along the years understand K through 12 finance. So it's a great thing when somebody can retire and enjoy that post-retirement life. But I will miss them greatly as well, countless others. So, thank you, Paul.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you all. Paul, hopefully you've had an opportunity to so-called that in. I think it was very heartfelt by everybody, and for everybody watching, waiting for us to get to the other business of the day. these moments are very important to us because what you're looking at is five years of service to this commission, but 30 years of service to education and the state of Nevada. And that's not a minor matter. That takes a lot of commitment and, and deserves the time that we're taking to give Paul the accolades that he deserves. And one thing that we have for you here is a certificate of appreciation. Of course, I didn't call you to ask you to print this up this time. And this one might be a little bit more meaningful because it's signed by actually people who are important, including, the majority leader and speaker. So we're love to present this to you, Paul, in the official blue holder, which -- And then we also have a bit of a gift for you here. We had -- we did some talking about this and collaborated on it. So, if you'd like to go ahead and take a look, you don't have to wait till Christmas. And I'll make a couple comments regarding the thinking that went behind this. So what we -- what we've given Paul, we know that he's an avid golfer and we got him a range finder. Now when the folks on the commission were talking to me, they were making comments to me like, make sure that you get the kind that can see through trees and under a foot and a half of sand and maybe under 30 feet of water. So, I had to look around and find the best fit that I could, but hopefully you're able to put that to good use out on the golf course or wherever you decide to use it, or however it is you decide to use it. but again, a small token from all of us, with affection for everything that you've done.

Paul Johnson: Well, thank you, Chair Hobbs and members. Like David, this is awkward for me. I handle sarcasm and insults a lot better than compliments. but I have really enjoyed this commission, probably more so

than being on any other committee that I've been on. This is a highly effective team. and I just really have appreciated the relationships that I've been able to build, over the years here. And I do consider everybody here in the commission, friends. And I'm just happy that I've been able to contribute in some small way. It's nice that if you're doing something for 28 years, you've been able to demonstrate that you've learned something. So that has been helpful. And it is just -- it is a pleasure working for education period. When I first interviewed, there's this one of my favorite songs that has a lyric that says, children are our future. Teach them well and let them lead the way. And I just -- it's been such a rewarding experience to be working for my school district and an education. So thank you all. I really appreciate it.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you again, Paul. That's what we try to do here.

Mark Mathers: It'll be your job to figure that out. We still need the help desk, the tech help desk.

Chair Hobbs: That's right. We can see if we can put you on audio visual retainer of some sort. That takes us back to the regular agenda, agenda item number five, Nevada Department of Education update. At this time, we'd like to have Megan Peterson come forward and give us an update and see if you can top that, Megan

Megan Peterson: Thank you, Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson, for the record. I'm just going to leave that with a mic drop and let y'all have the honor of having the best comments for the day. And I'm just going to share the updates. And good news that we did officially submit the recommendations from the commission on November 15th as required. And so we can check the box and clear our minds in preparation for next biennium, and the upcoming legislative session, knowing that all that work was successfully completed and delivered in a big box. Since our last meeting as well, we have been working to finalize and prepare the recommendations that were proposed for next session, I'm sorry, next biennium. So, we're working to identify a timeline for which to review those topics, aligning the subject matter experts who can be available to speak to those items, and are looking at drafting our scope of work to procure the next set of contracts in support of all of that. We've also been working in, Chair Hobbs is aware of this. There is a presentation to one of the committees on education accountability, that is on December 16th. So we're working through a presentation and preparing, to speak to that committee on the recommendations of the commission, as well as any other upcoming similar type requests. We are preparing, materials for those. And then lastly, we are working with several entities with a State Longitudinal Data System grant to continue analysis of the pupil centered funding plan externally, as well as how it's being implemented to make sure that we have appropriately accounted for all the uniquenesses that will be impacting this model as we move forward. So, we are busy little squirrels trying to round up the nuts and get them all in the line for our next meeting, hopefully next September if all goes well. And that concludes the NDE update.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much, Megan. And just a footnote to what Megan mentioned about the report being filed, to give you all an update, probably about 75% through a draft of the executive summary. And I want to thank member, Brune for agreeing to read that, over for me and redirect me in a positive direction, is very difficult task to take, a very lengthy and detailed report and try to distill it down to the maximum number of pages that I'm allowed by members, Mather and Woodhouse of three pages. And so, that's been a little bit of a struggle, but I expect to have that out with it, probably by next week for review. So, that's the status of that. I'd hoped to have that ready by this meeting, but there were some other things that came up that got in the way of that. So, that finishes agenda item number five. Are there any questions of Megan? Okay, not hearing any. We move to agenda item number six, and for this, this is a discussion and possible action regarding the MTSS. And we have with us deputy superintendent Christy McGill from NDE to provide her presentation.

Christy McGill: Good morning.

Chair Hobbs: Good morning.

Christy McGill: Christy McGill, deputy Superintendent. And I wanted to talk a little bit about some of the continuing improvements of MTSS. I came to you guys a couple months ago and presented, and I wanted to give you a quick update, and then also the relationship between MTSS and school-based mental health. I do want to pause and note that since we are going to delve into mental health, that watching you all express gratitude today is such a sign of a healthy and very productive team. So it was a great reminder that, yes, even people in fiscal and math brains have great social emotional skills as well. So one of the updates I wanted to bring to you is that we are finishing up this year's evaluation of MTSS. We will have a report, if you guys are interested in that report, we'll go ahead and forward it to you. But the data coming back is showing that one, we were able to expand the MTSS process to two other districts and also deepen it to other schools. Because we were able to do this, we have found continued reduction in, school discipline and also Tier 3, support. So that is very exciting. So that's great news. Also the Department of Education, along with the leadership of deputy Peterson, has helped us do a systematic look at how do we utilize MTSS here in the department, looking at data, making sure we're utilizing data, making sure we're checking, and becoming more of a systems piece. So I thought those were two really great updates. The third item I really wanted to go into today is the mental health. And I know that we have talked about school-based mental health on the edges, and I've listened to your commission meetings and this has come up several times, but there's a couple of contextual items I wanted to share with you. One is that in Nevada, we have a very small community mental health system. So what does this mean? This means that 90% of our students are in areas that are federally designated as workforce shortage areas in mental health. This also means that we put way too many children into hospitalization, and we do not have enough services for our students. So, what this -- what has happened is, and many of you probably already know this, is that the DOJ is actually doing report. They did a report and found findings that Nevada was not providing enough services for our young people. This has a direct impact on our schools because unlike community-based service agencies, schools cannot put kids on a wait list. They have to be able to assist and support their young people. And so what this has done is grown, the school's necessity to take care of mental health. Now, this is true across the nation. So across the nation, more than 80% of the kids that get mental health services get them in their schools. This is a huge shift in the last decade. And the reason I wanted to bring it here for you all today is that in Nevada, it's a little bit compounded. If you kind of look at, and again, we have asked the Gwen Center to do a study and report on school-based mental health in Nevada. So when they're almost finished with it, so if you guys are interested, they can come and report to this body as well to kind of really show you the data. So we have a confluence of an increase of mental health need in our students, and that is right on track with the rest of the nation. And we have a system that is really underfunded and lack of capacity. So this is really affecting our schools. For example, the governor, has come and visited the NAS. And one of the top concerns keeps coming up is school-based mental health and how to pay for it. So if many of Nevada students are getting their mental health in schools, and we are using education dollars, it's having an impact on the education. We're using them for Tier 3. So a couple of things, to update around this. One is, we took a look at what other states are doing, and it really is a kind of a west eastern picture if you look at it. So in the east, they have a much more robust infrastructure for mental health. For example, in New Jersey, mental health in schools is funded not only by state funds and by Medicaid, but also hospitals. In Nevada, we are really only funding school-based mental health with educational funds. So we've been trying to look at ways, for example, bringing in Medicaid. So for the last couple of years we've been working with Medicaid, Nevada Medicaid to do that to allow for districts to bill for mental health services that they're already giving in our schools. So this has been an on onion project, right? So as we unravel this, new things kind of pop up. So one thing is that the districts are -- we really wanted to build from assets. So the districts are already billing Medicaid for special health, I mean for -- sorry, excuse me. For special education services. So, we want to build off of those platforms and allow the districts to expand their building -- their billing capacities. So, a couple of those have occurred. Personal care services have been expanded. Also here in Nevada, we have free care now, which allows for the billing of Medicaid outside of the IEP. for things like 504s, for things like anxiety, trauma, those items that may not necessarily need an IEP. But it hasn't been easy. And if you talk to the districts about the billing of Medicaid, again, it's putting kind of a square peg in a round hole. So Medicaid

went through and they met with each district this summer and this fall, and they've come up with some very clear pathways to try to make Medicaid easier for schools to bill. So one of those is, they're going to be improving chapter 2,800, which is the chapter that school-based billing is under. So they are putting through those changes now and hopefully that that will be helpful. The other piece is looking at how we utilize different kinds of licensure in our schools. So for example, licensed clinical social workers can bill for Medicaid in schools where school counselors cannot. Now, I'm not saying that we should suddenly turn and only hire licensed clinical social workers. If you guys were here for our MTSS presentation, you would've heard that one of the most important services for schools to do is Tier 1. And so, school counselors do that. Very important Tier 1, help kids find careers they want to go do, teach them social emotional skills, all of those great things that schools do so well. What we're saying is when we venture into those Tier 2 and Tier 3 services, either through an IEP or a 504, that then we utilize licensed folk to do that so that then Medicaid could be billing. So we will be putting out some support. We have role documents that really kind of go through and talk about how districts can increase their ability to bill Medicaid. The other piece that other, and this gets a little bit into the weeds, but if you think about, the amount of money that goes into school psychologists, many school psychologists, one of their main roles we found, we have two here in Nevada, two roles that that school psychologists play. One is they do educational diagnosis for special education. That kind of service is all billable through Medicaid. And so, again, the problem is that in Nevada, that school psychs can't bill for Medicaid because misalignment of licensure. So we'll be looking at what other states did to correct that misalignment to allow for the billing of school psychs. Of course, we'll be working with the field to make sure that school psychs walk alongside of us again so we don't throw out the baby with the bath water and make it so that only school psychs can bill. The other piece that school psychs do is, crisis intervention. And this is particularly in Clark County School District, where they are looking at when a child is presenting with suicidal ideation, things like stability, planning, intervening, working with the families. Again, you might think of, well, isn't mobile crisis doing this? Mobile crisis just decreased their amount of services in Clark County, to only eight to only business hours. So this really leaves Clark County School District with a necessity of making sure their students are safe. And so, again, if our schools are already doing these services, finding alternative ways and streams of funding to pay for these services may make those educational dollars go further. So I just wanted to come and kind of give you that update and that link between multi-tiered systems of support and mental health. And then also to really say that we have a few last update from around the mental health. Medicaid just received a grant to really help with assisting our districts to be able to bill for Medicaid to offset some of those services. And so again, I think it's going to be really imperative for the Nevada Department of Education, our districts, and Medicaid to work closely together to get a system that actually works for our schools and not kind of, right now what they're kind of doing is limping along with a very clinical version because our schools aren't clinics. And so again, we're going to be working together to build what really does school-based mental health look like and how can Medicaid really assist in that billing that. So we just, they just got that grant congratulations to Nevada Medicaid, and they'll be working with us to further those strategies. So, I wanted to come and give you guys that update, let you know there's a few reports coming out and if you'd like to be kept in the loop around this issue to let Deputy Peterson know, and I will attend or bring other people to come and talk about this issue to you all as we move through the next year. Thank you so much. And if you have any questions, I am here.

Megan Peterson: This is Megan Peterson for the record too. I would like to just close out by saying that this is a concept as, Deputy McGill mentioned that the department is looking to adopt and implement more across the board within school districts and within the department. And so as we continue our conversations and especially, next year's, the commission gears up again for additional, support into the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. I think it's important that we contextualize and understand all of the components that are interacting with the funding that goes to schools. And so when you think about Pupil-Centered Funding planning in MTSS, the adjusted based funding aligns very beautifully with Tier 1 of MTSS and our Tier -- our weighted funding within all at risk and gifted and talented, all align wonderfully well with Tier 2 and Tier 3 as well. So being cognizant of the interplay with the other services, and how they're all interacting, I think was vitally important to our

conversations as we move forward. So we appreciate Deputy McGill being here today, and I think you'll see with our next presentation as well with Director Amelia Thibault and how it interplays now with chart of accounts and how we can start to begin tracking return on investment, that they are all wonderfully integrated and I'm excited about the systems processes as we move forward.

Chair Hobbs: Well, thank you very much for an informative and very encouraging report, Christy, we really appreciate that. I'll look to the members of the commission to see if anyone has any questions or comments. Please?

Punam Mathur: Chairman Hobbs, thank you. For the record, Member Mathur. Christy McGill, thank you. I don't know where we'd be as a state without you. So just a -- I need the reminder of some history. Wasn't it only fairly recently in the last few years that we changed our Medicaid policy, amended our Medicaid policy to even make school-based service delivery a reimbursable feature?

Christy McGill: Yes. It's called Estate Plan amendment or a spa, really not all that relaxing, but the state plan amendment allowed for Nevada to bill outside of the IEP. We were one of the first states to do so. One of the things that really came up though, as we move through that is that the IEP gives structure, which is what billing needs, right? And so that's what we have been billing -- building with the schools that if it's going to be outside of the IEP, do we use the 504 structure? So some districts have used that, other districts haven't. Clark County School District is probably the most advanced in billing outside of the IEP. They just started their mental health services, so congratulations to Clark County School District. They started that I believe in October. And then also they're looking at personal care services as well for their nurses. And then congratulations to them. They started billing for screenings of vision and auditory, if you can imagine, Medicaid is a numbers game. So, we are by state law. School nurses must screen children for vision and auditory. That takes money that was coming out of education funds. And now Clark County will be taking that money out of Medicaid.

Punam Mathur: And Christy, what year was that modification?

Christy McGill: Oh, I don't have that right in front of me, but it's been about, probably about four years ago.

Punam Mathur: Yeah. So, just to say in the sort of the arc of change, that was a big deal because it lays open a possibility that up until then didn't exist. And then as complexity goes, the details are always the thing to work through the mechanisms and systems required to be able to do the thing are now what, is being worked on. This is transformative, I think in a bunch of ways. The nation surgeon general has been screaming from rooftops that public health, the mental health, especially among our young people, is a public health emergency in this country. And so this is all hands on deck kind of moment. So it was proud of us as a state that we were actually the first to do something because we're not always, and it's by virtue of Christy McGill that this work continues. It is not easy work, but it is profoundly important work. So just thank you for that reminder. The one other side is, correct me if I'm wrong, but we've heard from a lot of the non-profit partners that have addressed us as a commission. And many of them provide school-based services as well, including things like iCare, dental sealants, dental care, and right now they're working really hard to try to grow, to meet need by selling tickets and tables. It's a very unsustainable way, and it's really not never going to be practicable for them to scale. So this whole, I think in the non-profit world, they've been looking to try to build the internal capacity to also build Medicaid, because at the end of the day, it's not getting it done for kids in whatever that partnership structure needs to look like at the campus, so that the full burden is not born by the educators in that building. So thank you, Christy. I appreciate you.

Chair Hobbs: Other comments or questions? And thank you for bringing that up. I think it's important to cast a spotlight on some of the things that are happening out there that a lot of people may not be aware of, but are extremely positive and innovative. Oftentimes the focus is on just the things that come up that may be negative.

But certainly, it's important to recognize those places where there's a lot of ingenuity being taken and innovation occurring. So thank you very much. Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Member Brune.

Nancy Brune: Thank you. Thank you, Christy, for the presentation. And Megan, I appreciate your comments. I just had a question. I hope it makes sense. I appreciate that the increase in the base and we've got weighted funding. But in your studies of other states or have other states explicitly called out school-based mental health services as part of the at risk calculation, because I don't think the way that we're calculating at risk, I don't recall that it references students' need for school-based mental health services. So are -- there other states that are maybe more explicitly calling out need for mental health services as part of the at risk weight, if you will?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record. Based on the research that we have done so far, that is not something that's been specifically identified. but it also hasn't necessarily been specifically part of the scope. We're continuing to investigate and understand and research and I think that the gender conversation over the last year has come to prove kind of the point too is that as time goes on, the way that we view and understand certain impacts and their weight within the conversation continues to change. And so, the area within mental health and the school counselors and that continues to, I think, be an evolving consideration in that conversation.

Christy McGill: Christy McGill, for the record. This isn't directly answering your question, but there is a trend in the other states. again, the west is a little bit slower, but let's just take Washington state 'cause they're a little bit closer to us in the east. They have actually untangled school mental health with education dollars. So leaving education dollars intact, they actually looked at different pots of money to fund the school-based mental health dollars. So for example, they have a separate stream of money going into schools for that. So in some sense, if this is where students -- and it is -- it's kind of a shift of thinking, if school -- if again, students are going to be getting their behavioral health services in schools, I think some of the thinking is using educational dollars for that purpose may not be the best and actually to use dollars that were flagged for medical services. So, there is that trend across several states doing that.

Nancy Brune: Can I ask a follow up? So is it in those states, is the appropriation coming from the state legislature, maybe going to HHS and then being dedicated to the school district so that decision makers realize you can't just use our education dollars that NDE gets to then fund school-based mental health services, but you're actually showing that it's going through HHS and then being transferred to the district. So you acknowledge -- so it's easier to acknowledge that this is separate from our educational monies and we're not going to tap into those.

Christy McGill: Yes. I'm not sure if they flow it through, you know, their health and human services like Michigan has actual mental health authorities in each of their counties, but it is separate from the educational dollars and they're tracking them separately for that very same reason.

Nancy Brune: Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: As a follow up to Nancy's, point, I think we would be interested in seeing what some of those models look like including the funding source and how it is actually segregated from the education dollars, but still made to be fully beneficial for these purposes. So I don't know if I'm jumping ahead to future agenda items or not, but anything like that that you could share with us, I think would be of great interest. I think it's a hugely important area.

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Chair Hobbs, I was thinking exactly the same thing. The -- again, just so I need a refresher. Just a quick reminder. The at-risk weight was sort of the 2.0 version of the initial categorical investment in victory schools. And so is it permissible for schools to spend their at-risk weight money on

provision of mental health services?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record. So as it currently stands, the at risk when it was originally adopted under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, focused on services that more specifically aligned with, what was previously called the Victory Services.

Punam Mathur: Yeah, victory Services.

Megan Peterson: So, it wasn't necessarily identified there, but as we continue to grow and understand what it is that's negatively impacting our students' ability to progress and move forward, it becomes more and more obvious that this is an area that needs support and attention. Because I know when I'm having a bad day, it impacts my ability to work, and then puts me behind in other areas and my peers and everyone else. So, I think it's just part of the ongoing conversation to stay relevant and make sure that what we are considering under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, is meeting the best needs of our students.

Punam Mathur: So that might be -- Chairman Hobbs, something to add as a part B to what are other states doing. Is there a way to get additional funding, specifically acknowledging the crisis in mental health? And as we are responsible for the mechanics of the existing formula, the one weight that right now contemplates kids in all kinds of different measures of crisis in their lives or instability in their lives, all of those attributes in the 73/74 that are included in grad score, could individually cause an awful lot of mental health issues for kids, right? So we should also sort of look at the way in which schools are allowed to invest those dollars to give them the ability to do what their babies need on the campus.

Chair Hobbs: Well, it raises another question too with regard to the weight itself for at risk and whether or not, the setting of that weight contemplated these additional services. So, it would appear that the answer is no. And if that's the case, it may be a good idea, you know, particularly over the next few months while we're in a bit of a hiatus, that sounds like something that we could revisit with Megan. You can tell me if this is right or wrong, but revisit through APA because we may be full funding a weight at a weight level that doesn't accommodate some things that are inherently needed within that weight. Does that make sense?

Punam Mathur: And might there -- and I'm jumping ahead too, but I can't help. And might there be a way to -- as we look at augmenting through DHS or other pots of money, is there a way to concentrate that within the formula to the weight, right? So you become a co-funder exactly. So I think there's opportunities, that begins with curiosity. So Christy McGill, as always, thanks for fostering progress and curiosity.

Chair Hobbs: We thank you both again for your presentation. It obviously sparked a little bit of interest -- well, a lot of interest and a number of questions, but -- and maybe some direction, Megan, that we can undertake. So when we come back together, that's something we can put right up front. That brings us to agenda item number seven. The commission will receive a presentation on types of return on investment analysis and education and proposal for a multi-year implementation pilot for return on investment analysis. So, we have Amelia Thibault and we welcome you and look forward to your presentation.

Amelia Thibault: Good morning. Thank you so much. I'm going to go ahead and share my screen. Give me just a moment. Okay. Hopefully everyone is seeing this. we'll go ahead and jump right in. So, Amelia Thibault, for the record. Today we're going to talk about two primary forms of return on investment, a little bit of history as to how MDE became acquainted with these analyses, and some of the goals that we have over the course of the next year in terms of implementation. I want to begin by discussing system strategy, return on investment. Very specifically, the National Comprehensive Center offered a community of practice to discuss return on investment approaches. And one of the primary things that they discussed was system strategy return on investment. NDE was very excited to participate. We were one of, eight state education agencies who

attended the community on practice and talked through different options in terms of developing return on investment analysis within states or local education agencies. We had myself participate as well as Dr. Cool Axtell out of the Office of Student and School supports, and Beau Bennett, our state education funding specialist. and this was a really rich discussion that we had with a lot of technical assistance to discuss what was possible, and what it is that we could do in terms of this within Nevada. So I want to talk first about, as I said, system strategy, return on investment. This is really a theory and approach that you can train boards of trustees, local education agencies and other such things to think about their funding in terms of outcomes and strategies. So typically one of the first things that you do in system strategy ROI is going to be gathering a large group that has representatives from both the fiscal side and the programs and academic side, with a strong basis in data. So on the one hand, you do want to have an actual LEA team that is going to be working on this process, and you also want to be providing, the board of trustees training on this process. I will say that when we look at S-S-R-O-I, it is a leading trend in school investment and school finance. When we talk about larger concepts that are emerging, such as student-based budgeting or design-based budgeting, SSRI is really a strong path forward to reach those types of analyses or budgeting methodologies. But what is it? So SSRI essentially a process, five step process, where we train our board of trustees to essentially look at the outcomes that we want to have, and think about what strategies they currently have in place to reach those outcomes that they're aiming for. Thinking about it strategically first, and then basically pulling in a bunch of data to assess whether or not they're currently, managing to see the results that they're aiming for with certain interventions or strategies, and then rolling it back to make sure that when we make budgeting or financial decisions, they're going to be in alignment with those strategies. So I know this sounds like something that we all are doing, but when we discussed it with that community of practice, it is something that needs a bit of reiteration and some additional training and focus to make sure that when we do have those cross-functional LEA teams or boards of trustees making those budgeting decisions that we really are unifying both programmatic goals supported with that evidence-based, interventions are really tying off with our financial folks in terms of how we are actually going to invest those funds. So the five step process in general is, first you're going to evaluate what strategies you're going to use, so what are you presently using and to what end? What do you want to introduce and to what end? And then you want to take a look at what kind of approaches you have in order to implement the same strategy. One thing that I think is really useful in terms of system strategy return on investment is that we have tools like investment grids that essentially say, these are our outcomes. We can look at really across section of interventions or strategies that we'd like to pursue to meet those outcomes. And then being able to pull out each of those items and discuss its scalability, discuss really the return on investment, how much it would cost to implement, and what kind of data or evidence we have about the strength of that intervention to succeed in the way that we want it to. So it kind of starts with a stock take to kind of pull back and say, what are we already investing in? What are we already implementing? And then deciding if you want to continue or introduce something new. So a lot of things that this does includes a lot of engagement with the public. So ultimately when we talk about stakeholders or families and community, the point is to be able to say, this is why we chose to invest this funding here. We believe it's going to have this outcome. there's a lot more engagement in this process, not just across the LEA and with boards of trustees, but with, schools and the community as a whole to talk about why we're moving forward with certain things. It adds a lot of transparency and from what we've heard from other LEAs and SCAs in general, it creates a lot of buy-in for the things that a school district is trying to do. So they do communicate and discuss the reason for their decisions. That's where we really have to have that data representation to make sure that we can substantiate the decision that was made. And then it also kind of takes us back to that identifying a root cause analysis, for why a given strategy may or may not be working. So, it -- it's really, as I said, it's a little bit, how we think it should work, but it's not always how we're having it proceed. And so this is really just alignment to making sure that we're always thinking strategically about what we're trying to effectively do and what the end result we're looking for is, and then having the budgeting follow that. So I will say that as we look at S-S-R-O-I, there's a lot of alignment with a resource allocation review process. Resource allocation review is a federal requirement that has come through over the last several years regarding how we work in school improvement plans, and situations with A-T-S-I-C-S-I, but those targeted improvement schools to say, how are you actually allocating the resources available to you to

intervene with students? So I think both federally and then nationwide, as we look at innovations in budgeting processes and strategic processes, we have a real opportunity to introduce system strategy, return on investment as a framework in alignment with the resource allocation review process that we are federally required to initiate with schools and school districts. We do have an opportunity here to make sure that we are assessing where we are right now and where we want to go. It's a great process to integrate with the strategic plans that districts have, and how boards of trustees also set their goals or gains. Ultimately this is strong alignment between strategic improvement plans and budgeting, database decision making, community engagement, and things like that. What's wonderful is that system strategy return on investment because it is kind of an emerging trend. There have been significant resources already developed for the introduction of this, from education resource strategies and the comprehensive, sorry, the Comprehensive Centers Network. So we have a lot of resources ready to go. The first phase that we really want to talk about, because I have a two phase implementation plan for you. The first phase is just generally providing training on SSRI as a framework, as a process to tie a lot of different pieces together. The second piece of what we're proposing is actually managing to track the expenses and expenditures made on a given intervention. So while system strategy ROI is a framework for making budgeting decisions and thinking about how you're investing your funds, the return on investment analysis that we are proposing as the second part of our phased implementation really is trying to get to tracking the exact amount that we're actually investing in a given intervention and being able to pull that out of our state reporting right out of our 387 reports. And out of those ledgers, so we presently have the NDE chart of accounts, which I'm sure all of you are familiar with. It's a system by which we have our fund codes and project codes and object and everything else already details. What we're proposing is to essentially look in the chart of accounts and pilot out a process by which we introduce something along the lines of a strategy code. so if we were to add an additional level of coding, which is what we're currently proposing, what our pilot is looking at doing, we could then develop a particular identification or a piece of coding that could be tied to an expenditure that says we have chosen to use intervention X, let's say a reading skills center. And this is how much we've invested in the Reading Skills Center. So this ultimately informs again, when we're making budgeting decisions, but also whether or not a given strategy is actually seeing the kind of achievement outcomes that we're looking for. So let me move along here. What we're proposing in our pilot is actually to take a look, at some existing categories. So NRS 3D7 1, 2, 4, 5, section 10, defines eligible services for English learners, which was historically under Zoom programming and at risk students previously under victory programming. Obviously as you know, we moved away from those categoricals and we transitioned to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. We do have weights for both English learners and at-risk students. It's kind of silly for me to be telling you that, I apologize. But what we have is statute that essentially says here are the allowable and recommended interventions for English learners and at risk students under what was historically Zoom and victory programming. Now there's also a process run through the Office of Student School supports that, when someone wants to utilize their weighted funding for English learners or at risk students outside of these generally allowable interventions, they can basically apply to the Office of Students School supports to say, we have an innovative program that we'd like to propose that we are going to dedicate this funding to in an effort to see certain outcomes or supports for those students. We chose this because we already have defined interventions that we could very easily track to a given code within the chart of accounts. We also have really copious amounts of funding that are dedicated to our EL students and our at-risk students. So for English learners, we have general fund, weighted funding, but we also have things like Title three funding. And there's this additional level, which is under NRS 388.408. You'll often hear this referred to as AB19. There are requirements presently that if English learners are in a certain percentage of achievement, and if they are in a particular bracket of low achievement, that the school must develop a corrective action plan to try to basically apportion additional resources and improve the achievement and outcomes for English learners. So this is an annual process, based off of the actual data that's done during the annual accountability report. The schools that are within that bracket are identified and they are required to work with the Office of Student and School supports in order to develop a corrective action plan. This further aligns with those school district performance plans and the CSITSI ATSI. So, especially with ELs, we not only have a rich amount of funding and defined interventions, but we also already know some schools that are very specifically looking at identifying additional

interventions, changing their resource allocations and making efforts towards improving those outcomes. We also, of course, have our at-risk funding, which has general fund, it has the weighted state funding. And then we have various forms of federal funding that actually do work to address at-risk students. So we have Title 1A, title 4A, title 4B, which is the 21st Century Learning Centers, McKinney-Vento, and a number of others. So again, we have a rich basis of funding that we are funneling towards a select group of students. And well Title 1A, 4A et cetera are not limited to what we have defined in NRS 387. 12445, because they are primary recommendations, we will likely see as we look at braided funding, the potential that some of these sources would also be flowing towards the primary interventions for at-risk students. So here is what we ultimately propose. And I will say that this is one item that we might actually combine. Currently within Object code three 70 and three 80. These are not presently defined object codes in the chart of accounts because we don't yet know how this will work out. We don't want to move forward with introducing a completely separate strategy code right now. We really just want to test with -- within the accounting structures that we have the ability to provide additional coding, to identify when we are utilizing any of these interventions with any form of funding. So primary interventions, we have a lot of overlap. And to that end, it's so funny that I did not consider this until after I had already done it. But the reality is that a reading skill center, or access to pre-K does tend to have a very wide impact on all students. It's not going to be exclusively at risk or English learners necessarily. So we may combine, for example, instead of having 371 for EL Reading Skills Center and 381 per Reading skills center, having that combined in 371 so that they can have braided funding for the purposes of providing an opportunity or intervention. So as I said, there is crossover. We have reading skills centers, access to pre-K, summer and intercession academies, extended school days, professional development for educators to better serve these students, incentives for recruitment. And then we also have under English learners, we have family engagement, and under at risk we have hiring additional support personnel like paraprofessionals for the classroom, and including wraparound services. And there are a lot of varieties of what that looks like. And then both have an option for applying and essentially requesting that they use an innovative program to meet the needs or improve the performance of their English learners or at risk students. So the goal here is to ultimately recruit, and begin testing out whether or not we can start identifying funding sources, using these test object codes. So the goal here is to have a greater understanding of school level practices. We are hoping to see this at the school level and not just at the district level. Again, because we have those AB219 plans for English learners that are specific to a given school, we are hoping to get down to that granular level and see what kinds of interventions different schools are selecting to use and what the amount of funding is, in those particular schools. We will be able to analyze investment in interventions, get an idea of how much funding we have going, to give an intervention across the state, analyze the achievement levels of schools. I will say this is part of the five-year plan implement. We really want to focus in the first two years on making sure that we can get accurate coding, which is a lot of school level and district level training with the folks who are actually coding all of those expenditures. Its training in terms of boards of trustees and how they're thinking about coding, and choosing certain interventions for the budget in a given year. But what we're ultimately hoping is that as we're able to identify different schools or different districts that are providing funding to specific interventions, we might be able to start seeing trends in terms of the outcomes of students based on our annual accountability report. and potentially whether or not certain things are working better in certain places. That is a few years down the road. But I will say that when I initially presented this, to some folks at NDE, the programmatic implications were absolutely the thing everyone was excited about. And we do have to slow down and make sure that we get the actual system and accounting pieces in place first. But there are a lot of opportunities I think, as we move through this process for what it can mean in terms of programmatic suggestions or interventions, and making sure that we can target that funding in the most effective way possible. So as I said, it is kind of a two tiered or two gold implementation process. So the first is really the system strategy return on investment training. We do want to provide that to all of our LEAs. We want to make sure that we provide that to school boards or trustees, which I think there's a great opportunity to align with Silver State Governance in terms of the types of training that are provided, and really emphasizing some of that systems thinking. And the second part is quite literally encoding return on investment, and kind of return on achievement and trying to run that analysis through the actual expenditures that we have in a given year. So the

first goal in order to implement, system strategy, return on investment, what we're hoping to do is actually begin in January or February of 2025 to begin providing trainings and resources on SSRI to LEAs. We will be working. We want to align SSRI training with those NDE resource allocation reviews. So we will be forming a internal working group within NDE to make sure that, the training on SSRI and how that impacts other requirements will be holistic. and not necessarily, you know, two very similar things happening, that are requiring two different things from you instead of trying to find a way to make sure that it is streamlined and consistent from NDE, and ideally asked once, rather than a few different times or a few different ways. So we really do want to spend the spring making sure that we provide initial training and resources, as we move into school year 25 26. this is where if we want to look at school year 24, 25, these are really Tier 1 supports. There'll be general webinars that folks can join. We will promulgate some resources as we move into school year 25, 26. That's where we start jumping into those Tier 2 or Tier 3 levels of supports. providing technical assistance and trainings to individual LEAs. Making sure that we have that support team in place to make sure that moving into future years, we have continuous training on SSRI, resource allocation reviews and the kind of various integrations that there are. Making sure that it's available to remain sustained in terms of training and approach and systems thinking. And really just containing -- continuing to provide those resources and training and technical assistance. When it comes to the actual pilot for return on investment, we are again hoping to begin in January and February. So for this school year in January, we're really hoping to share with school districts, that we'll be hosting this pilot, that we are looking for folks to volunteer. I will say that I have great hopes that both schools who have AB219 corrective action plans, but also potentially schools that have representation on the commission on school funding, will be willing to kind of gung-ho jump into the pilot. We are going to be holding Q & A at the federal title directors meeting in February, and we are hoping by February, the end of February, to have determined who our participants are going to be in the pilot. And then basically March through June. So the whole rest of the school year is really just training. We don't expect anybody to start coding items this year. We want to make sure instead that we start providing training and discussing what it will look like, making sure that we answer questions, in order to make sure that when we jump into next school year, school year 25, 26, folks are feeling kind of steady and well prepared for actually trying to identify these interventions at the level of expense. So when we actually jump into the pilot, what we anticipate the pilot, sorry, the pilot looking like, we do want to make sure that different LEAs or schools that are participating have an option to share information with one another. So every two months or so, we do anticipate holding a meeting that allows them to meet and discuss whether they're having specific struggles or, you know, a lot of success. We will of course have a cross agency ROI team within NDE, very much aligning, especially with some of those functions that we talked about out of the office Student school supports, making sure that we're working with people centered funding, and a couple of other folks across the agency. Essentially having a monthly check-in meeting with each of the LEAs in pilot. So making sure that there's time for someone to come and specifically ask a question what it looks like in their books or programs, what they're encountering, whether they're struggling, things like that. Ideally we have folks, coding their expenditures using those 371 381 codes. And we are collecting data ideally, of school level financial reports or district level financial reports, that include that coding so that we can start taking a look at quite literally what it looks like, and if it is effective or working. So this is really a matter of consistent -- technical assistance, reporting, monitoring, and trying out the experience in the first year to see what we need to go back to improve, expand on, etc. And as always, we do want to make sure that we're aligning with MTSS in those Tier 1 to Tier 3 supports jumping forward, as we go into school year 26 and 27, in theory we could take a look at the data that we gathered through school year 25, 26. I am hopeful that we'll be able to run some analyses in terms of, you know, specific school sites and performance, but I do think that one year in is going to be a little bit too early to be able to start tying it to whether or not we're seeing certain achievement effects with different interventions. I think that's very much something we'll be able to do in later years, but not necessarily immediately. We will follow up with the Commission on school funding. In terms of the results of the pilot so far, this is the point where if it is working, we might want to begin a conversation about adding a category to the chart of accounts for things like strategy codes. We would ideally expand and get additional LEAs participating in the pilot. And I think the big piece is we have predefined interventions in terms of English learners and at risk, but if we want to start looking at what

types of interventions are we investing in, in order to reach certain outcomes or goals, we kind of have to start defining what those goals are and what the most common interventions are so that eventually, right as we look at any program or process or intervention that we are trying to introduce in a school or district, that we eventually have some kind of code that we could draw that back to. So there's a great deal of diversity there. That's really where we'd want to start meeting with, kind of all of our LEAs and some specialists to begin determining what primary interventions they want to identify and how we might code those. Continuing into 27, 28, I think this is where ideally if in 26, 27 we had identified additional categories that could be coded, then in 27, 28, we might expand the coding opportunities to start identifying additional interventions and the funding given to them. We would try again, I think, to take a look and see if we can start getting any correlation between achievement and funding. But again, only two years in, you know, five years down. I think we'll have a lot of consistency and might be able to start looking at that, but I don't want us to get too excited about being able to make correlations too early in the pilot, and kind of proceeding in that process. So with that, I will go ahead and just pause and see if there are any questions.

Chair Hobbs: Amelia, thank you very much for that presentation. I believe there will be some questions. I have one or two, but I think Mark Mathers has been making a lot of movements up there. So I'll go to Mark first.

Mark Mathers: Thank you, Chair Hobbs, for your observation of that. So, I really, like the idea of using return on investment naturally, kind of, you know, being a finance person, I guess I, you know, this is the first, I think school districts have heard of this initiative and, you know, we have regular CFO meetings and other opportunities to connect. And so, you know, for big ideas like this, I would hope that there's a more upfront collaboration. Again, I think the concept is great. I am a bit concerned about the execution. You know, we have to, at the school district follow accounting regulations, rules, generally accepted accounting principles and so forth. And so when there are ideas about adding object codes, that's kind of near and dear to our heart. I guess my question of, you know, immediate, and these are kind of narrow technical concerns, again, I don't have a concern about the concept, but since it's been introduced as an example of kind of the technical issues that I have, you know, what we're, what is being suggested is to add object codes to track really program expenditures. And I think that's a misuse of object codes. And I'm trying to find the slide that kind of laid out those object codes. On the handout I had, it was slide 9. I don't think that matches the presentation. We saw there was a slide with two columns of object codes.

Unidentified Speaker: Would you like me to pull it back up?

Mark Mathers: That would be great. Yeah. That's the slide. So the suggestion is to create object codes underneath, function codes. And I think, right, so when I'm spending personnel costs and salaries and benefits, that's an object code. And I need, you know, object codes exist to account for types of expenses, salaries, various benefits, various professional services and so forth. And I feel like these are functional or program expenditures, not object code. So again, if I'm spending salaries and benefits in the pre-K area, they need to show the salaries and benefits under the object code. And then to me it seems more natural to show expenditures for, say, that pre-K program under a function project or program code. So as otherwise got a duplication of object codes trying to capture information. So I know again, this is a narrow technical concern, but it's an important one when we talk about providing direction to school districts. And, you know, I think there's a great level of accounting and budget knowledge and experience at the school district level. And I would hope we'd call upon us to weigh in on proposals like this because I have a concern that this doesn't work. Again, I would have no problem costing out or showing expenses underneath the function code program code or project code. So it's again, a fairly narrow kind of technical concern, Amelia, that I have. But it's again, an important one. So I just want to note that, upfront before you get too far down the tracks. The other concern I have is, we're kind of blurring the definition of at risk in my view. And so we talk about different funding sources for at risk, but they're, you know, especially in some of those grant areas shown on the PowerPoint,

those are very narrowly directed, say for homeless services or so forth. And I worry that we're using at risk is kind of a catchall category. We get funding from the state that is based on a grad score, and there's a very delineated list of services shown here that we can spend it on. And I just would worry that then we add to it title programs and other general fund programs that sure, they provide supports and services for kids who are fall under the narrow definition of this by the state of at risk, but many times do not. And so I don't want to, you know, we're -- I don't want to conflate the different definitions and services and supports that a grant indicates. We consider these folks in kind of, generally in the at risk category, but they're not in the states at risk category and definition. And so I, you know, I, again, I have concerns about commingling those funding streams and then calling all those kids at risk because -- and this is a critique of, again, the grad score. Only 10% of Washoe County School District students are considered at risk, and yet the kids in crisis exceed 10%. So I don't want to be measured on programs that we're using general fund or grant monies for the state can -- doesn't consider at risk, right? That doesn't seem right to me. Let's measure if the state has this definition of at risk, let's measure outcomes based on that definition, but let's not throw in other funding streams to get to other issues and programs be on the list we see here. So, those are some of the concerns. And I -- again, I -- before we launch a program, I'm just hopeful that there's more collaboration and opportunity to go over these issues because right. We don't want to get caught up in doing something and then we have to explain kind of how that doesn't work. I'd rather have those conversations upfront. So again, though, believe strongly in using ROI, you know, to make decisions. I think that is the right way to look at things. We -- Washoe believe in data-driven decisions that the academic return on investment would get to. So, appreciate the discussion. Just again, I think we need to tweak some of this to make sure we're on sound accounting and budgeting footing. Thank you.

Amelia Thibault: Absolutely. If I could respond. Thank you. I think where we're coming here and kind of in our timeline, I think the initial goal was to see based on conversations that may have happened previously with the commission, whether you felt this was a direction that you wanted to move toward in terms of trying to do a return on investment or return on achievement analysis. I think where we talk about January through June or July of this next year is very much that opportunity for collaboration with districts that want to jump in and start figuring this out with us. So in terms of order of operations, that is why it went that way. But I would very much anticipate to a lot of the great points that you just made that we would be having much more thorough conversations with CFOs, and those accounting teams about what this process would look like in the spring before we actually try implementing it. So to your point, I think we could probably do these as project codes. And potentially -- sorry. I was thinking. I do think that we can use something other than object codes to make sure that we don't muddy those waters. As I said, I think the theory would be that we would manage to end up with a different category, but we're currently trying to fit this into an existing chart of accounts without making any major changes, until we really have proof of concept. So changing these codes to something other than an object code, I think absolutely works. And I will say that when we were first working on this proposal, we were initially only going to do it with English learners. So I hear your concerns on at risk especially, in terms of that state and federal funding. So I'm happy as we continue to have conversations to see how we might refine or limit the at-risk funding analysis to not include certain federal funds, or perhaps only look at the weighted at risk funding that we're receiving. But, this is, I think, very much still a point in the process where we want to make sure that we're heading in a direction that will serve the larger goals of the commission and, you know, governor's initiatives and things like that. But that we do anticipate a robust engagement period as we move into the spring with school districts about how we really hammer this out to be able to attempt to implement. So I hope that soothes some of those concerns. And yes, sorry.

Chair Hobbs: Yes. Thank you. Let me go ahead and jump in because I had a couple of questions and I think Mark's points touched on a couple of those areas, and your response also touched on a couple of those areas. I believe, that what -- the reason that this is in front of us today is to sort of sketch out a big picture approach to how all of this may work. I mean, obviously, you can have a plan of implementation for something and then you encounter things along the way that change and reform the approach that you're taking. And I would

consider Mark's remarks, first of all to not be unimportant at all, but want to be an example of one of those types of things. You, you want to do this within the confines of a sensible accounting and recording system and not necessarily impose a tremendous amount of additional work, that, you know, to accomplish the mission. So, I, you know, the first point of emphasis is the collaboration with all of those involved, I think will be needed, with the CFOs, and the administrative staff. And certainly this commission wants to stay informed as well. The second part of what I wanted to bring up, and I think you were -- both of you were touching on it was, and I'm going to put this in the form of a question maybe to Nancy and Paul, hopefully not unfairly, but you know, we've taken it on to look at reporting, and some type of system of reporting that would lead to a determination of return on investment, right? That's part of what we just submitted in our report was identifying the framework and the metrics and how one might approach all of that. I am assuming that this is in part an answer to, or this is taking that to another step and actually moving towards some level of implementation. But before I make that assumption, I wanted to turn to Nancy and Paul to see if what I'm hearing is actually accurate. Does this dovetail and integrate with what we have sketched out in the report as a framework for reporting that would lead to an assessment of return on investment? So either Nancy or Paul, if you could comment on that.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Member Johnson for the record. Well, this is the first that I'm hearing and seeing this information. so, I share many of the same concerns that Mark shared. My primary concern is that decisions affecting school district have been made without input from school districts. And changing object codes sounds simple, but there's actually a lot of work, especially if it's attached to payroll, because there's a lot of moving parts. And I don't agree that we would -- are utilizing the account codes the way that the structure exists. So, I think before we identify deadlines of implementation, I think we should have the collaboration process and consensus first, and then, identify when the best strategic way would be in, in order to implement this. Absolutely agree with the return on investment concept. I think that is absolutely the whole thing we're trying to do to try to connect investment to performance, which is right on key. So, very happy that we're having these discussions because I think it's been absent, but I think we've also wanted to engage, experts, professionals in the industry to help guide us through this process to make sure that we don't do pilot projects without meaning. I'm not saying that this wouldn't have meaning, but go through a lot of efforts and have it not lead to some larger expansion. so, like I said, I agree with a lot of the things that market indicated, I think is a great concept. I would love for this commission to be involved and weigh into that because there's a lot of work that has been done previously adhere to identify performance frameworks, measures, and legislators have mandated. So, I would like to see how that is integrated and that collaboration happened first.

Chair Hobbs: I mean, hence the question of, how it integrates with what we put together. Let me say first that, you know, taking some affirmative step toward making something like this happen is something that everyone should be complimented for doing. You know, I know it sounds like a couple of the comments or are sort of critical, Hey, this is the first we're hearing about this and we would like to have more collaboration. The fact that something is being done in and of itself, I think is a positive development, that collaboration will be necessary. I mean, obviously, I think the success of doing the type of thing that you've laid out, Amelia, relies greatly on the cooperation and the ability of all of those that provide data to actually be able to do that, right? So, hopefully we can consider this the jumping off point for that collaboration, which I think -- and we have some time to do that while we're sort of in a hiatus and maybe develop it with some of that input. But again, I don't want to -- I don't want there to be a tone of, oh gosh, you know, this is a shocking and surprising to us when in fact, it's always positive in my mind that something is actually moving forward. But that question of integration, it needs to -- it needs to conform. I don't know if that's the right word. Conform with, but we need to make sure that the mission of the commission, as it has been directed to do within the area of reporting and accountability and developing, additional reporting that would lead to a conclusion on return on investment is something that is complimentary between the efforts that have been made by the commission and those that are being undertaken by you all. So I would just offer that as a comment. Please.

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Chairman Hobbs. Thank you, Amelia. So here's -- we just submitted. We just hit send on 543 pages of recommendations including that big homework assignment around commission. Please address accountability and metrics, right? And so, we've got something that now is just at the very beginning of legislative consideration as I listened to Amelia and give me a reality check on this. What I sort of heard was, holy cow, you are like Wayne Gretzky headed where the puck is instead of where it is. So we just sent the -- here's our suggestion for an approach to wrestling accountability. This to me looks like a further step in the sophistication and refinements of that sort of accountability set of measures by providing a framework that allows me to then make decisions at the school level or at the district level. But we've been trying to wrestle to the ground is how do we take a macro funding formula and give the public some set of gauges that say something's working, something's not, we had not actually gotten to the degree of refinement of providing tools associated with set accountability system that would allow building leaders or district board members to make decisions, right? So I really think this is a cool idea. It feels very Wayne Gretzky like, and so for me, just in terms of sequencing, I hope that there's a good, and I suspect there will be a healthy and robust discussion at the legislative level around what accountability they want to see based on the recommendations that we've advanced, that will hopefully advance that discussion. If passed this prologue, we're going to get a honey do list that is going to be reflective of the will of the upcoming session, right? That will be ours to tackle. And so, I would say this is a very cool idea. I think you're ahead of the curve, and if we don't sort of get the sequencing right, we're going to be running at parallel paths, which is the most inefficient of all those scenarios. And I know that no one has time for that. The other wisdom, that sort of life experience that came up for me was I spent years at the corporate level and was humbled by the fact that I came to appreciate why some of my colleagues viewed corp as the four letter word. Professionally. I never could understand it because I would always show up smiling with, you're welcome, I'm ready to help. But when I came to deeply learn from them, meaning the operating units where I was, the corporate structure is that co-creation, it's not even collaboration, it's co-creation. There's no other way to create things that are going to be equally valued and equally utilized by corporates and operating units. Unless it's co-created, it's not collaborated, it's not communication, it's co-creation. And so I think that is, there's an opportunity here, because we're -- I haven't met anyone from any LEA that said, oh, we've got surplus time to do these things. I mean, all of our districts are sucking wind. And so I think the opportunity that we've got and the asset at the statewide level is that we've got expertise and bandwidth and, well, I don't know if you have bandwidth, but you got willingness and energy to do it. So I think that's a really cool asset that at some point in this journey, we need to deploy and make maximum utilization of. It just feels very early. So I am grateful that you are Wayne Gretzky like, and contemplating where the puck is heading. This may be a moment where we need to let legislature first deal with the accountability puck because they're going to tell us what they want. And then based on that, then begin to think about some process to co-create what will be the right set of tools to support the public's understanding of what's working, and to provide really sophisticated tools for building leaders and district leaders to make decisions about their own investments at their own level.

Chair Hobbs: Well, let me say to Member Mathur, the sports references are always helpful to some of us, as far as really driving home the point. Megan, you've heard some of the comments that we've made, you know, mark, Paul, myself, Member Mathur, do you have any thoughts to add to the process or to the conversation?

Megan Peterson: Yes, thank you, Chair. Megan Peterson for the record. And I -- so I did want to back up a little to and add additional context to help with the timeline of this, and acknowledge the chicken or the egg situation that we are kind of in with this. And that the conference that was attended by the staff that Amelia had identified earlier only happened at the end of September. And our CFO meetings are held quarterly, which the next most recent one was October. And so we really hadn't had an opportunity yet to come out with some sort of clear plan of action to communicate the overall concept. And so it's taken us a little bit of time to compile that. And based on our other experiences with other projects, if we have not come forward with some sort of more concrete type framework to present, it's often met with, we'll come back with more information.

So we are planning to present this at our CFO meeting that is being held in January, but also recognizing where we were with the work of the commission concluding before we move into the next stage of work, we wanted to be able to present some of the early concepts and information and potential timelines. So that way that we all know the kind of work that is going to be ongoing. And absolutely these are -- should be collaborative conversations. And what I've often always said, and my predecessor, Heidi Harts was known for it and I think really pioneered the concept, right? The hardest thing to do is to get words on paper. And so that's what we're looking to do, is to start the conversation, get some ideas out there, and then work with everyone to see how we need to tweak that to meet our ongoing needs. I'll also say a lot of this work and part of the more aggressive approach, the timeline right now is also related to the fact that, as we've mentioned, the department is working on procuring a uniform system to acquire all of the information. And in order to do that and to be able to start providing feedback from that system, we also have to have the framework. And so, the sooner that we can start this conversations and say, here's what we need this to be able to do, and here's the level of detail, meta tagging, all of those kinds of things, we need to start having those conversations sooner than later as well to make sure that we find solutions that work for the situations. So yes, there's a lot happening and we want to make sure that, and I fully appreciate the hockey reference being a kraken pan myself, that we're trying to be as forward thinking as we can in all of this, knowing how these pieces are going to change and evolve. But we've got to start, somewhere. And most of the things that we're presented today are the initial concepts. They are not set in stone. And we'll absolutely look to work with our counterparts to find a system that works for us, but we do want to make sure that we're starting to chip away at that mountain, so that way we can get to answers sooner than later. We like to be as proactive as possible.

Chair Hobbs: Well, Megan, notwithstanding the Kraken reference being offensive to a lot of us, we -- I think that was a good summation. And again, you know, this isn't a case where anybody's done anything wrong at all. I mean, the fact that work product is being developed is a very positive thing. I think what's happened is it's evidenced this discussion is evidenced the reason why there does need to be that collaboration to work through some of it. All of us want to get to the end product of having a workable return on -- not just workable, but reliable and credible, return on investment system in place. I think all of us feel that way. So, you know, hopefully, from your standpoint, Amelia, you didn't take this as, oh my gosh, you know, these are a bunch of terrible people that, that yelled at me or something. Because that's not it at all. You helped get the conversation going, and for that we're deeply appreciative, but there's a lot more conversation needs to occur. I mean, that's largely what I got out of this.

Amelia Thibault: If I may. Very much so. As Megan said, this is a concept. I think one thing we're always trying to balance is, how much work we're putting on LEAs. And to that end, because it needed to align and make sure that it was aligning with what your goals were, that it was a concept that you were interested in pursuing. I didn't want to recruit LEAs and have them start working on a process for us to hit here and be like, actually no, that's not in alignment with where we needed to. So I'm very much looking forward to the opportunity in the spring to start opening that collaboration and conversation with school districts.

Chair Hobbs: Well, and they are the funnest group that you'll ever meet with. So, you should look forward to that. Any other questions or comments? If not, we can move the agenda to agenda item number eight. And thank you very much, Amelia, for all the work that you put into this in your presentation today. Future agenda items. We have a little bit of time to think about that. We did identify, one or two today. This obviously is going to be coming back to us. There's some that we already know that will be coming back to us. I think here it's appropriate for me to mention to all of you. Yes, we did put the report in. You will have an executive summary coming to you for your utilization for those that may have some difficulty reading through the entire report. That will be coming. There are some meetings that have been scheduled. The next one is December 16th with one of the legislative committees. I think there may be a couple of others. The Chamber of Commerce spoke with them a couple of days ago, and they want to have a meeting in. So there are meetings that are coming up, and all of it is to essentially explain what's in our report. And then there will be, activities

during the legislative session. We won't be receiving reports directly as a commission, but I'm sure that some of us will be following and will be made aware of things that may be occurring and recommendations that we made that have actually made it into bill draft requests and those sorts of things. So we can certainly follow that. And there always exists the opportunity too, that we may be called upon during the session to meet, in some form or fashion to clarify something while the session is still going on. So, a lot going on in the future. And otherwise I think that takes care of agenda item number eight. Agenda item number nine is public comment, period number two. And this public comment period is open for any matter within the commission's jurisdiction, controller advisory power. No action is taken. We all know the rules of public comment and we welcome you.

Chris Daly: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. So, sports, right? Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association. We thank this commission for your thorough, and thoughtful engagement on one of the most important issues facing Nevada. We attend many board committee and commission meetings, mostly focused on public education. However, in the last year and a half, we've also been regularly engaging meetings of the Las Vegas Stadium Authority, because in Nevada there's an overriding question of priorities. Yesterday, we told the stadium authority about a powerful story run by News 4 in Reno about the growing school lunch debt, which is now \$45,000. Also, it's reported that fewer students are accessing school lunches, meaning children in Nevada are likely going hungry. We told the authority about Joe Lombardo's veto of AB 319 to provide free meals to all Nevada students, but in terms of priorities, the reason we did this, was to impress on them that this was done a day after he signed SB1, the bill that authorized \$380 million in public funds, to help the California billionaire build that stadium. Not surprisingly, our comments didn't have a huge impact as the stadium authority. Then move forward all of the contracts and documents with no discussion from the Stadium Authority Board members, a contrast to this commission. So, back to the thoughtful work here, while you've picked up many other responsibilities along the way, I believe your most important charge has been to identify optimal funding, and a method to fully get there in a 10 year period in your report that you referenced for the next biennium your recommendation requires an additional \$406 million. And with tempered budget projections from the economic form earlier this month, this stepped up education funding will likely require significant more political effort than last session. When all of that revenue is available, increased investment in out years with economic uncertainty will require passing new revenue like your proposals on sales and property tax. That's why we've been calling the question on Nevada priorities. Last session we frame this question as, schools versus stadiums with limited new resources. It's very possible that, the question will be posed this upcoming session about schools versus studios. Outgoing, commissioner Johnson's reference earlier to the children are the future. While perhaps, a little -- well, I don't know, that song might be a little corny, but it's still a good song. It indicates that NSCA and this commission may have agreement on the answer to the question of priorities. We look forward to continue our work together. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Mark, let me look up to you, in the north to see if there's anyone wishing to provide public comment.

Mark Mathers: No, sir.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you. I don't see anybody else in the south. Do we have any by telephone or by email?

Secretary: Chair Hobbs, we have no email or, telephone comments at this time.

Chair Hobbs: Could you double check the email because, we received a text up here that somebody had submitted by email. And if you're not finding it, Joseph one thing I would ask is that when it is received, that it be made part of the record of this meeting and that those comments be forwarded to each member of the commission.

Secretary: My apologies, Chair Hobbs. I had an email hiccup, but I do have the comment here.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Please.

Secretary: Public comment from Sarah Adler with Silver State Governance Relations. “On behalf of a group of small self-managed charter schools, we have several comments related to the work of the Commission on School of Funding today. Regarding school mental health funding. We feel it is highly appropriate for at-risk funding to be allowable for students' mental health needs. School social workers was formally a categorical grant, and those funds are now within the PCFP. According to the SSROI discussion, Charter schools, especially these small, highly focused ones, are designed to be able to deploy unique strategies and thus may be very helpful in participating on an ROI pilot. On the other hand, these small schools lack resources and personnel for an intensive process of mapping expenditures to strategies to outcomes. It should also be noted that WCSD district sponsored charter schools do not receive a pass through the end of their share of Title two and three funds. So they are hampered in their ability to deploy unique strategies. Finally, we 100% endorse member Brune's suggestion that Paul Johnson's resignation should be rejected. We so greatly appreciate Mr. Johnson's service to our entire state and the educational system. Thank you, Sarah Adler.”

Chair Hobbs: So with that --

Unidentified Speaker: We have a motion and a second, is what we have.

Chair Hobbs: That concludes, public comment and we appreciate all of the comments we received. That brings us to agenda item number 11 or 10 rather. And, Vice Chair, if you don't mind, I'm going to delegate that item to Mr. Johnson to oversee.

Unidentified Speaker: Give him the last word.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Paul Johnson: Adjourning the meeting.

Chair Hobbs: Meeting adjourned.

Unidentified Speaker: Nice job.