NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING

February 23, 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 COMISSION MEETING

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

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT
Megan Peterson
Jhone Ebert
Beau Bennett

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT
Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE
Ricky Gourier
Ryan Reeves
Matthew Schaaf
Nathaniel Budijono
Charlie Kratsch
Karl Wilson
Justin Silverstein
Kelsey Krausen
Sean Tanner
Amanda Brown

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Hobbs. Quorum was established. Chair Hobbs noted for the record that they are joined by Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Ricky Gourier and Ryan Reeves provided public comment.

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

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

4. MINUTES APPROVAL *(Discussion and Possible Action)*

The Committee will vote on whether to approve the January 26, 2023 meeting minutes.

- Guy Hobbs, Chair, Commission on School Funding

Unidentified Speaker moved to approve the meeting minutes from January 26, 2023. Unidentified speaker seconded. Motion carried.

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

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

- Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent of Student Investment Division, NDE

Megan Peterson stated they have been very busy since the last commission meeting. Our working groups have had an opportunity to meet more and start laying some groundwork. I will cover that in the presentations after this but we were also able to connect three of our work group leads with subject matter experts from WestEd and Augenblick Pelican Associates to start conversations in terms of what support and information the workgroups need to do their work. We're excited for that work to take off from here and start discussing some of that accountability framework in the reporting. We have continued to progress with our contracts. We have successfully completed the evaluation portion of the accountability framework contract, it is going through negotiation period right now, and so we are hopeful that that will be able to go to our Board of Examiners for approval in April, as our anticipation at this point. We were also able to successfully close out the RFP process for updating the NCEI value for budget purposes coming up in the next biennium. And then we are continuing to proceed with the work for the Economist. That is the contract that will be supporting the 10-year conversation with the revenues in the work in that realm. We have also been working with obviously Infinite Campus for a presentation that you'll see today working to ensure that all the questions that were raised during the last meeting are addressed. I'm excited for that presentation, as I think it will address a lot of questions that have been posed. And then I did want to share that next month, a few select employees, myself and James, are going to be going to a conference in Baltimore that is hosted by the Association for Education, Finance, and Policy, where they're going to be discussing many of the topics that we have before us today, including Teacher recruitment, retention, education, finance in general, as well as English language learners and dual language programs. We're really excited to be able to go and learn about that and bring back the information that's being shared nationally on those topics right now.

Chair Hobbs asked what is the estimated timeline on getting the Economist piece on board, selected and contracted.

Megan Peterson stated that request for proposal is currently posted. I believe that the period for application ends next week and then the evaluation committees will have approximately two weeks to review and then meet and make their decision, and so we'd be looking at probably a May timeline for Board of Examiners approval.

Chair Hobbs stated just for everyone's background, that's the one that will provide support among other areas to the updating of the report that we produced last year. That's one of our working groups as well, and I'm very, very eager to complete the update of that report. What that will culminate in is me basically coming back to you all with some recommendations for consideration, taking the very wide array of funding options that we looked at previously, and trying to boil that down into from 15 or 20 different illustrations that we provided, down to two or three recommended approaches. We'll be posting an item then hopefully around May to be able to do all of that.

Megan Peterson stated she wanted to clarify that they are evolving our approach with the contracts and so specifically we're looking for longer term contracts that will play out over multiple years. That way the contracts are in place consistently throughout the time that the commission does need the support. That is also one thing that is going to be in place for these contracts going forward as well.

Chair Hobbs stated they would like to be able to get this support on as quickly as we possibly can. We also appreciate everything that you and the superintendent have done to try to move that along. Member Brune is here now with us but Member Woodhouse is obviously recuperating and we all want to send our very best wishes to her. She is here by way of video conference, and there's some concern as to whether or not she is being allowed to vote, so if there's something that you need to open up for her, please do so.

6. **WORKING GROUP REPORTS AND DISCUSSION** *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)* The Working Group Leads will report on the progress made since the last Commission meeting. The Commission may discuss and make possible recommendations based on information shared by the working groups.

- Working Group Coordinators

Jim McIntosh stated in his particular group, he hasn't actually met them yet because he's been trying to pull some information together, but regarding accessibility between schools and a public school system, not without limitation to open zoning, I have been pulling as much information as I could together before I met with this group. I'm trying to understand the intent behind this request, and I think part of having an equitable funding formula like the People Centered Funding Plan is the thinking that the dollars follow the student, that perhaps it'll be easier for a school district to allow for more open zoning. There have been pilots done at CCSD. They have expanded their magnet programs. They allow for students to move outside of their zoned area for career and technical academies as well. I have a draft of something, and I think we spoke last time about this likely being a one page item we would present. I don't know if it's worthwhile to get connected with a consultant to assist if there's something beyond what I'm understanding the intent here is. But I will be providing something to the two members of my group, which are Member Woodhouse and Member Mathur here very soon. But it really is just turning into this overview of what has been done. What I don't know in terms of what else could be available out there.

Chair Hobbs stated to the point that you raised about what the purpose is, Megan or Beau or anybody, are you able to provide clarity? I'm just kind of going on recollection right now, it seemed to me that it was a topic where if we provided observations and maybe a recommendation of some sort, that would be fulfilling.

Megan Peterson stated she thinks it is in the realm of observations from recommendations in terms of how to make improvements to the funding formula, but also within the context of are there certain things that we should include reports within the quarterly reports to ensure that the necessary information is percolated up for decisions to be made if warranted.

Joyce Woodhouse stated the working group on the performance of the PCFP has had a couple of meetings. We had a meeting with NASS, the district superintendent. And then we had a meeting with the CFOs around the state. We have a printed report for you of comments that were ones that were basically came from more than one person on both of those two listening sessions. A couple of things, and you'll notice that in the first paragraph in the report that these conversations continue with the superintendents, we used the West Ed document for their Nevada LEA focus group summary report as our goal points that we wanted to make sure we discussed. And then we asked the CFOs to really get in the weeds as best as we could and determine what they felt was going on and so there's a list of comments there that I'm not going to read through. I think it's important that we put on the record the observations overall and I think Superintendent Jensen would agree with me that the PCFP is working well, and I would even put a very well in front of that based upon the remarks made by superintendents and CFOs at that meeting. Always there's room for improvement, any changes that we might want to make, and the ones that came up were to leave the ending fund balance language as it is. And you all know that discussion that's gone on for years, there were comments that if it was going to be a change, that it would go back to the original SB 543. The next one was that we found that especially for new CFOs that are coming in, that it would be a good idea for us to do a better job of making sure that they are trained in how the PCFP works. A number of items such as attendance, areas really were not understood. So that would be an observation that we would share. And Superintendent Jenson, if you have additional comments, I welcome those for you to put on the record. And I think Paul Johnson and Member Casey are also on our committee, so welcome any additional comments and discussion that they have.

David Jensen stated Member Woodhouse did a great job of covering our discussion. As noted, when we met with the superintendents, we hit it from about the 30 foot level. Being a superintendent, we're not very bright, so we didn't want to take them down into the weeds. So it really centered around what's working well, what's the perception, are there any major issues. We talked about weights quite a bit, and there were some things that we flagged in the conversation about weights and being able to expend funds, especially around the EL category which has presented with some challenges. As Joyce indicated, the next day with the CFOs, that's where we got to the really bright people, and we started to get into the mechanics. And saying the actual operational components of the PCFP, what's working, what's not, are there some things that we need to tweak? We highlighted the things that the Commission's already working on so that we wouldn't start to dig in too deep, understanding we're already doing work around NCI and around what's the other one at risk? So, because those could be conversations that the CFOs would want to spend a lot of time on. We just said look, Commission's working on those and they were very appreciative of that fact, knowing that those were targets for the Commission to address. So great conversations. I don't know if Joyce mentioned, but we're going to try then to reach out to LCB, and GFO and see if we can't have those conversations at that level too to get a broader perspective to bring back to add into the information that we've collected to this point.

Paul Johnson stated just one thing to add on the attendance areas. That actually was a part of the Nevada Plan and it was designed for teacher allotments through the Nevada Plan, but we've kind of repurposed it in this funding formula for a different reason. So what we want to do is make sure, since that's dated, that it needs basically to be updated to see if anything is, new attendance areas should be in existence or whether others should be changed.

Chair Hobbs stated one of the things that we want to try to keep track of, and NDE is helping us with this through the Work Back Schedule, it's on the smart sheet application, is understanding what the deliverable will be from the working group. Now, I understand that it comes back to the full commission and it's the commission that actually exercises on the deliverable, because the working groups can only provide information to the full commission. But with respect to timing and closure and what the end product will look like. At the end of all of this, given this wide array of topics that we've been asked to undertake, we envision a report that will have multiple sections or chapters in it, each of which could be liftable on a particular topic. We'll have to start thinking now in the coming weeks about how we're going to assemble that report and when the pieces are going to come together and how to make it all integrate. As we go through these, if you can also give some kind of indication on timelines and what the deliverable may look like. And I know it may be a little bit premature because you're still working on it, and particularly in some of the working groups, some have hardly started, but we'd like to be able to make note of those so we can keep the current on the work back schedule.

Joyce Woodhouse stated they have at least two more meetings that we want to have an opportunity to listen to the LCB fiscal folks and the Governor's Fiscal Office. So, just timeline wise, I would think that we easily could have our working group done sometime mid-April is, unless something pops up and then, of course, we can address that as it happens. But I think we could put that one on the table as being able to finish by mid-April.

Chair Hobbs stated with that in mind, that might be something that we write down as a potential, maybe April, but probably May agenda item for the full commission bringing back the information from the working group and then hopefully getting closure at the commission level. So, when we're putting the agendas together, let's keep some notes on what agendas some of these might be best placed upon.

Paul Johnson stated his was Working Group 4, which is the Accountability and New Reporting Framework and to kind of address your question on the deliverable, it kind of depends on what we're asked to deliver. If it's simply recommendations of next steps that could be delivered by May, as you had indicated, but if it's something more detailed to actually resemble a framework and information in the framework, that is much further down the road. We could provide recommendations that would guide a direction, but you certainly wouldn't have a finished product of a matrix that would be, resemble a framework by that time. That is a much more longer, deliberate process. Members of our group are Punam, who is the Co-Lead, Jim, Nancy, Beau Bennett, James Kirkpatrick, and Megan Peterson, who are probably a member of all of them, so thank you for all of your hard work and support. We have made certain that we have grounded all of our discussions with around the Commission's definition of optimal as was identified back in 2021. So that we make sure whatever we were discussing is not constrained with existing fiscal resources and current situations and those types of things, because we want to identify an optimal performance framework with the understanding that we are guiding toward optimal funding. The key phrases that you can pull out of the definition are per people funding, uniformity, equitable, exemplary student performance, exceptional achievement, on par with the nation's best strategic investment, effective practice recommendation. That theory behind the definition needs to be captured somewhere within the framework. The things that we are trying to align to make sure that as opposed to kind of the shotgun approach that we currently have, where we have a bunch of different things that may not be connected or even aligned with one another. We're trying to streamline all of the data and information that I think that Jason's group is working on, to align the portrait of a learner that is currently in progress, the Nevada Academic Content Standards, workforce and employability skills, stakeholder and policy, priorities, accountability, and assessments that measure performance in authentic and meaningful ways over time. Fiscal commitments, state district and school improvement plans, which need to be linked as a continuum from performance through funding. Financial reporting also needs to be linked and it needs to be consistent, and use a similar language as our chart of accounts. The financial data, and the terms that we're using for descriptions of services are consistent, so that there's common language. So that's kind of where we were. We've had one meeting so far. I've had another meeting with industry experts to kind of offer their help to guide this process, which will be awesome. I just talked to Megan a little while ago, so we're going to try and set up monthly meetings. Pick a second Friday or third Friday of the month or whatever so that we can have regularly scheduled meetings, so we can continue this process. With the objective in mind to create a comprehensive user friendly framework that's going to inform decisions down to the parent level, so they can pick something up, gather information that's understandable. Most importantly, we want to identify those authentication factors, or metrics that are kind of most significant indicators of what student success should be or what it looks like, and that's the process we're going through. Since there is a performance framework already in place, which is federally mandated, we call it the Nevada School Performance Framework, kind of using that as our foundation to build upon, and add additional data, and information vertically to make it deeper, and horizontally to make it wider in order to provide, as meaningful data that we can, not just for academic performance, but for culture and climate, for growth, for achievement gaps, for the whole spectrum. I would welcome any one of my other members to chime in and improve that any way they can.

Chair Hobbs stated he’s encouraged that a couple of your comments about having met with the subject matter experts, so you're getting a bit more of a comfortable feeling about the subject matter experts being available, and able to support your work.

Paul Johnson stated he thinks through the existing contracts that NDE has with the providers, they are able to offer some guidance and professional advice. So, that currently is in the process. In addition to that, there is a contract that currently is under negotiation that will provide additional resources toward the accomplishments of this whole piece. When that is awarded, there will be a lot of focus effort from those folks that will be able to take this information and develop, I guess, the plan or the framework, which would be finished sometime in 2025.

Chair Hobbs stated that's great to hear, and I think I heard you say that you all were going to bring back, I think you used the term recommendations, but discussion points probably for the commission in and around May. The hope is that some of these more singular topics that we're dealing with, I know that Punam, you have one or two of those, Jim already talked about one, I have one of those if we're able to bring those to conclusion in the May to June timeframe, then everyone will be available to focus their attention and efforts on all the accountability and reporting pieces of this which is really the centrepiece of everything that we're doing this go around. So hopefully from about that May June timeframe, we would be dealing with those more collectively as a commission based on the work that you and a couple of the other groups are doing to help get us positioned to do that. That's sort of the thinking in a chronological way.

Paul Johnson agreed. One other thing that I think is important for us to identify is that we're having some short-term goals because, there's an understanding that some immediate deliverables to the executive branch and legislative branch to indicate some sort of benchmarks or measures that identify how school districts have spent their money and why and what that has done. So we'll try to identify what those factors are so that we can report how the additional investment has influenced our investment in education, and then subsequent to that, you'll have the framework that's being built that we ultimately will use as a dashboard, similar to the NSPF that we currently have, and the Nevada Report Card model, which has layered information that you can go and drill down to a very detailed level as you'll get the summary information first, and then if you choose to go in, you will have links to more detailed information down to the school level.

Chair Hobbs stated as we hear these target dates, hopefully then we would have an agenda item sometime in May, or thereabouts, and you can certainly feel free to check with the working group, leaders as to the timing of those, and when those may be ready to work.

Punam Mathur stated working group #9, Teacher and Support Staff Compensation. That was the thing that we had, and we've been so efficient and effective that we're going to slough it off to another group. Here's what happened. There's another working group that we created around the notion of the future pipeline. As we started visiting with NDE staff and the other group started to visit with NDE staff, thank goodness, NDE staff was quick to say, hey, there may be conversation that is just beneficial between you, and so we did. Dusty is the leader of the other working group. When we got together, it was clear that it really wasn't two efforts. It was probably a unified effort, so I'm proud to report that Working Group #9 has completed its job on behalf of Mark Mathers, Jason Goudie, and myself. I'm quite proud to be the first one across the finish line, and in the conversation, there was unanimous agreement that Dusty ought to lead the working group for the resulting joint efforts. He wasn't there, but it was two against one, but it was one of those, but we do think there's a lot of logic through reaching out to the sources to get the information. And to the point you made earlier, this also feels like one of those one off sort of to do items that we were given by the legislature as opposed to something fundamentally critical to our job as overseers of the people-centered funding formula. So we intend to do a good job, do it quickly, and with Dusty leading the work group. I have every confidence that it will happen.

Chair Hobbs stated he had two, one of which I already spoke about the optimal funding and updating that report, which again, the item will be, and this will be something that may take a meeting or two because we're talking about significant tax policy recommendations that have political ramifications as well. I'm hopefully targeting that for, based on Megan's information, May, June timeframe, maybe more likely June. If there's information we can get out about that in advance to enable us to bring closer to that more quickly, we will certainly do that. But at this point essentially see that that is really just an update of the prior report for the most part, other than the recommendations, which we expect to try to boil down. We didn't really provide recommendations last time, we indicated methods by which it could be funded at different levels. That was a little short of making any recommendations, so we'll take that information, update it, spend some time with it, and bring something back to the commission. My feeling is that making one recommendation as to how to do it is generally always doomed because any recommendation that involves taxes seems to have a force field built around it going in, and providing multiple recommendations, at least two or three, at least gives an opportunity for them to compare and contrast which they think is the best fit or the least bad fit. We're probably heading in that direction, but we'll bring that back for discussion, and once this concurrence on the direction to take with respect to the recommendations, we'll finish that update of the report and that will come back to the full commission. Before we prepare the final all-inclusive report from all of the topics that we have. The other working group that, we have not met yet and we will. This is small school capital, and what I've been doing on that is, first of all, we had a bill draft at the last session, so we have that to work from. There was another bill draft that could have provided some opportunity along these lines, and we're looking at that as a, another potential template. I've also, through some folks that I work with in the financial sector around the country, sent out feelers about whether or not they've had any similar kinds of challenges, and whether or not they can provide us any case study types of comparable that we can look at. I'm not expecting there's going to be a lot coming from that because very frankly, any funding, that involves, well particularly borrowing in some form or fashion, whether it's internal or external borrowing requires some form of security, and that seems to be the problem. Largely in some of the smaller school districts, but nonetheless hopefully I'll have all that information together, be able to share it with the other members of that working group, and I would expect that we would be able to bring that to some kind of conclusion by May as well with the recommendation.

Kyle Rodriguez stated he does not have a lead, but is a member of a few groups, and I don't want to steal their spotlight, but congratulations, Dusty, on the appointment of the expanded group, and then Jason, thank you for having your team compile that list of all the reports. I'm not envious of the additional reporting you have to do for being a large population school district.

Jason Goudie stated his group is the Accountability Current Reporting. We actually started this process maybe a subgroup or two ago that Paul Johnson, and myself, and a few others are working on. The primary piece that we are doing is essentially trying to compile an inventory of the reporting requirements of school districts including federal guidelines, state guidelines, anything else that's relevant. It's a large task, and given the fact that we are the largest, so we probably have the most, and I also have the most staff that can assist. We started that process a couple months ago, and we have compiled call it a Google Block that notes that the reports, the requirements of why they're required, some descriptions, frequency, amount of time to prepare, who the recipient is, who the preparer is, and then ultimately kind of a notes column at the back that is intended for our departments to the note value of the report, the redundancy of report, and just to give us kind of some trigger points so that we can start looking at those. Ultimately, our working group has met a couple of times and really just focused on, on trying to get that compiled, my team is compiling right now. We're fairly close, we sent a couple drafts out to the working group, which includes Bo, and James has been helping as well at the state level. They provided an inventory that they had done, so we're cross referencing that, and the ultimate goal would be to have as complete a list as possible, and then distribute that to the other school districts, and allow them to evaluate to see if we missed something, and then also to have additional comments in there about validity, use, redundancy, etc. I was also in the call with Member Johnson, with the subject matter experts, and they're also kind of tasked in their process of kind of assisting this piece in looking at the accountability, and the reports, and the value, and we discussed utilizing that group to help, what I'll call validate some of our assumptions around redundancy, necessity, value, etc. So, we think we'll be able to utilize them. They also had a couple of good comments both of which we had kind of thought through. The challenge is that this is a voluminous report. So the two missing pieces of data that we really truly need are probably examples of the reports, so we can see what's in there, and then also what we'll call the key data points that were within those reports, so that you can then cross reference data points used, either different sources, and/or at work. The challenge with that is, it's given the size, so what we want to do is kind of narrow that list down to some of those key reports that may cross over into what Mr. Johnson is doing and some other groups, and then drill down to get some more of those details because otherwise I don't think we'd ever get done and that's not the path. So, we are we're very close. We've set a couple drafts out to really right now focusing on format just to make sure we capture all the data. I think we have, and we're waiting on a couple of other of our departments just to kind of fill in a few pieces. So, it’s undertaking, we've got a great process that the team's been involved with, and as soon as we get the next step, like I said, we'll distribute to all the school districts, and just have them provide input, so that we can at least feel like we've captured everything that we can.

Chair Hobbs stated he knew from the beginning that this would be a massive undertaking, so thank you for shepherding that one, Jason. I also think there's a tremendous amount of opportunity to increase efficiencies within the entire reporting structure, which hopefully will save a lot of time and effort while not sacrificing any quality of information that's being provided. I think this is an exceptional opportunity and the tie into the framework, part of it is also exceptionally important, so we really look forward to you guys being able to bring that to conclusion, and thanks again for that undertaking. Next, I see that we're skipping Mark, and when I went back and looked at the list, I didn't recognize that was faulty by design. If anybody can think of something excruciatingly challenging, and I'm almost impossible to do, let's assign it to Mark.

Mark Mathers stated he would delegate some of his stuff up. There's plenty of work to do there.

Chair Hobbs stated he did think of that part on the reporting part of it, that Mark would have an equal interest as well as the other members in the outcome of that.

Dusty Casey stated he is honored to have been volunteered unanimously to be the lead of the group, so thank you very much. I do think it makes sense as Punam discussed earlier. We did have an interesting meeting with NDE. We had a couple other members on that James coordinated for us. Myself, Kyle, and Punam met, and that's kind of when we decided that the collaboration or the combining of the groups made the most sense. But we learned a couple of key things, and I'll be brief. Number one that there's a couple of groups out there that could probably help us, including a teacher recruitment and retention task force. So NDE is going to coordinate a meeting with our group and that task force, so we're really looking forward to that. We also learned that there used to be a meeting of the HR directors from each district, similar to like the CFOs meet, and so we're discussing what to get that together, at least for our purposes, to possibly help us better understand from each district's perspective, their challenges with recruitment and retention and possibly what data they have related to that. We're really looking forward to that, and we have reached out one of our community partners that presented prior from NCEI is looking at helping us gather some data as well, so, I reached out to them, and they're currently working on that. One thing our group feels is that we probably don't need a consultant. This time that the data does exist. NDE feels comfortable that the data exists out there somewhere that we can pull together. There's bits and pieces, obviously, of it everywhere, and so our challenge is really going to be just pulling that data together. One other key thing I think that we kind of learned that NDE is undertaking right now is that there are a lot of, and this was new to me as far as hearing the statistic, but that there are a lot of active, an abundance of active educator licenses in Nevada in the NDE system, and, so they have been, I believe they're already undertaking a survey, creating a survey to figure out where a lot of these people are, and why they're no longer in the education industry because it sounds like there's a whole bunch of them. So we're really eager to hear back what that might look like. So again, I think over the next few months, we should be able to meet that timeframe of that may timeframe to really pull a report together, and present both the study from a pipeline, and a compensation as well.

Nancy Brune stated they may recall that at the last meeting, we decided that the group that I'm leading, which is the presentation of basically the work that Member Johnson is leading, really would make sense to occur sequentially, and so we decided that I would join Member Johnson's group to sort of have that consistency across groups. Having said that, I did also join the subject matter expert call yesterday with Member Johnson and Member Goudie, and in sharing with the subject matter experts, the scope of my particular committee they shared that they have examples of sort of visual presentation of data and have, worked on that, and so I think once we have examples of some of the ways that they have worked with other school districts, or they themselves have created different presentations of the data. We will convene to start reviewing at least how we want to start thinking about the different presentations of the data, and then how it might look for, as Member Johnson mentioned, legislators vs. parents vs. member of the community vs. Punam's next door neighbor, and so once we have those examples, we will convene to start looking at that.

Chair Hobbs stated it does make sense that it would be sequential, sort of moving from one to another, but those are the three real key areas. All of these things we're required to do because we were asked to do them, but I think the biggest deliverable at the end would be the accountability piece and developing something hopefully transformative for the State, and I want to thank everybody for all of the time and effort that that you're putting in, and hopefully, we can bring some of these to closure and some of the rest of us can join on to your groups as well.

Punam Mathur stated she is not sure which group, I suspect is being addressed by somebody. Thinking about my neighbor for a minute, when we built the formula, what we said is this is going to be like a backpack of a child that will follow the child. I just want to make sure that we've got some dipstick to confirm that we know that that is what is happening. So clearly talk to districts, but is there any way to know that or to check it, to confirm it, or is that already being contemplated in some of the other metrics that we may receive?

Chair Hobbs stated he's not sure who's best to address it, but anybody who would like?

Paul Johnson stated he thinks that's something we certainly can incorporate into a performance framework and we can mention that, when we are discussing that with our subject matter experts.

7. PRESENTATION REGARDING THE USE OF GRAD SCORE TO IDENTIFY AT-RISK WEIGHTED
FUNDING (*Information and Discussion*)

The Commission will receive a presentation on the implementation of the Grad Score to fund the at-risk weight within the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

- Beau Bennett, State Education Funding Specialist, NDE

Chair Hobbs he will note that this item is marked on our agenda as an Information, Discussion, and Possible Action item. When we move to agenda item number 8, and I may be asking you a question here Megan that also has to do with GRAD score and Early Warning System, and that one is noted as Information and Discussion only. One of our goals today, and this may be a little aspirational, but hopefully not. We've previously taken action as a commission with respect to GRAD Score and the use of GRAD score in place of free and reduced lunch. This item has come back to us because there's a lot of discussion about the appropriateness of GRAD score, its application, possible limitations, and those sorts of things. The goal of going through this would hopefully be to be able to either reaffirm our prior action that GRAD score is the way to go. Possibly with some additional modifications resulting from the conversation, or that isn't, but I think with everything else that we have on our plate, and as difficult as some of those items will be, the sooner we could potentially put this one to bed, at the same time recognizing the importance and sensitivity of this item, I think better off we probably are. Now, in having a lot of discussions myself about this, and I would look around this dais and consider all of you probably to be far better informed on this than me. But in thinking about this, I keep coming back to, and I just mean these as like initial comments to get us thinking, and get us going or disagreeing or whatever direction we take from here, but I kept thinking about the term at-risk, and the question I kept asking myself as we, as I had different discussions with people, some of which are on this commission is, what does at risk mean? At risk of what? Because it seems to take on, and appropriately so, in some people's minds, a very emotional context. Part of that, because if there's anybody, any child that's considered at risk for any reason, there's a feeling that we need to do something to help mitigate that risk. But I had discussions about this, the more it occurred to me, and understanding the boundaries of what public education is, and what other programs that exist that are public programs are that line between them started to blur quite a bit, and I started to think to myself, that's really to the disadvantage of education that it's expected to do more things than perhaps it should be reasonably expected to do. All with the best of intentions, however, and again, I think we have to be very careful about. What we say about all of these things, but, what kept coming back to me was what does at risk mean and the definition that, and again, this is no news to you guys, I think, but it's at risk of graduating. That's what the definition was that I came to understand for at risk, not just generally at risk of other things, but at risk of not being able to complete what the education system provides for them, and that would be graduating, and that started to sort of narrow the context in my eyes, and then you start to think about, okay if it's at risk of graduating, what are the best indicators of risk of not graduating? I thought back to free and reduced lunch, and I can totally, totally understand why we migrated away from free and reduced lunch, because the correlation between qualifying for free and reduced lunch, and the ability to graduate was not anything, or the propensity to graduate was not anything that I ever saw any good data on. It was just a kind of a good catch all, but a very large catch all. Which at the end of the day was diluting the amount on a per student basis that could be applied. I think we all understood that that's probably largely why we went from free and reduced lunch this other metric, and so we've had this in place and questions have come up about the appropriateness. We heard during public comment a couple of points raised about things that I believe a lot of us have heard, and the exercise today was to provide us an opportunity to demystify, the application to GRAD score, maybe address some myth and fact type of issues associated with GRAD score, and come away with a more confident feeling about what is the best fit at this point, what's available to us and what is the best fit. I'm just making those as opening comments to this item, and anybody else want to add anything before we get into the presentation part of it? I don't know if what I said made sense or not, but I just wanted to make those opening remarks.

Megan Peterson stated she did want to make an observation, an option. When we were looking at these presentations, it was kind of a chicken or the egg conversation of which presentations should go first, so please based on how we proceed, feel free to make decisions about changing orders if you feel necessary. The intent of the two presentations, the department's presentation is focusing on specifically, more or less, addressing the request that is in the legislative letter of intent, which is for the commission to review the use of the GRAD score for the funding plan, and its effectiveness in identifying at risk peoples, and so what Beau and I will be going over is essentially a short history of where we started, where we are now, and then providing some Venn diagrams and counts of information. That way you can kind of see the difference between the counts and then we have Infinite Campus available to provide presentation, on the score itself and the Early Warning System.

Chair Hobbs from an agenda standpoint, both items 7 and 8 cover this topic, and 8 seems more specific to a presentation by Infinite Campus, but item 7 allows us the opportunity to take possible action. I'd prefer not to vacate the ability to take an action by moving from item 7 to item number 8, when really, we may be going back and forth between the two items. I guess the guidance that I'm looking for is, can we go ahead and combine the discussion of items 7 and 8 and take them in the order that you just discussed while also then preserving our ability to take possible action. Maybe that's a question for the Deputy Attorney General or provide guidance on how we could achieve that.

Craig Burkett stated you certainly have the authority to do it. You could actually move from one agenda item to the next, after you have a presentation on the issue, come back to the agenda item. I would prefer that you do so through a motion. So yes, you certainly have the right to take items out of order. You have the right to, through your group, through a vote take up an agenda item that's been closed as well. So really you have a lot of freedom there, do however you see fit.

Chair Hobbs asked, understanding the objective, do we combine the items or do we go back and forth between the items or what would the motion be that would allow us to have discussion of both items and still preserve the possible ability to take action?

Craig Burkett stated he was looking at the items themselves. They're very similar in subject matter. There are concerns for the public, is that we make sure that we give them an opportunity to understand what this public body is going to consider. I don't have a problem with the idea that you take both up at the same time because they're so similar in subject matter. So I would simply make a motion to open up both agenda items at the same time, which would give you the leverage of taking possible action.

David Jensen stated he knows there's been a number of iterations of this agenda, and maybe I printed off the wrong last one, but items number 7 and 8 on mine listed as information and discussion only. I don't have either of them specified as action items.

Chair Hobbs stated he is showing item 7 as possible action.

Punam Mathur stated the version that was posted online this morning does not mention action in either of the two. We had talked about it.

David Jensen stated the latest one, I don't think listed as an action, so I'm concerned that if we take action, we could have an issue.

Paul Johnson stated he thought he had an outdated agenda. So that's what my agenda shows as well, is that both of them are for Information and Discussion.

Chair Hobbs stated this is why we asked the question. The intent was certainly to have this be possible action, so I apologize for that, but if it's posted as Discussion and Information, then it would be limited to discussion and information. Sorry to have wasted our time on that, but the intent was to have it also be a possible action item, and would ask in the future that we note any item where there could potentially be closure as a possible action.

Beau Bennett stated the current codified definition of at-risk under NRS 387.1211 is at-risk means a pupil who is within the quintile of pupils to determine to be most in need of additional services and assistance to graduate based on one or more majors prescribed by the State Board, which may include, without limitation, consideration of whether a pupil is economically disadvantaged, is at-risk of dropping out of high school, or fails to meet the minimum standards of academic proficiency.

Megan Peterson stated she did want to pause here and just quickly go through the history and a refresher of where we were before the People Centered Funding Plan was originally adopted. For those who may remember, under the Nevada Plan, we had numerous categorical funding opportunities, and one of them was known as the SB178, New Nevada that was a categorical set of funds that were identified for students who are similarly placed to the definition that we have today. So they were in the bottom 25 percentile in performance who were not served by some of the other categorical programs. So as we've progressed through with the implementation of the Pupil Centered Funding Plan, as an initial framework, we had brought in the free and reduced price lunch concept with the opportunity for the state board at the recommendation of the commission to adopt an alternative definition, and so through the last few years that is how we have today come to the determination of the economically disadvantaged, at-risk of dropping out as you had mentioned Member Chair Hobbs, and the failure to meet minimum standards of academic proficiency, and so through that time, that's where we have worked with subject matter experts, and reviewed and determined where the GRAD score really did seem to align most closely with those metrics, and intents, and the legislature did seem to agree, and had codified through SB503 during this last session, this definition in statute, and so that is the framework from which we are presenting on today.

Beau Bennett gave a presentation. *(See "7. Grad Score CSF 2.23 NDE ADA" for more information.)*

Megan Peterson stated going back to the comment about the 20% cut-off, when we have our presentation from Infinite Campus, what we're looking at are the number of students in the high risk, and the median risk categories within the framework of the GRAD score, and so taking those into consideration, and looking in general at our own state's data that seemed to closely align with the group of students who were not on track to graduate. So that is a framework that was essentially off the shelf, out of the product from Infinite Campus, but it was a decision that the department made based on how the data aligned with what we were seeing locally.

Chair Hobbs stated to Beau, as we go through this, since I know a number of the topics that you're covering, and truly appreciate this, are things that have come up as points of discussion, for example, the 20%, I know there have been questions raised about why 20? Couldn't it be 32. 3 or some other number? If there's any of these that we need to spend a little bit of time on, feel free to ask questions, but I think what you're pointing out is this seems to correlate with the 20%?

Paul Johnson stated he wants to make sure that he heard what Beau said, that we identified the percentile ranking of GRAD score to fit the funding that we currently have. Could you repeat what you just said a little while ago?

Beau Bennett stated the product coming out of the box was 20 percentile. So we had to look at, if we extended that out, that would reduce, the per pupil amount, and the effective weight, which would get us further away from the APA, and then if we look here at the graduation rates, it seemed to correlate with our graduation rates which is the decision to maintain for the time being until we get some feedback on what's working and get some historical information.

Paul Johnson stated he just wanted to make sure that we didn't change the factors to meet the current resources that we had available so that we had a student population that matched.

Chair Hobbs stated that's why he thinks it's important to have this discussion as we go because I've heard that inference before, I think we need to directly address that.

Mark Mathers stated he heard the statement that 20 percent was, if we didn't use 20%, then the amount of funding would be watered down, and Beau, maybe that's not what you said, but that, sorry, that's what I heard, and to me, the first place we start is to have a definition of at-risk count, how many at-risk students are, and then we'll figure out how to fund that. It's not to work the other way. How much funding do we have? And, if we were to fund that at the total weight, how many kids does that mean? That, to me, is backwards. I guess I just have to say, I know there's been this note by some or correlation by some that statewide, 20% of kids don't graduate, and that matches up with 20% being at-risk. I just think that's a fallacious correlation. If that were true, that would mean if 20% of kids are at-risk, and 20% don't graduate, then we've done nothing to help those kids. I would hope with that risk funding, we would reduce the number of kids not graduating. So, if we start with 20% of kids at-risk, and we end up with 20% not graduating, we weren't effective in helping those kids. I take that as a coincidence, not a correlation in any way or certainly not causality. I just have a problem making that connection. That just doesn't work for me.

David Jensen stated no need to add anything else because Mark just hit my concern about trying to connect the 20% percent to our graduation rate. I'm struggling to see that.

Megan Peterson stated to clarify, we are at a starting point, and so when we're looking at the data and trying to analyse and understand, and make sure that we're making the correct decision points, there are certain assumptions that you have to make at a point in time like this, and we won't see an impact on the graduation rate until we have a set of students that we can focus and start investing and making progress towards reducing. We also need to be careful in the context that we're making specific correlations right now to saying 20%, but when we're talking about the GRAD score, and the actual indicators of where students are, we're talking about the percentile of performance, which in terms of our state is coincidentally corresponding to 20% of our students are in that quintile of performance. So, it's a little bit confusing because there's a lot of referencing 20%, but there's a difference between the quintile of performance where students are falling in that, and that is, has resulted in 20% of our students being in that range.

Paul Johnson stated regardless of the percent that graduate, there will always be a 20th percentile, regardless of the population. So, we may have a larger percentage graduate, but there's still going to be a quintile population regardless of the size of population.

Punam Mathur clarified, 20% percent wasn't us setting a cut score, 20% is the result of all babies in Nevada identified based on a GRAD score as medium-to-high risk. So we did that right. So, we said, what? Right, we believed in an approach that gave us an absolute number, that is the 20%, and then, separate, then, it also happens we've got roughly 20% of our babies are not graduating, which to me felt confirming, not causal, and it didn't really change at all the sort of theory of action that, for me, made sense around utilization of a GRAD score, and taking those kids who were identified at medium or high risk. It just happened that that resulted in a 20%. That was a quintile. We didn't say, give us the quintile. We said, give us, based on the calculation of the algorithm, give us the kids who are at most risk, medium or high risk. And then we landed at the numbers. So, I think the point you make, Mark, about did we sort of work backwards? I don't feel like we did. I felt like we said, this is what the optimal approach would be, and that gave us a percentage, and then it just so happened that in the real life in which we lived. That's about a comparable percentage to how many babies today are not graduating, which to me was affirming.

Chair Hobbs stated everything he's hearing is that there's less reason to believe that there's a causal relationship and more of a coincidental relationship.

Megan Peterson stated hat is correct, but I would venture to say that it's not coincidental. It means that we have gone through and tested our hypothesis, and found that they have aligned.

Chair Hobbs asked, looking at a graduation rate of 81%-ish, from a comparison to national averages, where do we stand? Are we graduating significantly less than average or, this seems to be one of those statistics we've read about from time-to-time and doesn't place us well with respect to other states, but that's why I'm asking.

Jhone Ebert stated it's hard, it's apples and oranges. States are allowed to set their own graduation requirements, and so we cannot directly compare our state to another state next door because they have different number of credits. It could be 24 credits in one state. It could be 18 in another state. If you were to take away that piece of saying, okay, well, everyone does have the same graduation requirements, 80% is right about the middle of the pack. There are states that have lower graduation rates, and there are states that have higher graduation rates as well.

Chair Hobbs stated but the goal of providing the additional funding to those that are categorized as at-risk would be to improve this number.

Jhone Ebert stated 100%.

Chair Hobbs stated it kind of goes back to the causality coincidence question. If we have 19% that aren't graduating, the goal would be to improve that to less than 19%, right?

Jhone Ebert stated yes.

Chair Hobbs stated by targeting the funding and the programming.

Jhone Ebert stated K12. And that's the other thing, too, people have gotten confused with is that is any of this funding going toward elementary students? And absolutely it is, because we can identify students based on the various components, right, that they will not in historical data, they are not on track to graduate beginning in third grade. They're not reading at grade level, they're not proficient in mathematics. All of those pieces will lead to a student not being able to graduate with their cohort.

Chair Hobbs stated that's certainly another area that I was hoping would be covered today in terms of the point of identification, and the point of intervention, and application of the programmatic things that could help, again, improve these numbers because I look at those, and I understand what you're saying about the comparisons not being necessarily apples to apples, but that's a number that I look at, and I think we want to do better than that.

Jhone Ebert stated yes, we completely agree with you, and the conversation around percentile and percentage being a mathematics teacher, I think is really important for all of us, and we as the Department of Education have a lot to realize when we are communicating with parents, when we're communicating with others, of how to make sure we separate and are very intentional on the two words as we use them and as we move forward. Because even within our own department, beyond the people that work with this information every single day, working with our own staff, making sure we are very clear on the facts, and that there are not any myths created, or to Member Mather's statements, making a correlation that is not there, but that it may be a coincidence that that is how the data played out. So, thank you for the opportunity.

Chair Hobbs stated he doesn't think there's any way that this issue is resolved, but knowing this is a touch point for a lot of folks, wanted to make sure we spend a little bit more time with it, because I think at the end of the day regardless of whether 20% has some kind of statistical correlation or, causal relationship, or is just coincidental, everybody's objectives are the same. We want to do better, and I think understanding some of the numbers and there may be a case where you have to set it someplace to begin with, and we got that recommendation to do that, and then I think part of it too is based on the way that it's being applied, are we seeing improvement? Are we seeing enough improvement? And if not, you have to recalibrate, reevaluate, reapply all of those kinds of things, but I don't know that any of us are really saying things from a different perspective as far as the desired outcome. I think we're just trying to understand the mechanics more than anything else.

Beau Bennett stated he didn't mean to insinuate that the funding is watered down. If the percentage goes up, it's the effective weight, and this is per student money, so what per student get, for example, looking at the preliminary FRL numbers from this year, right now, we have a .30 effective weight, and after hold harmless adjustment each pupil gets $3,137.

Chair Hobbs stated when we start talking about amounts per pupil for at-risk, whether it's, I can't remember what it was under FRL, it was a very small number, seemingly small number compared to what it is now. I have to tell you, in all honesty, I don't know what those numbers really mean to me because I don't know from a programmatic's perspective what they're doing for $800 per student or $3000, I have no idea. I think that is really the thing that matters is how it's being applied, because I don't know if that's too little or too much, because I just don't have that perspective. Can somebody help me?

Paul Johnson stated let me help make this more confusing. I think it actually goes back to fine tuning what you started the discussion with, what services are school districts supposed to provide to in order to help these at-risk students? Because if you go back to the adequacy, it was cost based in order to identify the amount of revenue that's needed in order to fund this. We really have to get an idea of what integrated student supports that we're supposed to be providing in addition to academic supports in order to get, and based on that level of service, and prototypical schools that are included in the professional judgment report, what does that mean in terms of funding relative to each school district? And then in theory, those services are supposed to provide the results that we need in order to increase the number of percentage of students that are graduating, and I don't know that there's clarity on any of that at this point.

Mark Mathers stated just to further complicate, we are struggling somewhat with implementation strategies because if you look at the law, there's this list of eligible uses. And that was borrowed from the old Victor and Zoom statutes, and I think those probably need to be modified, but in terms of providing services for at-risk students, it's a real challenge, right, in that you pull the students out and provide some services, do you, going back to the Zoom and Victory School model, do you, if there's a adequate sufficient number of at-risk students at the schools. Do you focus to the entire classroom that those kids are in? I mean, it is very complicated to structure services to support those students. When you pull them out, obviously there's a dimension to that and a sensitivity to that, that you need to have. I remember some early conversations along these lines of the pro to the Victory and Zoom School Model is that right, you're investing in those schools where there's a heavy population of either EL or at-risk kids, and how do you not do that? I hope that makes sense, but to operationalize and fund this is, is very complicated, and it's a school by school analysis, so for the larger school districts here, as Jason would know, you're allocated dollars by student, and so that goes to each school, and you really need to abide by that cap of funding by school, really. And so it is really challenging, and almost three dimensional. I don't know, if I'm answering your question, Chairman Hobbs, but it is very complicated to fund those services.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks what he said makes a lot of sense. Maybe I didn't word it very well, but when statements are made like waters down the amount per student, I think that's a pretty unfair way to say it because I think at the end of the day, whatever the number is, how it's applied programmatically. That is going to be something that then dictates whether or not it's effective or ineffective, too much or too little. I don't know how you do that. I've always wondered about this, and I guess I didn't want to seem this naive by asking the question, but the funding follows the student on a weighted basis, the at-risk students. But on a programmatic basis, it's always alluded me as to how, and I think that's what you were saying, Mark, and it does make sense that then the numbers that you as CFOs, and superintendents get, you have to determine how to program those dollars to most effectively reach that student population. I feel enlightened, yet more confused.

Jason Goudie stated he guessed the quick simple answer to your first question was, is $2,000 or $800 enough? And the simple answer is no, it's not. We know it because if you're using a weight of a base, which we know is inadequate by definition mathematically and logically the weight is inadequate. So that's the easiest part to get to is that it's inadequate. As Mark mentioned and others, it's very challenging on how to use and track, and it's one of the reasons why FRL is absolutely not away to follow child, because you have no children to follow. At-risk at least, or the GRAD score at least lets you identify those specific students for which, and it actually identifies why they're at-risk. Whether it's homelessness, or whether it's because they're English learner, or because of the other pieces, and then you can tailor programs. Are we doing it effectively yet? No. This has only been in effect for essentially one or two years to where the school, so there's a lot of challenges on how we do this. But in speaking to principals and other groups there, it seems to be a sense of excitement around being able to get access to this data and utilize it to truly target the funds. And when we say it follows a student, that's a misnomer. There's no way it follows these students because we don't have the ability as a district to say, okay, student A got funding at school B, he or she leaves to go to that other school, we don't take away a fraction of however many days and add it. It becomes too complicated. It follows a student at the beginning of the year based off initial enrolment, and then the school has a base of funds to apply to programs, and other pieces to most effectively take their students, and again, I don't know any principals or any schools that are looking at their students quintile and saying that is the only group of people we're going to help. They're using their pool of dollars, and they're helping as many students because it doesn't just apply to those. I think Mark alluded to the fact that it's classrooms, it's programs, it's after school tutoring, which anybody's eligible for. It just happens to be targeted to that piece. So I think there's a lot of complexities, but the simple answer is no, it's inadequate by logic and dimension, and we all know that.

Jim McIntosh stated he thinks Jason stated a lot of what he was going to say. By way of background, at least having been at CCSD when the state legislature implemented Zoom and Victory Schools, the whole purpose of that program was to say for the Zoom schools specifically to English language learners, the Victory schools were specific to at-risk students. It was instead to say, instead of having the money sensibly to follow the student was, let's just declare the entire school as a program that is dedicated or provide them with additional funds to access those services. Remember early on, we had Dr. Laszlos here very regularly stating we were seeing gains in those schools that she felt this was a good model, and that possibly this process of having the money follow the student might sort of disrupt what we were seeing in some of those areas, where we dedicated a full school to say, this is an English language learner school, this is an at-risk school, and they will get services as such having those being labelled as such. I think it's a philosophy about how we do this, and I know there was a struggle even for myself in terms of thinking, now we're going to eliminate those instead of saying the full school gets these programs, the dollars are going to sort of follow the student, and then somehow we're going out to make determinations as to what specific services do we provide. I'm glad to hear Jason say that their principals are excited about that, because maybe they can, more tailor what those services are, but now a principal is in a position of having to go out, and determine what services they can for the population that they have, instead of just having the full school dedicated for being ELL or at-risk.

Chair Hobbs stated this has been a very, very helpful conversation to have. Maybe I'm the only one that benefited from it, but I think this is part of demystifying what is happening by way of the discussion around at-risk. I think that's as big a part of it as anything, because there's this natural negative reaction to having less students qualify for at-risk. It seems harsh, when in reality, it may not be the other way we were doing it. It may have been convenient, but certainly no better at targeting what the definition of at risk really means, which I don't know that we've fully resolved that either, but let's move along for another five seconds before I interrupt.

Beau Bennett stated just to build on Member Goudie's point, I think we'll learn in their next presentation that the GRAD score allow the schools to identify those that need, and the issues they face, and to create interventions for them, it allows us to track it. So in the future, we'll find out which interventions are more successful, and then we could start replicating that. Following an FRL, I don't see there's any possible way for us to be able to do that moving forward.

Chair Hobbs stated as Jason mentioned, we've had this in place for one full year and part of another. I mean, is that adequate to make a determination about the effectiveness? What'd you say?

Paul Johnson stated five years minimum.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks that's important to bear in mind as well because we don't know. And I think one of the things that we need to come away with is a constant monitoring with the ability to make adjustments as may be necessary, regardless of any other recommendations that come out of the discussion. I think that's one that has to be there.

David Jensen stated he doesn't disagree. I guess where I'm struggling with is this concept. For me, we're getting a lot of information. This is beneficial for me. I've been held up on two points. Number one, is 20% appropriate? How do we get into that discussion? Because I understand that if you raise it, the amount of monies decrease, so be it, but so is 20% percent appropriate? Why did we land on 20%? And then for me, my other component is we're looking at the GRAD score when we've got 75 areas that are considered in there. I'm not convinced that some of the metrics that are currently in there that we're using are appropriate to determine at-risk. And so, for me, I want to go, why are we at 20% and is that appropriate? And then I want to look at the components of the GRAD score, and say, why are we using ethnicity or race as a determination of at-risk? Should that be in there? And if not, uncheck that box and let's hone into what we really believe are indicators of at-risk. I'm getting a lot of ancillary information, which is not a bad thing, but it's just refreshing our prior conversation, that's where I think our work needs to be.

Chair Hobbs stated that's one of the reasons when they brought up the 20%, I wanted to open that up, because I know that's a touch point with a lot of people.

Mark Mathers stated he just wants to make the point it's 20% statewide. Like in Washoe, only 11% of our population is at-risk. I also want to make that point that it's 20% statewide, not 20% of every district's student population. And maybe other districts are even less than 11.

Megan Peterson stated percentile. I think all the conversation that's been occurring here has been exactly focused around what we refer to in the Department of Education, and I think it's a practice across the country is Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, MTSS, and so when you look at that and having the universal interventions that are available for, if your systems are working appropriately, ideally 80% percent of the population of students, and then you have another section at a secondary intervention level that targets a little bit more of those interventions, they might be right on that cusp, and that's part of where the conversation with what we landed on using within terms of the grad score, because you can have students who are right on that line of being either medium risk or high risk of not persisting to graduation, and so incorporating both the medium and the high risk students, so that way we were capturing those who were on that edge of being high risk, but still being in the medium risk category. That way we ensured that they didn't slip further. This then allows us to focus those interventions at the appropriate levels, and if we have more than 20% of our population in that 20, or that quintile of performance, then obviously our tier one interventions aren't working. That's where districts will have the tools through what Infinite Campus will allude to more in their presentation to be able to make the determinations about which interventions are working, and which ones need to be applied to which students.

Chair Hobbs stated he wants to point back to the questions that Dr. Jensen asked, because when we asked everyone to send questions in, those were almost universal to everybody's response, in addition to some others, but I want to make sure that we tackle both of those head on today.

Beau Bennett stated he thinks they should get to Infinite Campus then because I think they will demystify us on some of the ways that this works and the way these 75 data points are included.

Chair Hobbs stated let's bring Infinite Campus.

Mark Mathers stated before they do that, he has a quick question on the timing of the funding. So, can you confirm, when are the GRAD scores pulled? Is it the prior year, October 1st count?

Megan Peterson stated yes, and that's an alignment with the data pull that we do for all of the other data points that we use in the People Centered Funding Plan.

Mark Mathers stated for him, this presents another big challenge in that a public comment was made earlier about daily GRAD scores being pulled, and it's a tool for administrators and school counsellors to use yet. The funding is supposed to follow students whose GRAD score was pulled the prior year by October 1st, which isn't even the completion of a full quarter. If we're talking about measuring academic performance, the data is probably heavily weighted on their performance from the prior school year, the end of that. We're expected to fund students who actually, their GRAD score may no longer reflect they're at need of that money anymore for the current year or possibly move schools, or possibly they graduated the prior year, or whatever, so when we're talking to me that presents a real problem of trying to address resources for the kids when really the data that we're using is almost two years old, essentially.

Megan Peterson stated that is where the department is providing what the cutoff score is, essentially, and then districts have the ability to go into their system, identify students who are within that range, and focus the dollars on the current students.

Mark Mathers stated so then essentially, the October 1 count determines the 20th percentile score, and any students in that next year who fall within that range, then we're able to use the resources for.

Megan Peterson stated correct.

Mark Mathers stated that's something I think is widely misunderstood especially within our own school.

Jason Goudie stated making sure I understand that piece because my concern is the same as Member Casey's, is that the data is old, and given the fact that we can run our own GRAD scores on a daily basis, it'd make more sense for us to take, the funding from the state is based off, this is how it goes to each district. Everybody gets their funding based off those students. A number of those students don't exist at CCSD anymore. So, I can't send money to that school. It logically means that we then run our own 20% and distribute, but what you're saying is that we really should take, if the cutoff score is 75 out of the 150, anybody, any student that has below 75 would then get funding. Is that correct? That helps. I think that we really need to get district input to the commission to make recommendations on how to better utilize the GRAD score model, if we get there, hopefully we get to the GRAD score, and make some changes to make sure we're in legality, et cetera, but because that's, that's one sentence and, I'm interested in hearing more about the, the levels because our district's research team has been running GRAD score type data for a long time, and they are the experts in my view, and from my group, and they truly believe in it because it's lining up with all the data they've shown over the last decade or so. Perfectly no, but at least it's better. But the concern is with them and I've heard different groups is that our GRAD scores are typically very, very low at the elementary school because of the amount of times, so there's a lot more factors that by the time you get to senior, you're either going to be a 50 or you're going to be a 150, and it's not that simple. But you're a lot closer, and so with that, it skews virtually all dollars if we did that purely to elementary schools. Getting back to some other conversation, I truly don't believe all of our at-risk students are in elementary schools. Is there more ability to affect those and change those? Yes. I think there should be more money there, so those are some of the concerns. I think that's good. I think it would be great that once we kind of establish what the parameters are, get some input from all the districts as to how to operationalize this. It is not set up right now to operationalize well, and I think that's part of our challenges and why we're at, I think if we can get the basics done, and agree that here's a GRAD score, here's the percentage that gets funded, here's how the state's going to fund the district, and then talk about how the district should be funding schools, which ultimately fund the students and programs.

Dusty Casey stated he thinks this is an area for improvement because I actually appreciate that comment because it helps clarify establishing the GRAD score. However, the funding is still tied to kids. For example, small district and small schools, those statistics can really, a few, just a handful of kids can really change the amount of funding. For my own school, for example, we went from receiving a pot of money for FRL to only having three kids identify from the prior October year count, out of almost 800, and those kids are no longer even at our school anymore. While the GRAD score was established, we're still only receiving funding in this year for three kids who are technically fallen within that GRAD score that are no longer even there. We can take that small pot of money, and try to do something with it, but the funding was still determined by a count. And so, I would love to be able to explore that in a more, at least in the current year, especially if it's pulling just a score. I don't see why it couldn't be done at least down the October count, and trued up of the current year. But again, there's lots of reasons for it, but it still seems like a flawed system when we're looking at moving the funding to the kids who actually need it.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks that's a question we need to explore. First of all, the good thing is we have a data driven basis for the October 1st identification. As you move from that to actual funding during a programming year, there's a question of recency of information. The migration of students in and out and that sort of thing. Now, whether that timeline can be tightened up or trued up, let's find out. It’s either yes or no.

Megan Peterson stated it is something that we can explore and evaluate. The things to keep in mind when we have this conversation, we need to be mindful of the fact that this is also the same process for the English learners and the gifted and talented students. Any changes that we make in terms of addressing at-risk, we should also contemplate what effect that would have on those other populations. But also then similar to what we discussed, we were talking about earlier is any changes to those counts during the year because it's a fixed funding amount that was allocated by the legislature will then change the per pupil amounts that are effectively distributed. Those are just things to contemplate as we think about that moving forward.

Chair Hobbs stated a big part of our charge is to make recommendations on improvement of application. And if that can be done, that doesn't deteriorate the usefulness of the data that's used to apply the funding then it would make sense to try to move in that direction, I would think.

Jason Goudie stated he thinks that the challenge with inadequate funding is that, so if we're talking about expanding the pool, and that does is it provides monies, a pool of money to more pupils, more schools, but dilutes the amount or we restrict the number of students in order to increase the per pupil amount. The challenge is that you don't truly ever have a great analysis of what's effective because if it truly costs $5000 per student at-risk to get them out of at-risk, and you give $4,000, you might get closer, but you're going to be in a short smaller group, but if you give $2,000 and it doesn't get what you need and nobody gets better, you might dilute the results. It's really catch 22 in the fact that trying to figure out, do we focus on the lower population, try and give them enough money to try and get enough services? Or do we try and do it to make sure that we have kind of what Member Casey was talking about to make sure somebody has something. It's no answer. This all gets back to inadequate funding, no matter how you slice it up. If our per pupil was $20,000 base per student, I bet you we would not be having this discussion. I think that all of these pieces that were right, and I truly think the way at least my proposal on how to solve some of these challenges, that we see with the implementation is to bifurcate the funding into how is the state is funding the districts because they are in different timelines than we are. I know the data is a year old. They don't have any ability. I know Meg's going to try, but she's not going to be able to fix the state's budget process and say, oh, they're going to move it back for us. It's not going to happen. Maybe we'll get some slightly newer data. But once it gets to the district, the districts have a lot more current data than the state does, and then at that point, we should be able to use our current data in order to make sure we're funding the schools based off our current population. I think as we go down that should be one of the recommendations, and I think every district would probably agree that that allows us the freedom to still work within the law, and best address the students, and then cost them. I think that as we get down there, and that's maybe down the road a little bit, but that would be my recommendation.

Chair Hobbs stated let's definitely make note of that because at the conclusion of all of this discussion, we do want to make recommendations.

8. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE GRAD SCORE AND EARLY WARNING SYSTEM (*Information and Discussion)*

The Commission will receive a presentation from Infinite Campus on the use and functions available in the Campus Analytics Suite. Infinite Campus will also provide information and background on the Grad Score, including how it is developed, who receives a score, and what data elements are used to determine a score.

- Nathaniel Budijono, Infinite Campus
- Matthew Schaaf, Infinite Campus

Matthew Schaaf and Nathaniel Budijono gave presentations. *(See "*8. NDE Early Warning CSF 2.23 ADA" for details.)

Chair Hobbs asked for questions the commission may have.

Nancy Brune stated her question is, in your model, do you have any indicator for, I guess, sort of, this idea of path dependence? I know that the data comes from the prior year, but I imagine that, if a student has sort of been at-risk for multiple years, sort of that student, you could argue has sort of greater risk than maybe a student who just, for one year, for whatever reason, seems to have a higher risk. Is there anything in the model for path dependence or, sort of higher weight based on the number of years the student has been deemed higher risk.

Nathaniel Budijono stated yes. As part of predicting a student's at-risk, the Early Warning model will only consider data from the current year of the student and one year prior. It won't consider anything what you're describing as the number of years that a student is at-risk, so the extent to which the model considers path dependence will only be the current year, and the previous year. It does not go any further than two years.

David Jensen stated he had two questions and thinks these were sent electronically, but the question is around the GRAD score components, and I want to confirm, are gender and ethnicity included in that calculation, and if so, why?

Matthew Schaaf stated they are part of the pattern recognition, and it's part of identifying who the student is and what patterns apply to them. The reason that they are considered as part of it is because they have been shown to be mathematically predictive in a very small degree. We based on some of the feedback that we've received through this session and then the previous session have taken that as something that we're going to challenge within the model itself. We do go through an annual retraining of this, which is loosely planned to be something that we'll be doing in the next quarter, so starting in about a month as part of releasing a brand new model in July of this year. As part of that, we are going to evaluate removing those features from consideration to see how well the model scores, and whether it does have a large or small impact on AUC.

David Jensen stated you noted that other states are using a similar process for whatever purposes. I'm wondering if it's funding, number one, and number two what do you know, if they're using it as a funding determinant, what threshold are they using, 20% percent or are they using a different one?

Matthew Schaaf stated he can't speak specifically to how other states are utilizing the product, unfortunately. One, I don't have that information and two, it wouldn't be probably appropriate for me to share it if I did. We are statewide in a number of states. I know it is a factor that is considered, but I'm unfortunately, cannot definitively say how they're using it.

Dusty Casey stated he has two questions, but the first is around the day of going into the model. One of my concerns after kind of talking to some people on our team, our counsellors, and our Infinite Campus Manager is the data that's actually going into Infinite Campus. For some schools that are small schools or small districts, they don't have robust teams, and I'm worried about the data that's actually going in. What are the assumptions about the data that's going in, especially around categories like behavior, for example, that go into determining the GRAD scores?

Nathaniel Budijono stated for behavior specifically, we only consider negative behavior events recorded in the campus SIS, so any sort of positive behavior events will not be considered by the model in terms of quantifying risk. As for the quality of the data that goes into the model, we do recommend that school districts will have two years of student data in order to trust the GRAD scores coming out of the Early Warning model, so that means one prior year, as well as current year of student data. As for that, we do not have any control over the quality of the data going into the model. That is all up to the school district that is inputting the data, and Early Warning model is just another machine learning system. So, it's not magic, it can only work on the data that is provided, and the data, garbage in, garbage out, if the quality of the data is not very good, then the predictions will be less valuable for a school district.

Dusty Casey stated as a follow-up question, one of my concerns is, after talking to my team, is what data is actually going in, and I think that varies by schools and districts, for example, recording detentions, or various factors that happen during a day. I don't know if that's something we need to consider as far as training to make sure everybody's inputting consistent data to help establish those scores because we look at our own school, for example, and that could be one reason why our number is so low is because the types of data that we're putting in, especially from our counsellors who work really closely with kids, if we don't know what we're supposed to be recording, then how we make sure we have the right number of kids identified to help get support? My other question would be, the 20th percentile, can you explain, looking at those slides, it appears that the GRAD scores are partially determined by immediate peers, whether it's zip code or school level. Is that true? Are they measured against that and are those GRAD scores partially determined by that?

Nathaniel Budijono stated yes, that's correct. A student in the process of evaluating their at-risk are compared to other students using the Infinite Campus SIS at those different levels, zip code is one of them, statewide is another, school district is another, and at their specific school, in order to make these comparisons, we do need one full year of school data for each of these students, so that is true, that we do compare one student's performance to another as it helps us predict their at-risk.

Dusty Casey stated one other concern I have is we take the 20th percentile across the state and that who gets funded. Yet the GRAD scores are partially determined by immediate peers, which leads me to believe that there's a component there when we don't look at the bottom 20th percentile in a school, or a school district when that's partially determined the scores that maybe that's potentially an area for improvement.

Mark Mathers stated he has two main questions, just to try to distil down a number of questions I had before. One of them, I'm channelling another district, but they had noted that a high schooler with a high, with A's, and were an AP in honors classes, didn't actually have the highest GRAD score. What they saw were that the highest GRAD scores were in middle school as a group versus high school. Their question kind of was, well, how could that be? If you're a senior, and you're got almost enough units to graduate, and you're doing great, high GPA and all that, why wouldn't you see an extremely high GRAD score for them versus what they saw, were really high GRAD scores for like kids in middle school, and I know this is maybe particular to a school district, but I think we've had questions like that, where the GRAD scores don't seem to match what we would expect them to. Can you try to answer that?

Nathaniel Budijono stated ultimately, as a machine learning system, the Early Warning model produces a GRAD score based on patterns that it has seen in the past, and the attributed end of status for all of these students that it's seen in the past resulting in a graduation or not resulting in a graduation. As long as we do see graduation rates for students that belong in this pattern, for example, like you've mentioned having many AP classes or a high GPA, then they will in general have high GRAD scores. Another thing to consider is that during the translation of the predicted probability of persisting to graduation, so I'm converting that probability on the scale of 0 to 1 to the 50 to 150 GRAD score. We do squish the low probabilities of dropping out on the high end. The difference between, for example, a 130 GRAD score and a 140 GRAD score is a very small probability difference whereas on the other end the difference between a 50 GRAD score and a 60 GRAD score is a larger difference in probability of not persisting to graduation, and the purpose of that is to assist counsellors in evaluating their students and figuring out where they should spend their time in terms of interventions. So, that is another thing to consider, that the difference between this hypothetical middle schooler and high schooler that in reality their predicted probability of graduating is not all that different.

Mark Mathers stated that's interesting what you just said, and that helps a little bit. Just as a follow up on my first question, you talk about different risk factors for elementary, say versus high school, right, so I just wonder how do you calibrate the risk? If there are different risk scores for, right, those different levels, how do you, you know what I mean, calibrate between the different levels to ensure some equity there? In other words, how do you know you're not underweighting the degree of risk for high schoolers and overweighting it for elementary, if that makes sense?

Nathaniel Budijono stated there are specific considerations that we had to make in terms of the elementary school model. One thing is that during our 30 years of student data there are fewer students that we know the outcome of, know whether they graduated or failed to graduate for a student who started in the Infinite Campus System in elementary school. That number is fewer than if they started in the Infinite Campus system during high school and eventually graduated. There are some different machine learning engineering challenges that we addressed in terms of making this elementary school model because of that limited data set that we know whether or not an elementary school student eventually graduated. So those are the main considerations. However, the model is similar to high school model in that it considers these same features, contextual features and interaction features that we've mentioned before. But the process of training the machine learning model is different, and we do take into account these differences between elementary schools and high schoolers.

Mark Mathers stated his second question, and I don't know if you can answer this or maybe just partially answer it, but, I know there's this very common concern about cutting off at the 20th percentile, and so my question that I had provided to Chairman Hobbs, that concerns me for a couple of reasons that seems arbitrary, in that I would think you'd use standard deviations or something besides just 20%, and maybe that wasn't your call. I'm trying to clarify, going back to this question, how is 20% determined and are there better statistical methods to determine a cutoff? That's kind of 2A, and then 2B is, I guess I just am concerned if we're always grading on a curve. This was something I raised several years ago. If you're always saying it's only the bottom 20 percentile of students are at-risk, to me, that doesn't account for environmental factors or changes in conditions as a general society. I would think in the Great Depression, you had way more than 20% of students at risk. People were really struggling back then. I would think, okay, maybe 40, 60, 70 percent of kids were at-risk. Whereas, in a different era, I might expect a lower percentage than 20%, one would hope. If we're always just saying, well, it's just the bottom 20th percentile that are at risk, it just inherently doesn't make sense to me. If there's a period of trauma, as a society, say COVID, that there are real issues caused by COVID. Why wouldn't it be more than 20% based on those experiences of those students? Is it you that determined the 20% or was it not you, and then why wouldn't some other statistical method be better than that? And then grading on the curve kind of question.

Matthew Schaaf stated there's a few points there. The initial display of GRAD scores within the system does do a percentile breakout at 20 and 5 for those risk categories, and that's based on some national trending statistics that we've looked at overtime, and the need for the interface itself, and that visualization to make a decision. It has to start somewhere, but it's not a hard line in the way that it's implemented. It begins there, but those are absolutely changeable in the way that the interfaces is working at it. If a district has determined due to some of the considerations that you're speaking on, that that percentile should be greater or lower, they absolutely can change that, and it will regroup the students based on those newer metrics. You can choose what the high category and medium category was. The system has to make an initial starting point and that quintile distribution was the starting point that was determined to be the place we would begin based on some of those statistical norms. Does that help?

Mark Mathers stated it does, but so again, going back to this 20th percentile question. I look at data, if between zero and 30th percentile, it's really, those GRAD scores are really close and flat, and then it kind of picks up, say at the 30th percentile mark. I would say, well, cut it off at the 30th percentile then. If there's very little difference between someone in the right bottom 18th percentile versus 30, why cut off at 20? I guess my question is, how do you do that? Is there a recommendation here or is that really up to each agency or state to kind of do that statistical analysis?

Matthew Schaaf stated he would say from an application standpoint of where you apply that number, I personally believe that would be more of a state-to-state, district-to-district decision.

Mark Mathers asked if he could go back to the grading on the curve kind of question? And again, the equity or efficacy as opposed to grading on the curve and saying the bottom quintile or the bottom 30% count is at risk, versus saying there's a fixed GRAD score at which statistically those kids really are at-risk, right, so that the number of students hitting that GRAD score or going below that target GRAD score would change over time. Can you talk about that?

Nathaniel Budijono stated grading on a curve and grading not on a curve are both possibilities for you. As for having a specific cutoff score again, these grad scores that range from 50 to 150, ultimately they can be translated back into a probability. Just as an example a student who is predicted to have a 30% risk of not persisting to graduation, if you feel that that is the cutoff you would like to make, then there would be a GRAD score that corresponds to that, and any student with that GRAD score, not matter the state or district or school that GRAD score would correspond to that same exact probability.

Jason Goudie stated he's going to follow up on a couple of Mark's questions, and I think it was the AUC? Is it the accuracy? Basically, I'm making sure I had the right acronym. Do you have the AUC broken down by high school students, middle school students, and elementary school students to show, I think it was 94.7 percent it looked like, which seems very high. Do you have it by those different groups, and does it change, I think, getting back to Mark's comment about, I know you guys implemented elementary school later, which typically means in algorithm language that you have less data. Do you have that data and is it more or less accurate by grade or by school level?

Nathaniel Budijono stated yes, they do have that data. We have analysed it grade by grade, and elementary and secondary school. If needed we can provide that.

Jason Goudie stated the other piece is when we talk about the AUC, the way I understand that is, you look at the model and the scores, and then you would actually correlate that to, do people graduate or not? I mean, that's the simplest way to look at it, in my view. So when you do that and you calculate the AUC, is that based off of the 20% component and say that, you look at everybody below 20% percent and those didn't graduate, so it correlates perfectly, or are you looking at a specific GRAD score, meaning 62, and saying everybody below 62 becomes part of that AUC calculation?

Nathaniel Budijono stated this is not related to that 20th percentile figure. When we compute the AUC, what happens is we evaluate that based on the 30 years of student data in Infinite Campus, and based on that, we identify students who we know eventually either graduated or failed to graduate, and based on how those students GRAD scores are sorted. In terms of lowest to highest GRAD score, we evaluate the AUC based on how many of these are sorted correctly. If we find any students who, for example, fail to graduate, but for some reason have a higher GRAD score than a student who eventually does graduate, that would be a penalty in the AUC calculation.

Jason Goudie stated that's helpful. And then, just one other question. As I'm looking at all the data that's available, I think it's incredibly powerful to have data. As I mentioned, as I've spoken to principals, not everyone is excited about it, but I think a lot of them are excited about being able to really help students more specifically. Is there a way, since this is an Infinite Campus, and I know that parents have some access to Infinite Campus, is there a way to allow the GRAD score data to be accessible to parents, so that a parent can look at their children, and see risk factors and see, I know you have stuff in there about the things that can really help, and maybe not specific, but maybe school districts can help, that's a piece of it, but that seems like a piece of data that could be very valuable to a parent in helping to understand their children and understanding how they can perform better.

Matthew Schaaf stated in the current implementation of the tool set, it is geared primarily towards district and school staff. There is not currently a parent portal representation of the GRAD score or the associated risk factors. That is something that we have talked about internally. It hasn't reached to the point of actually you making it into the product, there are some challenges there around district autonomy that we have to deal with to allow districts to configure what they display and how they display it, but it is something that we're considering and looking into, yes. It's not there presently.

Kyle Rodriguez stated to piggyback off of Member Casey's question, since we use this for funding, is there the possibility of manipulating this information to increase or decrease funding by excluding or including certain data points?

Matthew Schaaf stated he can tell him it's very, very hard to game the model. We have a role here at campus known as an app specialist, and they're the group that goes out and does our demonstrations with customers, and they've tried, because they try to build the model to tell a very specific story, and it fights them because of the way that it works and the way that it considers who the student is, and who they were in comparison to the rest of their peers, their district, their state, all the things that Nathaniel referred to. Can it be done? Sure. At some level, it's all math, but it's extremely hard. Just anecdotally to make it do what you want it to do and to try to force it to evaluate a student as at risk or not.

Kyle Rodriguez stated his next question, when I met with the RIC expert at Lyon County School District, he said the scale test scores were not included in the 75 indicators and the only raw test scores. Is that correct?

Matthew Schaaf stated that is correct.

Kyle Rodriguez asked if there is a reason.

Nathaniel Budijono stated he can't speak to the exact reason, but it's something we constantly challenge as part of the evolution of the Early Warning system, whether or not the fields that are inputted into the model are the ones with the greatest predictability. So, it is something that we monitor and continue to evaluate whether or not these features should be included or modified, or new features should be added.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks he'll reserve his until after they've gone through all of these to try to sum up points of clarification that we'll need after they've had a chance to address everybody else's questions, so I'll pass it over to you.

Punam Mathur stated she knows there was a lot of curiosity expressed from the dais and then, as well in the opportunity to express our questions in advance, a little sad that Nathaniel, in terms of responding to what other states are doing that there wasn't much. So a couple of questions, how long has the Early Warning System been a product, as I heard you use the term, a product that Infinite Campus has been offering?

Matthew Schaaf stated roughly eight years.

Punam Mathur stated and although you were pretty clear that you, that not only could you not describe what other states are, how they're using it, but it would be inappropriate to do so, which I appreciate. How many states are you operating in, this Infinite Campus operating in, with the districts?

Matthew Schaaf stated nine states currently.

Punam Mathur asked if that means like in Nevada where you're in every district within the states.

Matthew Schaaf stated he is looking off to the side because our CEO, Charlie, is like right there feeding me stats.

Charlie Kratsch stated yes, of our nine customers kind of running them down, our first customer is the State of South Dakota. They are statewide with our products, so similar to Nevada. Also Kentucky is statewide with all of their school districts using our products like Kentucky. You have Montana, where most of the districts are on our product, but not all. A few of the larger ones in Montana are not. Hawaii is another customer. They're fairly unique because the entire State of Hawaii is one school district, so they're one 185,000 student school district. We also have a couple of relatively new states that have come on with Delaware and North Carolina, and so while they're just starting to use our product, we don't have all of their data rolling into the GRAD score calculations yet. We also have a couple of unique SEAs or State Education Agencies. One is the Bureau of Indian Education, which is considered a state by the federal government, and also the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, and they were in our office all this week freezing their butts off here in Minnesota, coming in from Guam. So those are the nine that we're currently working with, with many more lined up. I will say when it comes to the use of the GRAD score in this way, Nevada is definitely on the leading edge of that curve. The other states using the GRAD score, really using it at the district level for interventions at that point. They have not yet used it as a substitution for compensatory aid or any other items.

Punam Mathur stated she wants to play it back because we have an awful lot of people that care deeply about this and all wanna get it right and we gotta find a way there. I think we're all headed to the same place. GRAD score, when you say the product, you're talking about Infinite Campus, the software, or are you talking about the GRAD score?

Charlie Kratsch stated just their use of the Early Warning System, which includes the GRAD score, and what I will say is Early Warning is kind of a suite of tools. The GRAD score is simply one component of it. The reason that we implemented the GRAD score itself, and that's something that I pushed for, was I wanted a very easy to understand score, like a credit score, that anybody could look at that number and kind of have some sense, generally, of how that student, class, school, or district is performing, but by no means the end all and be all. You really need to look at how that fits on the continuum of the scale of scores in whatever environment you're looking at, and another question we get a lot, which I kind of heard coming up here is, why 50 to 150 and not zero to 100? I get that a lot in the sales side of this. My worry was if we went zero to 100, people would think of it as a percentile, which it is not. I do not want people to say that if you've got a score of 75, that's a 75% likelihood that you're going to graduate, because that is not what this is. So that's why we shifted everything, and also, while it's not logarithmic, you heard the description before that, the scale is skewed a little bit to give a greater variation at the bottom end because that's usually what people are looking at. When you get to the high end, it's important to understand that the high end, don't worry so much about that. The odds are pretty similar. What we're really focusing at with this whole system, with all the AI, is the at-risk kids who tend to be on the low end of this thing.

Punam Mathur asked how many school districts in America are using the Early Warning System.

Charlie Kratsch stated 3000 school districts, online. I don't know if I could tell you right now how many are using the Early Warning.

Matthew Schaaf stated if you can give me three minutes, I can answer that question.

Punam Mathur stated the other thing that has caused a fair amount of conversation, where most of the conversation stayed, the utilization is fairly common for purposes for identifying interventions for delivery to kids. It is much less the case, that any states are using it as it the basis to making funding decisions. I think what the cutting edge here is, yes, we are cutting edge here. I actually think that's okay. What feels very important to me is that there be a basis on why we're going to focus on certain kids with the prioritization around given the intervention because that is exactly what ultimately the entire theory of action was about. We're gonna contemporize and modernize the thing, and one part of contemporization and modernization is to recognize that there's a differential investment required to meet kids where they are. So that was literally the sort of the design principle that gave rise to this weight. The fact that we've got 3000 plus districts in two and a half minutes, we'll know exactly how many are using with the Early Warning System, the fact that they're using it for make decisions about which interventions need to go to, which kids gives me great comfort.

Matthew Schaaf stated there are currently 569 districts, affecting 2.3 million students on the Early Warning System.

Charlie Kratsch stated he thinks the key to that just to put in context, they're actively using the system for determining the interventions like you're talking about, whereas, 100% of our districts and students are contributing data to the model, that's just a default piece of the product. And also, as you heard, we also use all of the data that we've been tracking for the last 30 years since I founded the company. Another piece is all of its anonymous data. There's no personally identifiable data in the model. That makes it very safe.

Punam Mathur asked if there is anything that you could share with us that shows the success that districts have had in using it as a basis to focus interventions for kids. Specifically the elementary, middle, and high level. Anything that shows fidelity or efficacy, which I think may help.

Charlie Kratsch stated he didn't have that right now. I can bring it up, not having prepared for that. Really what you're looking at is kind of anecdotally the change in those scores for kids and that being observed longitudinally over time. Typically what a school district does when they use the Early Warning products, they're focusing on areas of intervention, like attendance, behavior. The curricular interventions are a bit more difficult that's a whole other subject, but that's something that we're also working with states to address. One of the things that you did mention is Nevada is on the leading edge of this, however, I just got off the plane talking to another state that's looking at adopting our product. One of the challenges they face is they just switched to free lunches for all their kids. And so they're not collecting free and reduced data anymore. So they're going to be using Medicaid Direct Certification, which is easily even less reliable, they've seen this problem and they were very interested in how a model like this could be used for compensatory funding. So there are our eyes on Nevada with us, and the advantage, I think there's obviously a lot of issues with being early in the process, but one of the advantages of being there is the attention that we're placing on this. This is a big deal. We want to make sure we get it right. The thing that I want to stress, and I was just sitting listening to your great debate with the panel is we're recording this, and I'm going to boil it down to two minutes, so I can show to other states because you guys have got it. You've got it dialled in. It was a great conversation and a great understanding, and we want to get your feedback on this. So as you heard, we can continue to evolve this model. It's as much of a science as it is an art, and how we build these models, and how we apply them this is very important stuff.

Paul Johnson stated he just wants to start off by saying how much he appreciates this public deliberation, and this process, and all the work that's gone into this. I think this is the right thing to do, and will help us craft a more careful solution. I think this is awesome. I'd agree with everything, and I share a lot of concerns that have previously been mentioned, especially with respect to the quintile ranking, which I don't think should be encoded into the NRS and should be removed, and most of my stuff has less to do with questions directly to Infinite Campus, but mostly, for general purposes. First of all operationally, the clarification that at risk is at risk of graduation. To me, it was very helpful because that helps me identify what resources I record in my at risk bucket versus what resources I record in my general fund bucket because there are a lot of risks. That we have school districts have to mitigate toward students social, emotional, behavioral, and perhaps those should be something that is paid through our general fund instead of our at risk funding. I'm curious to how that affects our adequacy funding study. I mentioned about the quintile ranking. That seems to be something that was created for now and not under the lens of optimal. We've crafted the definition. We don't even know what the definition of optimal as yet. I think that needs to be revisited. I'm curious to know from APA how this significant change in student population may affect the weight calculation and base calculation relative to their funding study because the original funding study was based on a much larger student population multiplied by an adequate weight to create an amount of money, which is four to five hundred million plus or minus more than what the current system has. I'd be curious to find out from them whether adjustment is even necessary, or whether reducing that population actually did reduce the adequacy cost. I think it's important, this is all new stuff, and when I was doing my research, nobody has a good answer for this. Nobody, and I think a lot of states have erred on guessing a number that's too high than too low, and I think that's prudent for us to do as well, because trying to get more money into the system after we make this decision is, is not going to be easy. So I think if there is an error to be made, it should be on over identification than under identification. Kentucky was mentioned previously. Kentucky's at-risk definition, and this was published June 1st, 2023, the amount of at-risk funding is based on the average daily membership of students in the district who are approved by free meals under the National School Lunch Program. Every school district, even though they may not have free and reduced lunch applications, every school district receives direct certification for free meals. There is a baseline for that, and I believe that's what Kentucky does. I think probably what's in all of our best interest is since this is new that we make certain, that we have an independent professional that assess identification, funding, effectiveness throughout this process, so that we have an external expert coming in to provide validation of this. That's something similar to I don't know that I can articulate what was just provided by Infinite Campus to Punam's neighbor, who I would love to meet one of these days. But, I don't know that I have to as long as it has it's been professionally vetted and confirmed that it's good. I don't have to be able to explain my actuarial study to my board of trustees for other post-employment benefits, but I have an actuary who does that on tested scientific measures, that provides that information, and I can have them review the report if they want to.

Jim McIntosh stated he believes he has all his questions answered regarding the Infinite Campus Early Warning System, and I would like to thank you very much for the presentation because that has been very helpful for me, and thank you to my members for all the questions that you've asked because that has been enlightening as well. I think to Paul's point, I would just as a comment, I think it's more for me about, I think I have a better understanding of this. I think it's okay for us to be on the cutting edge. To Member Mathur's point everybody's struggling with how they do this, as Paul stated, and I do, a lot of mine are simply surrounding how will this impact the formula? And how will it impact the weights? I think it needs time to get a better understanding of exactly how that's going to work.

Chair Hobbs stated perhaps it's after listening to everything today, it's best that it was an information and discussion item. I mean, we may have been able to resolve a few component parts, but I think there may still be a few that we need some additional information on, and that's kind of where I'm heading here. I heard some things that registered with me. I mean, one of them was well, more than a few, I mean, we have an evolving product. For example, with respect to the issues surrounding, presumably the legality of including factors that deal with ethnicity and gender. I was kind of looking at that as more of a legal test than anything else, and presumably, it's in what we're doing right now, and I'm saying this presumptively, somebody would have looked at the state level to verify that what we're doing is in fact legal, and my understanding is that that process is currently underway, so that's a positive, and it was good to hear Infinite Campus say that they're reevaluating that for whether or not it's a significant or material factor, anyway, so if the determination is made that that doesn't have a significant impact on identifier or a predictive impact, and it could go away, the legal issue presumably would go away as well. I think we have those things running concurrently. If we were to get an answer back from legal that that's probably not one that we should be including, then it would have to be removed as a factor for us. If Infinite Campus was to determine that it's, I'm trying to give an example of one I think we can work through Mark. If Infinite Campus determines that the sensitivity of that is minimal in the calculation, okay, there's two paths for that to be dealt with. I feel much better about that because I think that's something that caught a lot of people's attention on the questions that many of you sent in that was identified. I heard something earlier too that I think we can agree should be a recommendation. It's a how to do it kind of thing, and that is that it's a new product, it's an evolving product. Both of those things, scream to me that there needs to be some ongoing training provided by Infinite Campus to, and then you fill in the blank superintendent, CFOs, and hopefully Infinite Campus could work with NDE to provide a twice a year webinar or something like that where, like what we've gone through here today, but condensed a bit. I think that is key, because I've picked up, not for everything that we've talked about, certainly, but for some things, we didn't know that. And that would take care of some of those we didn't know that type of situations. Another one that we heard was that it's new, it's evolving. It's certainly better than what we had before, right, in terms of targeting, but that there be some kind of validation process that occurs, I think it's good for Infinite Campus to do this because it helps them improve their product, and it's good for us because it increases confidence in what we're using, right, so a process that after the fact validates that in terms of being predictive, it actually was. It's never going to be a 100%, and I think we all know that, but that we see predictive measurements that are improving over time. I think we would all be comfortable with that. I'm not trying to put words in anybody's mouth, but I think those are easy things that come out of this. I think where we need some additional time, the 20th percent percentile, still seems to be a point of concern, and, somebody over here, and I want to make sure I give the credit appropriately, raised a point that perhaps Infinite Campus can shed some light on if there's a concentration of data that would suggest, or if there are data points that would suggest, yes, there really is a statistical difference between the 19th and the 22nd percentile, that would be helpful to know. If you don't see that until the 25th and a half percentile, that would be helpful to know. Again, I'm not sure what that's going to say, but I think we would all look at that information as very helpful around the discussion of the 20th percentile. Regardless, we had to have a starting point somewhere. Somebody has made the comment, and I don't think anybody would disagree, that a starting point that would be more than, I think it was you, Paul, more than less inclusive is a good place, but nonetheless, you have to have a starting point to determine whether or not it needs to be moved to the left or the right. So no harm, no foul on that. I think what we embrace is continuous improvement. For the next meeting, if we could target more information around the 20th percentile, hopefully, we can set that aside, setting it aside might be confirmation that, yeah, that makes sense now that we think about it, or it might be that it needs to be moved to the 25th percentile. Either one of those I think is improvement.

Paul Johnson stated having the percentile ranking in law makes our ability to be adaptive very difficult. I don't think that's a place where it should be administratively. We could assign that based on evidentiary information, but I don't think it should be codified personally.

Chair Hobbs stated that was the next point he was going to raise. Obviously there is some fluidity to that over time. Some thought needs to be given to how and by whom that percentile is set, and over what periods of time, but I did hear you when you said that, and again, this data looks to me like it is not fixed and static over time, and so it needs to be adaptable to change.

Punam Mathur stated she has a question and thinks it was related to something you may have raised. The GRAD score is last October, for the purposes of defining the value of the weight, and for sending it to districts, we know the mechanism, but then to what Jason said, you've got GRAD scores today because ultimately, we gotta get it to the best, but we can’t follow the kids. If there's real time dated, is it our job to come up with sort of the, here's how that should look, or is that something that's within the department's purview? We're defining here's the mechanism by the action that we've taken with the GRAD, we've already set the mechanism to define the amount of dollars that will show up at the district. This is how it works. Then the next layer is an administrator player. The fact that Dusty, you had three kids count day last year, who weren't there in the school this year, you still got $3,200 times x3, but no kid. I just don't understand. It has implications for all the districts, the big ones and the little ones, it strikes me that it could be wide fluctuations. I just don't know whose purview is that.

Megan Peterson stated currently in statute, the State Board of Education is identified to have the authority to make recommendations in terms of additional factors to consider in the conversation, so I think that that would probably fall within that same vein of conversation, but the Commission does have authority to also make recommendations, and we can bring that back as another topic to discuss, and try to flush out where those decision points live in terms of who has the appropriate data.

Chair Hobbs stated this item will be on our next agenda again is the Discussion, Information, and Possible Action item. What I would encourage everybody to do is based on the conversations that we've had today, hopefully we've cut down on the list of questions a bit, and specific areas of focus that you would like to see Infinite Campus provide some additional information. I've already identified a couple of those. Please send them to us. So we could hopefully get to the point on this, and move forward and, it's not just an Infinite Campus Grad score, yes or no, it's Infinite Campus Grad score, probably with additional recommendations that are attached to it, to improve the product, I am thinking, so not that it can't be something other than what I am thinking, but I'm just trying to frame it, so we know what we're going to be dealing with on the next agenda. With that, the hour is 12:18, and again, I want to thank the folks from Infinite Campus as well. That was very helpful, very responsibly, we appreciate that very much.

Nancy Brune asked Chair Hobbs if he would want to check in with Senator Woodhouse to see if she has any questions or comments.

Joyce Woodhouse stated no, this has been an excellent conversation with the questions and the answers and I really, really appreciate it. I don't have any other questions. You all have done a marvellous job of looking at those lists of questions that we all had and getting them to the folks from Infinite Campus, and I appreciate their time today as well as at the next meeting.

Chair Hobbs stated he wants to mention something else apologetically. I will have to leave at 1:20 for a meeting with a client that's extremely anxious this afternoon, and so normally, the gavel would go over to Joyce as Vice Chair. With Joyce not being here, Joyce, would it be maybe more efficient if we have Punam act as Junior Vice Chair, if we're still going when I have to leave? Is that okay with you?

Joyce Woodhouse stated yes, thank you. I think that would be a marvellous idea. Not being there, it's difficult, and I also am concerned about connectivity. So, it's best if she handles it, and I appreciate it. Thank you, Punam. Thank you, Chair.

9. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE USE OF ENGLISH LEARNER WEIGHTED FUNDING TO PROVIDE A DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*
The Commission will receive a presentation on whether a dual language program has the requisite record of success to allow English learner weighted funds to be used to provide for a dual language program.

- Karl Wilson, English Language Learner Programs Supervisor, NDE

Karl Wilson gave a presentation . *(See "9- Support Materials" and "9. EL Weighted Funding on DLL 2.23 ADA" for details.)*

Chair Hobbs stated to give us a frame of reference as we start to ask questions, Megan, from the Letter of Intent, specifically what has been asked of the commission.

Megan Peterson stated the specific request was to determine if weighted funding would be an allowable use of these funds by school districts and charter schools to establish and operate the programs, and if it wasn't determined a recommended weight that would be required, if a new dual language program were to be established.

Mark Mathers stated he's going to go out on a limb then. You provided a lot of evidence that these dual language programs are effective. In terms of the plank, as a demonstration, in order to confirm the eligibility of funding for a two way immersion program that had 50% English, 50% Spanish, like you described on slide 3, which Washoe County School District has, I guess I'm connecting dots here, and tell me if it's not fair to connect these dots, you're saying, dual language programs have a demonstrator record of success and they're inclusive of English learners. It sounds to me on the surface that a two way immersion program that had a reasonable share of English speakers would qualify for English learner weighted funding. I'm generalizing and I get it, and I get you'd have to look at it, but it sure sounds like It would be eligible for EL funding.

Karl Wilson stated there are two things they want to share. One, I think we've already received as an agency that the Attorney General's office has said that if it is a practice or a model that is approved by the state superintendent, then yes, it would be approvable. I think that all of the research that we looked at, I think it's always important to just highlight that when these models are implemented with fidelity. Then they have the record of success, and it's similar to other things that we see in education. Things that people don't take the time to do the appropriate training and organization, building the capacity, monitoring the implementation that we lose the fidelity. We lose the effectiveness. In brief response, this is a model that districts could recommend to the Nevada Department of Education through the process that will soon be released for consideration. We would look for those criteria. Is it successful? Yes. And has it been implemented in a similarly situated population that you're wanting to do within the specific school district that is being recommended.

Mark Mathers stated he should have probably asked his question the other way, the reverse. I'm understanding a two way immersion program where there's approximately 50% English learners that had a demonstrated record of success and consistency could be considered. It's not a definite no. If I kind of reverse the question. It is very possible for EL funding to be used for a program meeting those conditions, just to summarize.

Karl Wilson stated yes, and if the request that came in had the adequate documentation to meet those criteria, and it was approved by the state, then yes, that would be an allowable use of the EL weighted funding.

Nancy Brune asked how many schools currently have dual language immersion programs and how many students would that include, and then if we have them, are most of the dual language programs Spanish or what other languages?

Karl Wilson stated Nevada does not have a lot of existing dual language programs. Clark introduced a pilot just this past year with three new schools, and it's actually one elementary school that feeds into a middle school that feeds into a high school. It's too early to say just how many students are being impacted there. I know that there is a new charter school that was opened just about a year and a half ago in the Las Vegas area, and that is the model that they're implementing. They started with kindergarten and moving on to first grade. Washoe County School District, I believe, has three schools that are dual language immersion and they are, were not all originally intended to be Spanish English. Again, we would have to look at the specific circumstances, what is the language that is the target language of pairing up with English and so forth.

Joyce Woodhouse stated the research that you presented is excellent. I do not believe that that was posted, so would it be possible to have Joseph send that to all of us? That information, I think, is very, very important. I would appreciate that.

Karl Wilson stated they can make available the summary notes that are also part of the presentation that includes citations of research.

Dusty Casey asked if it would affect the funding model at all. In the case that you gave for a charter school that was, let's say, a fully dual immersion school, they would still only receive EL funding for any kids they had qualified as EL, correct?

Karl Wilson stated unless there were some kind of legislative change, this would not impact the amount of PCFP EL weight funding that goes to a given LEA or school that is based on the weight amount times the number of English learners. Choosing another model would not result in additional funds or a reduction in funds.

Dusty Casey stated just as a hypothetical example, if that school had zero qualified EL learners, they would get zero funding, even though they had a fully dual immersion program.

Karl Wilson stated yes, that is the case. They would have to find a different source with which to fund their program.

Punam Mathur asked if they are looking to take some action based on the legislature.

Chair Hobb stated once we went through the questions, I was going to pose that question back to the commission that the opportunity certainly exists to take action. It's an action item.

Punam Mathur stated if she understood correctly, the legislature wanted us to delve into how the weight currently interfaces with dual language programs, and the answer is, as long as there's ELL kids. If all the way it's going to follow the ELL kid, and if it's allowable as a Zoom service there, it's clear sailing. Otherwise, they can go directly to the department, make their case and receive a yes or no. If no, I think we were asked by the legislature to then contemplate in a separate weight, a different kind of weight for dual language.

Chair Hobbs stated there were two asks in what you read before. Maybe you can just refresh us on each one of the asks.

Megan Peterson stated the first ask specifically is to conduct a review of the English learner weighted funding to determine if it would be an allowable use of these funds by school districts and charter schools to establish and operate dual language programs.

Chair Hobbs stated let's stop there for a moment because I think that's been asked and answered in the discussion. If there's a motion made, we could include the fact that we've stipulated that. The second ask?

Megan Peterson stated a determination of the recommended weight that would be required if a new dual language was to be established for the plan.

Punam Mathur stated for her, who knows, someday? I remember the discussion at the State Board of Education. I think it was really valid, and it was around the fact that our diversity is an asset. Our economy needs to benefit from it. It probably someday warrants instrument to maximize that asset. We are so far from surface, let's get to surface, which is average. As we are dreaming about optimal, yes, absolutely, this should be a topic of discussion. But man, to spend time now to evaluate what size the weight should be on the thing that someday we aspire to have, seems a little out of sequence.

Chair Hobbs asked if that would translate into we think this is a worthy topic, and should continue to be evaluated based on available funding.

David Jensen stated if he understands the question, it was first, is it permissible? And if not, what weight would we recommend? So if we're saying it is permissible, then we need not go into question number two.

Chair Hobbs stated that's a great point. Is that the wording?

Megan Peterson re-read it. A review of the English learner weighted funding to determine if it would be an allowable use of these funds by school districts and charter schools to establish and operate dual language programs or determine the legislative changes necessary to do so. That was ask number one. And number two, determine a determination of the recommended weight that would be required if a new dual language program was to be established for the plan.

Punam Mathur stated it's a yes for ELL students involved in said dual language program.

Chair Hobbs stated he supposed they could do a motion that sounds something like this. That we confirm that the answer to the first question is, yes, and to the second question, we can say something along the lines of, should continue to be reviewed, and over time -- something like that. Does that work? And we'll have addressed it, which is what we need to do.

Megan Peterson stated in terms of making sure that we have officially identified it on the record. I think the motion would be that does the commission believe that they have reviewed the materials, and can confirm that the weighted funding is an allowable use, and therefore no legislative action is required. And then secondarily, a motion could be that in response to determining a weight that it would recommend continue evaluation in consideration with, for optimal funding as it's discussed.

Chair Hobbs made that motion. Punam Mathur seconded. Motion carried.

10. DISCUSSION REGARDING FUTURE PRESENTATIONS FROM SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS

(*Information and Discussion*)

The Commission will receive a presentation related to future agenda items from subject matter experts. The Commission will have the opportunity to identify specific topics and questions the Commission would like to see included in future presentations.

- Dr. Kelsey Krausen, Director, WestED
- Dr. Sean Tanner, Senior Research Associate, WestED
- Tara Bergfeld, Senior Education Finance Associate, WestED
- Justin Silverstein, Co-CEO, Augenblick, Palaich and Associates
- Amanda Brown, Vice President, Augenblick, Palaich and Associates

Chair Hobbs stated this is a presentation related to future agenda items, and the Commission will have the opportunity to identify specific topics and questions the commission would like to see included in future presentations.

Justin Silverstein, Kelsey Krausen, Sean Tanner, Amanda Brown and Tara Bergfeld gave presentations. *(See "Commission Presentation_Feb2024 ADA" for details.)*

Punam Mathur stated Guy put this on the agenda so that we could all get a clear idea of exactly what our specialists and subject matter experts are going to be doing for us. Partly to give us all confidence that there's a plan as aggressive as November for final report seems like it is that we can take some help. The other thing is that he also I think wanted all of the work group leaders to be aware of the kind of work, so that if there's any specific assistance that you believe your work group will need sooner rather than later would be the better time to sort of bring it forth.

Nancy Brune had a question in terms of logistics. I know you all are planning on attending our full commission meetings and maybe this is a question for you, Megan. Even our subcommittees wanted to pull in or submit a request. I know yesterday there was mention of the fact that you all have some ideas about visualization. Should we go through you, Megan, to sort of make that request and ask the right person to come to our subcommittee meeting or what does that flow look like, please?

Megan Peterson stated it is a fine line that we have to walk in terms of support for the working groups need to be in terms of research, and not that any recommendations would come as a result of what is seen. If there's something that you do envision being a recommendation for the commission to make, we would request that it goes through the agendizing process and communicate with the Chair, and the Vice Chair to make sure that it is made available on an agenda. Otherwise, they are available to assist in any of the work groups as they're meeting to help, guide, and provide research that they have seen and help condense that timeframe.

Nancy Brun stated will you give us their contact information, we can reach out directly, or do we submit the request through NDE, I guess is my question. And then you will take the appropriate steps to identify the right person to come to the subcommittee meetings.

Megan Peterson stated we are working with all of our wonderful folks on the line to be able to join the applicable work group meetings to provide that guidance and then based on any conversations that result in a determination to be made. NDE staff are also in those meetings to help facilitate that conversation and make sure that we move forward in the right path.

Punam Mathur stated ultimately you and staff are managing the contracts with all of these, so ultimately the call is yours.

Megan Peterson stated correct, NDE is the holder of the contract.

Punam Mathur stated and then just to put on the record, apparently it turns out state procurement is not the easiest set of stuff to go through, and so to all of you on screen for the grit and resilience that you've demonstrated, and I think that's causation Dr. Tanner. I also want to acknowledge the staff because I know it's not been easy.

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Punam Mathur stated he thinks we're pretty clear on what's coming based on the reports that came out of the workgroups today, we know what's upcoming on agendas. She asked if there was anything in addition to what has been talked about today that they'd love to see on a future agenda.

Joyce Woodhouse stated she didn't have anything more. As we went through the meeting, it sounded like next meeting's agenda items were coming together, plus with the three items that was on the APA WestEd schedule for March, I think were set that way too.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There were no public comments.

13. ADJOURNMENT

[Audio ends abruptly]