

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
OCTOBER 20, 2023
2:00 PM**

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

TRANSCRIPT OF COMMISSION 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

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Joseph Baggs
Megan Peterson

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Dr. Kelsey Krausan
Dr. Sean Tanner
Justin Silverstein

Chair Hobbs: Thanks very much. Good morning. It's 9 o'clock and I'm calling the August 16th, 2024 meeting of the Nevada Commission on School Funding to order. I'd like to welcome our audience who are joining in person as well as by Livestream on the Nevada Department of Education's website, which is recorded for public record. Will the secretary please call roll?

Secretary: Chair Hobbs.

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Secretary: Vice Chair Woodhouse.

Joyce Woodhouse: Here.

Secretary: Dr. Brune?

Nancy Brune: Present.

Secretary: Member Casey?

Dusty Casey: Here.

Secretary: Member Goudie.

Jason Goudie: Here.

Secretary: Member Jensen.

Dr. David Jensen: Here.

Secretary: Member Johnson.

Paul Johnson: Here.

Secretary: Member Mathur. Punam Mathur.

Joyce Woodhouse: She just text me. She's trying to get online. She's trying to log in right now.

Secretary: Thank you so much. Member McIntosh.

Jim McIntosh: Here.

Secretary: Member Rodriguez.

Kyle Rodriguez: Here.

Secretary: And Chair Hobbs, correct me if I'm wrong, member Mathers is excused today.

Chair Hobbs: Yes. Member Mathers is excused. He had other conflicting business up north. And I would just ask that when Member Mathur joins then you mark her present.

Secretary: Will do. Chair Hobbs, you have a quorum.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Also, like to note for the record that we are joined by Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott. As we get started with the agenda, the normal housekeeping items, I'll run through those really quick. Some participants may join our meeting virtually. As always, we ask for your patience with any technical difficulties we may have, as it may take Member Johnson a few minutes to work through those and save us. I also want to remind our audience that the Commission on School Funding meetings can be viewed via YouTube with closed captioning. I'll remind participants to turn off their microphone or mute when you're not speaking, and remember to turn on your microphone or unmute when you'd like to make a comment. Of course, remember, you're on video and being broadcast via YouTube on the NDE website. If you'd like to be recognized to make a comment, feel free to gesture on screen. Although my screen's not on, somebody will let me know if somebody is gesturing. I don't know if anybody is joining by video conference today, however. And we'll try to make sure that we get your comments taken care of. And as always, and this group knows, just feel free to jump in whenever it's appropriate to ask a question. All of today's meeting materials are available on the commission's webpage, and I trust when the commission members are not actively engaging on their screens with us, they're reviewing materials. So that brings us to public comment period number one. First, I'll go up north. Is there any public comment in Northern Nevada?

Secretary: Chair Hobbs, we have no public comment in Carson City.

Chair Hobbs: Alright, so next I would ask if there's any public comment here in Las Vegas.

Megan Peterson: Chair Hobbs, we have no public comments in Las Vegas.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Next, I would ask if there's anybody that wishes to make public comment by telephone.

Secretary: Chair Hobbs, we have no comments by telephone.

Chair Hobbs: And lastly, have we received any public comment by way of email?

Secretary: We do not have any public comment via email.

Chair Hobbs: And I would just remind those that may be watching or listening to provide public comment or testimony telephonically dial area code 312-584-2401. When prompted, provide meeting ID 19042398 and press pound. When prompted for a participant, ID press pound. If you're unable to attend in person but would like to provide public comment, please submit your written statement to nfcsf@doe.nv.gov before the close of the meeting. If there are any comments submitted by way of email, we'll take those during public comment period number two, since none were received during public comment period, number one. Next items, item number three, approval of the flexible agenda. This needs a motion in a second.

Dusty Casey: I'll move to approve.

Megan Peterson: Second.

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

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Okay, thank you very much. That brings us to the NDE update, and at this point we'd like to

recognize Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson to provide us with that update. Good morning, Megan.

Megan Peterson: Good morning, Chair, members of the commission. Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson for the record. So, since we last met, we have submitted the legislative letters of intent as required by August 1st. We do have an item on the agenda today for additional follow up and clarification in respect to the special education distribution methodology seeking a little more clarification and so we'll discuss that a little bit later today. I did also want to share that we recently had members of our staff attend a return on investment conference in Texas, specifically related to special ed -- I'm sorry, related to education. And so, we're excited to bring that information back if not next meeting, the meeting following in terms of how does that connect with the conversations that we have around the EB400 metrics and how we report the information that we're looking at and utilize that data. So we're very excited about that. We also gave the presentation to the Committee on Education with Chair Hobbs, and the meeting went well. There was a lot of interest and we're excited to continue those conversations. And then next I will go over the deliverables as they exist. I do want to highlight the ones that we have completed first. And these are related specifically to that legislative letter of intent. Let's see. Hoping it's going to load momentarily, but while we're waiting, I can start referencing. We did -- sorry, here we go. Nope, it stopped. It is not having fun today.

Chair Hobbs: Somebody is coming with a -- looks like a new cord. Is that what you would've recommended?

Megan Peterson: Yes.

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Megan Peterson: Yeah. Okay. I do. This one was more hardware, Paul, so you're off the record or off the hook. There we go. Okay. So these are the deliverables from the commission that we have officially completed. As a reminder, that was review of the Nevada Cost of Education Index and how that should be applied within the formula. The recommendation was to maintain it at a 1.0 for everyone until we are able to do additional resource and analysis on the impact and how that is functioning within the formula. We also have reviewed the fiscal year 2020 baseline funding with the statewide base per pupil not being used for online schools. For those districts that are still in the hold harmless space, we recommended to maintain the current methodology as moving to the statewide would result in a loss to those districts that are in that model, which the intent of the hold harmless is due negate that. So we are maintaining that as it is. We did review the grad score indicator for use at risk definition within the context of the pupil centered funding plan. We did a review of -- excuse me, the English learner weight and how it applies to dual language programs. And we determined that it was allowable within the existing definition. And as a result, no additional weight was needed for any dual language programs that may be currently implemented within school districts. And that brings us to the items that are still outstanding. You'll see I have them separated out. We have the ones that are highlighted in yellow or the ones that are still in progress that we're waiting to close out. Some of those will be addressed today and have an ongoing conversations that we'll be wrapping up very shortly. And the ones that are highlighted in green on this page represent those that we have completed and are pending compilation with the other items into a final graph to meet the deliverables that we are planning to close out in the month of November. So this includes where we have a little more follow up today regarding the special education weight and the distribution methodology. So I do have on both slides just because we did make the recommendation, but then we have follow up today. So those first two will be looking to turn green after today. And then we have the review of the progress made by pupils in Beach Public School. We believe that this will be addressed once we get through today's presentation on the metrics within AB 400. Once the commission comes to consensus on that, then our consultants will be able to go back and compile that information into a report that will be reviewed by the commission in October for finalization for November. That is in similar vein to making recommendations for strategies to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability of schools. Those two pieces go hand in hand, again, will be addressed as part of that November closeout report. You have made

recommendations to the department and school districts on how to improve the tracking reporting, under the AB 400 metrics. That is part of the inventory that we're reviewing as well today. But that also includes improving the accessibility of existing and new programs under the open zoning conversation that we had had earlier in the year. Still remaining, and again, this will be addressed as part of today's conversation is the quarterly report finalizing those metrics and components so that way we can pull that data into the report that will be consolidating into a single report in November with the recommendation to move to an annual reporting structure. Again, providing recommendations to address deficiencies and implementation. We identified that that is going to be addressed as part of the November report along with the recommendation of compiling -- I'm sorry. Streamlining and reducing reporting requirements. So those are all going to be coming to a close as part of that conversation as well. And then we have already through work group one and two with Chair Woodhouse, the optimal funding levels review of the K-12 funding mechanism as it exists and it's how well it's functioning. We had the presentation from applied analysis with Chair Hobbs on the 10-year plan for funding. We have given the recommendations -- draft recommendations to the Committee on Education that we'll be finalizing with the November report as well. Review of the cost adjustment factors that included the attendance area adjustment that has been completed and will be part of -- it has been drafted in part of the report that will be finalized in November. Review of laws route governing sales and use tax and property tax. Again, that was part of the 10-year plan conversation and the work with applied analysis. We have completed the work on the revolving fund for school small school districts to make loans for capital improvement projects. Similarly, the Nevada -- discussed the Nevada State Infrastructure Bank and the municipal Bond bank as part of that conversation as well. And then also as part of today's conversation, we'll be reviewing the recommendations from the teacher recruitment and task force, retention task force work group and their recommendations and how they relate to the recommendations that the commission would like to make. A lot of recommendations. And that will conclude my update for today.

Chair Hobbs: Questions, comments? Anybody? I think this would be just a good time to have a very brief conversation about how we then end up pulling all of this together. I think this probably pertains mostly to the green areas in the yellows as they turn green. What we've been trying to keep pace with, and by we, I mean mostly NDE on our behalf is taking each one of these topics that we complete and converting them over to a similar report format. As you may have seen, as you may recall, having seen three or four meetings ago with respect to the small school capital funding, where there's a statement of what was requested of us and then some background, and then, some analytical, depending upon the topics and some analytical content. And then, the actual recommendations that are being made with some support for those recommendations. So that's generally the format. And all of those will essentially fit together as chapters in the report. And by doing it this way, each one of them would be liftable as its own report from this big compilation that we're going to do. So that's what's being worked on now. And I think it's our hope that by next month's meeting, we will have brought closure. And I'm speaking out loud here, so please jump in, correct me. But we will have brought closure by next month to any of the outstanding items where we need to make a decision as a commission, leaving us time in October or the latter part of September and October to actually do the physical assembly of the report, which will come back to us before it's due. I think we would imagine that a late October meeting, something along those lines for final review and approval. Hopefully all of that is done in advance enough time that you all have an opportunity to read what is probably going to be a war and peace type of report. And then be able to affirm our support of the report by the end of October so we can file in November. Does that sound about right to everybody? Sound doable to you too, Megan?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. Yes. And we are working simultaneously with our consultants, WestEd and APA that as these recommendations from the work groups are coming together, we have plugin pieces for each one of the recommendations that can be compiled into a single comprehensive report.

Chair Hobbs: And as you look at everything that Megan just went through, I mean, I remember looking at this

list of requests for this commission a little over a year ago thinking, oh my gosh, this is a lot. Well, to this point, a lot has been taken care of. My appreciation to everyone that worked on any of the working groups, you all did tremendous amount of work and showed a lot of dedication in bringing those to fruition and getting us to this point. I think we might have been a little bit further ahead of the game than we are at this point. Had we had some of the subject matter expert support for our work earlier than we did, but hey, we like a challenge, right? And everybody has stepped up to the plate and looks like we're going to make it, not just make it, but make it in good form, which I think is important to everybody on this commission. So just sort of wanted to round out what the next few weeks look like. And again, anything that is remaining to be dealt with, hopefully that's on the September agenda and we can deal with it at that time and move into production of the report. And there may be elements of that that we have to come back to the working groups for a little bit of assistance with, but we don't quite know to what extent yet. That's where we are. So thank you all again for everything that got us to this point. Yeah, they've been, Megan and Bo, and we don't have to say anything good about James anymore because he isn't here. But they have been absolutely tremendous in supporting this commission in addition to doing their regular day jobs. And you'll always have my gratitude for that. Item number five on the agenda is now referred to as a consent agenda. And that is comprised of minutes from the June 27th and July 19th meeting. Hopefully you've had an opportunity to review those minutes and the action would be a motion for approval of either or both of the minutes that are included.

Joyce Woodhouse: Mr. Chair.

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: I will move for approval of the consent agenda, including the June 27th commission summary and transcription, as well as the same for the July 19th, 2024 meeting.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. So, we have a motion for approval of both dates' minutes.

Kyle Rodriguez: I'll second, Member Rodriguez.

Chair Hobbs: And we have a second from Member Rodriguez. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed? Thank you. Work through the consent agenda. Item number six, the commission will continue the discussion regarding state special education, funding, distribution, methodology, and weighted multiplier. Subject matter experts will be present to guide the commission's discussion in decision making in response to the legislative letter of intent. For this, Megan, and is Julie joining you as well? It's you. Okay. Well, welcome back Megan.

Megan Peterson: Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson for the record. Unfortunately, Julie was not able to meet with us today, conflicts arose, but I am here and I have overseen the state special education funding since 2017. So, I'm very familiar with it as well and I'm confident that I can speak to any of the questions today. But the question that we have today based on the conversations from the last meeting was the recommendation was to continue the methodology as it exists today. One of the points of clarification as a result of that were some of the changes that resulted out of this most recent session with focus on the district's and the PCSA state Public Charter school authority sponsored schools. We modified the application of that funding and the distributionology, distributionol -- okay, I'm not going to repeat that word. We modified it slightly in order to meet the legislative intent, which was that, all new dollars that were following through the model were intended to go just to the four entities who were identified that were below the per pupil amount that was identified. Unfortunately, we were not based on enrollment growth within the IEP Individualized Education program

student counts. The counts grew beyond a point by which we could honor per person amount that was intended as part of the legislatively approved budget. And so, what we ultimately transitioned to was allocating just an aggregate total allocation at the LEA level. So, previously, all the way up through 2023 fiscal year, we were allocating the 2% cost of living adjustment off of the prior year base as a hold harmless provision. And then any funding leftover after that we would distribute on a per pupil basis for enrollment growth where those districts that incurred enrollment growth. And then after that, any funding that was still available that we would trigger, allocate again on a per pupil basis to those who are below the multiplier. So, lots of iterative steps in there of distributing trying to catch people up in certain areas because the funding has not kept up overall. And so, the difference, as I was trying to explain between 23 and 24 is we were allocating on a per pupil basis for enrollment growth and then for what we called an equity adjustment fiscal year 24, in order to try and meet the levels that had been also identified in aggregate for those LEAs we went to just straight aggregation of dollars without regard to per pupil distribution. So that's where our clarification is needed for us to maintain the methodology is the preference that we maintain trying to award on a per pupil allocation up to the amount of funding available, or do we maintain the current methodology of allocating at a total amount and essentially maintain the hold harmless provision for everyone. I hope that clarifies without getting too deep in the weeds.

Chair Hobbs: Before questions and comments, does NDE have a recommendation?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. Our recommendation is to align with the intended methodology as prescribed in interest and similar to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, which is to allocate on a per pupil basis rather than maintaining a hold harmless because it does erode the intent of allocating those dollars and allow transparency within how the funding's being allocated. We are sensitive in understanding the impact of moving to a straight per person distribution methodology though as it would impact a number of districts in a negative capacity.

Chair Hobbs: And I assume that any such impacts have been quantified.

Megan Peterson: Yes, they have.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Go ahead Paul.

Paul Johnson: Member Johnson for the record. Yeah, Megan, and I think transitioning to what it should be makes sense, we're one of the school districts that would be pretty adversely affected, but there's usually been a transition period so that it wasn't an abrupt disruption to education services. So you guys give some importance to that.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson. Yes, we have. We could look at doing a two-year essentially phase in or hold harmless where the result is reduced by half for the first two years and then by the -- I'm sorry, 50% in the first year and then 50% in the second year or do a four year where we reduce it by a quarter each year. That would at least give districts time to adjust and it would reduce the impact on the transfer from the adjusted base.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thank you. Member Johnson for the record. And that's consistent before your phase and was consistent with what we did when we had to make changes to the DSA formula years ago too. So, I appreciate that. Thank you.

Dusty Casey: Member Casey for the record. Thank you, Megan. Just a quick question. Are your recommendations or Randy's recommendations in line with WestEd's recommendations for the special education funding?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson. Yes, they are.

Dusty Casey: Okay, perfect. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Additional questions, comments? Kyle.

Kyle Rodriguez: Member Rodriguez for the record. So Megan, what is the recommendation with a two- or four-year blended phase in?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. We would advocate for a four year, given the significant impact that it has on the all but five of the districts. Some of them it's more than a 60% impact on their overall allocation. And knowing that where we are within the revenue projections right now, we think that that is most favorable.

Kyle Rodriguez: Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Any thoughts on direction then with that recommendation?

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen for the record. I echo the thoughts of Paul. Anytime we've seen an impact on districts, we've tried to do a phase in so that they could prepare in the past. It's been that four year and it'd be my recommendation that we implement this change back to a per pupil allocation over a four-year adjustment period.

Chair Hobbs: We have that as a motion.

Megan Peterson: And I will second it.

Chair Hobbs: Motion and a second. Additional discussion? If there's no additional discussion, please signify your support by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed? Abstained? Are we good?

Megan Peterson: That is what we're looking for. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Brings us to item number seven. We've been working through all of the different working groups and of course we have three, four, and five, which will be a subject of discussion later today. And that'll be the big culmination of a lot of the work. This interim is bringing that to closure hopefully, completely by September. But in the meantime, we also have working group eight and nine which we're dealing with teacher compensation and retention and those types of items that's been headed by member Dusty Casey. And Dusty is with us today. And I know that you've had other folks working with you, Dusty, on this to try to synthesize this into something that could be presented to the Commission for consideration. So at this point, if you like, I'd be happy to turn it over to you to summarize where you, where you all are.

Dusty Casey: Sounds good. Thank you. Chair Hobbs, Member Casey for the record. And so, yeah, just to recap, there were two subgroups. It was educator and Sports app pipeline and then a compensation work group. One group work was led by Punam and the other myself. And we chose to join those together earlier this year. And some of the early findings were number one, uncovering the word of the task force and that was a big eye-opener for the work group and learning that there is an entity out there that's studying this and making recommendations to our state government around those things. And so, rather than reinvent the wheel, so to

Speak, we decided to dig deep into that, uncover what exactly they do, their responsibilities, etc. And one of the big things they have to do is submit a report, which they submitted in June. And that's outlined in statute and I think that goes to interim ED and a few other people that report. And it's a very lengthy report with a lot of findings in it. And so, we took some time with the help of Member Woodhouse really going through that to identify what potentially aligns with the commission's work and maybe what doesn't. And so we went through a detailed analysis. There is a writeup that I believe will be sent to the commission members that we did. Going through that and finding those areas of alignments. I will briefly kind of cover those. The overarching funding, of course is the work of the task force and what we need to figure out for as a commission, formally is whether we want to support that work in some fashion and rather than us trying to do similar work side by side. And so when we went through that we identified some areas in their report that align with us, for example, they do a lot of work around, and it's not all encompassing, but they do have work in there, looking into salary and compensation data. There is some of that in there. But it seems incomplete for what we would need to do as a task force. And so, that's one area we feel is an opportunity that could be expanded. And I'll get into that in a minute. Another area they talk about is healthcare coverage for educators. We think that's something that could be looked into expanding the benefits to the public employee benefit plan that could be area that could really benefit in recruitment and retention of staff members. They talk a little bit in their report about multi-tiered systems of support. That's something we've already covered, including wraparound services here. And the commission, we looked into that I think a few months ago. So that's already wrapped into our programs. Another area is mentor programs allocating additional funding to education and prioritize the use of those funds for mentor programs including but not limited to salary stipends and training for mentor educators. That seems to be something that's in alignment with the commission in order to improve our education workforce. And then really, another areas like this, we've talked about this on the commission before, but this idea of having an HR data portal, they refer to it as a workforce data portal. I think it appears we might need some more clarity on exactly what that looks like, but that is an opportunity there. We've talked a lot about having a centralized data kind of HR area and that could be an opportunity for that entity to own that as well. And then they get into things that align with our work, including recruitment and retention. There's areas and they're talking about scholars for specialized instructional support personnel, teacher advancement scholarships, providing resources for educators to get endorsements in critical areas of shortage. For example, special education, things like that. And then potentially a loan forgiveness program to provide support for student loan forgiveness to current Nevada teachers who have been teaching maybe for at least five years and who are not eligible for loan forgiveness through other funding sources. So again, areas and they're split up in that report. But overall we've talked about that on the commission of providing resources to get people educated, whether it's specializing or alternate routes to licensure, those sorts of things. There's a lot of work in there and a lot of recommendations that we feel align with the commission's work. And so that brought us to an area of opportunity and looking at their report and the makeup of the task force, how could we better support that as a commission to fulfill our duties and expand the duties and make of the task force in a way that would have a lasting impact on educator recruitment and retention. And so, I would like to actually- Punam had some really good thoughts on this. Punam, would you mind kind of jumping in and talking a little bit about your feelings on the wide?

Punam Mathur: Sure. Thank you, Dusty. For the record, this is Member Mathur. Let me first just thank Dusty. We each had a work group and then we folded them both into Dusty, so I think you missed that meeting and the forgot leadership. Thank you for being a leader. I think going through the work on this- one thing that seems has been clarified for me is that there is no central place in Nevada where this absolutely critical topic, which is human resources related to our K-12 system is owned. And as we look as a commission at a funding formula where we know that the vast majority of all funds going into K-12 are paying for people, getting that people thing right is so critical. Not just educators, but support personnel, social workers, counselors, and so just felt like we needed to, but there was an opportunity for us to offer recommendations to the government legislature to say, let's imagine having a properly structured, adequately supported, clearly accountable, incredible group who could actually own it. Because I think forever, there's been many conversations I've been over many years that's -- what's happening in higher ED, what's happening in our pipeline through K-12 into

higher ED. How far short will we be across all of the different specializations that we need? And I've never seen a really clear answer to those things. And so, using our own commission construct as a template, we thought that there might be a recommendation that warrants our advancing it together legislature to say, let's take this amazing group. They're motivated, but not yet. I don't like fully equipped and supporting and resourced to really focus on the thing that for the Pupil-Centered Funding formula is going to have the largest -- it will be the largest determinant of our ROI in terms of student achievement. It's the people that drive the achievement. And so, it just felt like a big topic in terms of an opportunity for us to advance a recommendation. Is that what you had in mind, Dusty?

Dusty Casey: Yes. That's great Punam. Thank you, and Member Casey for the record. And I'd like to add on to that. It's apparent when we're looking through that, and we talk a lot about this on the commission, that it can't be a one-time shot, right? We can't do a one-time salary study and come to any type of conclusion, a one-time pipeline study and come to any conclusion. It needs to be something that's continually monitored. We know people are not coming into education as an industry like they used to. People are leaving education. Why is that? So that whole attracting new labor into the labor market and understanding it as a labor market, my feeling is one of the biggest pieces. And that labor market is really regional. We know administrators are going out of state to try to recruit personnel. We know we're competing with other- not only other states for educators, but other industries, right? People just aren't coming into education 'cause they're choosing other industries. That needs to be studied and consistently monitored, is my feeling. And so, somebody, as Punam said, needs to own that. An entity needs to own that and be resourced properly to hire consultants or hire experts as needed to study those areas. And so, as we started looking at that, the biggest area of opportunity we felt, or as it appears, is potentially in the makeup of the task force. And so, I would like to defer to member Woodhouse. She has some really good thoughts on that as far as what that could look like potentially. Member Woodhouse.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Member Casey. And 1001% I support what Dusty has said. The task force was made up of teachers and support staff individuals who did a phenomenal job in that report that they released in June. And when we went -- actually when the two work groups that got together and working on this and coming up with a way for us to really be following the issues of the workforce, of the teacher retention, recruitment, and not just teacher but across the board in education. And so, what we decided -- we didn't decide. What we proposed was a commission that it would dissolve the task force, but it would lift, lift up their work, and it would be made up of a broader array of individuals. One of the things that Punam and Dusty and I talked a lot about was for this, for this work to continue, we really need to have the expertise of particularly human resource professionals and business leaders. So, that's where we started. What we have or what we are suggesting is a new name, which takes the work that's been done already, and it would be the Nevada Commission on Educator Recruitment and Retention. And we use the word educator so that we're covering all educators. Those are teachers, those are administrators, those are support staff. So, that we can really look at what the workforce in the school districts could and should be. So, since you don't have this in front of you, I'm just going to go through where we've identified these individuals. We would have five ex-official members, which would be superintendent of public instruction, the chancellor for the Nevada System of Higher Education, because we are dealing with pre-K all the way through. Plus we wanted to have the deans from the three college prep, educator prep programs of UNLV, webinar and NSU. So those have the ex-official, because we want their expertise having them to be able to bring in the right people for the commission to speak to and work with. The voting members of which they would be 15, two would be appointed by the Governor. One would be a human resource professional and one a business leader. And then four members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the majority leader of the Senate, and the minority leader of the Assembly and the minority leader of the Senate, which is typical in the last two commissions, the Commission on School Funding, and the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education.

Megan Peterson: And the legislation, what I've written in the paper that you'll get, identifies how those will work together so that they are making sure that we have a broad array of experts that are coming in this area.

And for those of you who are appointed to this commission, you know how leadership and the governor work together to make sure that the people were placed and we didn't have everybody from one location. So we don't want to redo that. And so, those members again would be human resource professionals, business leaders, and they'll work in concert to make sure that we have people from all school districts involved. Two teachers will be appointed, one by the Nevada State Education Association and one by the Clark County Education Association. And as we did in the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education, we put in the language that the two organizations would work together to identify that there was an urban teacher or an urban county teacher, a rural county teacher, and one of which would be elementary and one which would be secondary.

Joyce Woodhouse: Also the same sort of format individuals who would be support personnel, once again appointed by organizations that work with those individuals. And the same format of making sure we're covering urban and rural, rural districts and elementary and secondary. So, and then the Nevada Association of School superintendents would appoint one, the Nevada Association of School Administrators would appoint two, and again, because there's two, looking at urban and rural and looking at elementary and secondary. One member from the Nevada State Charter School Authority, one parent or guardian appointed by the Nevada PTA. And the last one, which we felt very important is that the governor would appoint the chair, and then the members would, at the first meeting like you all did here, the members then would elect the vice chair from the members of the commission. So, you can't do these things out there all by yourself. We did write in this recommendation or the suggestion that the legislature would be asked to provide funding to cover expenses, travel meals per diem, and that the Nevada Department of Education would serve as the facilitating organization, which is what they're doing for the two previous commissions as well. And I already indicated that the task force would be elevated to this commission, the work that they're doing. And then reports would be provided annually and we just put in November 15th as the commission funding is, and we go to the governor, the Nevada Legislative Commission, the Nevada Department of Education, and to entry into the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education. So that is what that commission would look like. And I just want to repeat again, what Dusty and Punam have said that this is not a one and done task. This is a major effort moving forward, that's going to take some time. And that's why all of those groups and individuals need to be included. But something we have not done a lot of, and that is designated from outside of the education field to look to human resource people and to look to business professionals to be a part of this. Because I think Punam probably has the best response because she works with the business community all the time, and we need to know from them what's important as well. So that's why we put quite a bit of expertise on this commission in that area. So back to you Dusty.

Dusty Casey: Thank you, Member Woodhouse. That was excellent. Member Casey for the record. And so, looking at that, we tried to uncover areas of opportunity and look at an example what's existing around us. Joyce mentioned the other two commissions. So we was like, well, there's an example of two entities that have long running room, for example, our commission going out 10 years or however long it is. Again, that can't be a one and done. They would need consistent studies. Some of that stuff would take time. And so, we're basically putting those in front of the commission as findings, as well as opportunities in an example of what something like that could look like and really open it up for discussion. So, we'll turn it back over to you Chair Hobbs,

Joyce Woodhouse: Mr. Chair.

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Joyce Woodhouse: I think one really important thing I forgot to mention, and I just skipped it over in the notes, and that was in the funding piece. We also put in there that funding should be placed with the commission in order to contract with various research organizations to assist in the work that needs to be done.

Chair Hobbs: Well, thank you both. Thank all three of you for the report and all the work that went into it. I know that you all have been on this for the last several months and appreciate you bringing it forward this way. I'm trying to think of -- first of all, are there any questions of Dusty or his working groups? If not, I'm trying to think of what the best action would be at this point. So, anybody chip in with better ideas, please? We have a report that's been generated by the working groups, and I think at very minimum we will be accepting the report. I think we may want to think about going a little bit further than that, accepting the report and concurring with the findings and converting those into recommendations to be included within our broader report. I don't know if that was the best wording, but I just throw that out there as a way of bringing this one to closure. It sounded like motion.

Dusty Casey: If that was a motion, Chair Hobbs, I would like to second that motion.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks. Let's do it that way instead of asking me to repeat it. Any additional discussion? Not seeing any, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed? Thank you very much. Thank you again. Brings us to agenda item number eight. Let's see here. We're going to receive a presentation summarizing the recommendations previously discussed surrounding the reporting elements identified in SB400, or excuse me, AB400 and SB98. The commission may make recommendations on which items we'll move forward for purposes of developing the first report as prescribed by AB 400. And with that, we'd like to welcome once again Dr. Kelsey Krausan, director of WestEd to coordinate presentation. Welcome. Sorry, I failed to introduce everybody else.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Good morning, Chair Hobbs and members of the commission. Thanks for having us here today. I'm going to get us started with our presentation, and then we'll turn it over to Dr. Tanner to talk a little bit more about the report for November. So, while we're waiting for the slides. As I go through the agenda, you'll see on the next slide there's a place for questions and discussion at the end. But really, we invite all of you to jump in with -- since you are actively involved in this work, also with any questions and other contributions. So, we're going to talk a little bit about the different components of the work that we're supporting the commission on just to measure and report on progress. And then I'm going to turn it to Sean to talk about the summary report and then provide an overview of the commission's recommendations thus far for the recording framework. This next slide is really just a reminder of the different components of the work that we've been supporting the work groups on and that all of you have been actively engaged in during the commission meetings as well. First, the framework for required reporting. This is the data that was outlined in AB 400 and SB 98, that the commission has made some recommendations around revisions and slight adjustments to really strengthen that framework. As Chair Hobbs mentioned, we'll go through an inventory of those recommendations so far. Towards the end of the presentation, Sean -- Dr. Tanner will be talking about the summary report. This is really just to give you an initial sense of what we're planning for the report and get your input on things that feel really important to bring forth and communicate through that report. Then we'll have subsequent discussion so that we can make sure we're ready to go in October for the preview of the report. I didn't mention this before, but in addition to refining what was outlined in AB 400 and SB 98 in terms of the reporting framework, the complementary set of work was around reviewing existing reporting requirements in the state and making sure that we were leveraging all existing recording rather than recreating any duplicating efforts and also making recommendations to refine those reporting requirements where we could create some efficiencies. And that work is ongoing. And then finally, Member Brune is leading a work group on the wireframe that will publicly report the data collected through AB 400 and SB 90. That's also work that we're going to be ramping up now that the commission has made recommendations on what those data will be. Then finally, very small text at the bottom here, not to be forgotten, is our team's work to support the causal analysis,

impact analysis of the PCFB and the additional investment on school and student progress in the state. That's also ongoing work. With that, I will turn it to Dr. Tanner.

Dr. Sean Tanner: I'm not on? Can everyone hear me now? Okay, great.

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Dr. Sean Tanner: Yes, good. Okay. Student Achievement. We have ELA, math. These are all the standardized assessments that are taken and are presented for the report. We thought the most helpful way to present that would be percent proficient statewide, then by LEA, then by student group, but not by student group, by LEA and then change over time. So, just that not dividing it up further by LEA, by student group, is to spare the amount of information that you're getting. Of course, it's your decision. We'll analyze the data however you want, but we just thought that that was too much detail. If you want to know how Carson City schools are impacting specifically English learners, that feels like a deeper dive study than part of the annual progress monitoring. Same for student attainment which is really about progress through school. Then you have post-secondary concerns. International Baccalaureate, IB, AP career technical Education, all those measures. Those will be under a student attainment section. Then student engagement, which somewhat awkwardly lumps chronic absenteeism with discipline and violence, those very different things, but they're neither attainment nor achievement. So they're getting a meaning of student engagement. Okay, now for the fun part, so here are some considerations with all of these data. So, one is the change over time, okay? So, I think in years in the future, just the change from last year is probably what you want to know. So you're going to get a snapshot of this year, and you want to know how these things have changed since last year. But of course, there was a before time, before the policy, before COVID, before all of that. That may be helpful to see so that you can -- it sort of acts as a benchmark for how things are improving, right? Compared to this baseline before the policy change. That's up to you, but it's something to consider. Do we use 2019? Do we use 2020? It would be a baseline measure that you would want to see to compare today's scores to. The second element is there are a lot of post-secondary measures, and you're, and this is merely one section of a report, right? So you're going to have to make your way through a lot of this data. And so, it presents an opportunity to potentially combine indicators and just give you one data point per LEA per student group per year. One of those considerations is web two, combine IB and AP. This is a little bit outside of my area of expertise, but our researchers have told me that these are really close substitutes, and that knowing the difference in them doesn't tell you as much as maybe just knowing what the participation rate is as a whole. So that would be one level of aggregation for the post-secondary data. Another level of aggregation would be to align that element. So all post-second into a college and career readiness indicator like you have on the Nevada School Performance Framework. Okay? So that would roll up everything. It wouldn't just combine IB and AP, but it would roll up CTE and a lot of other things. So you always lose information when you aggregate. But again, we're trying to spare the amount of information that's presented to you in the report to make it most helpful. So those are considerations for you. What level of aggregation do we use for the post-secondary information? Okay. Let's see. I think I'm going to take this slide and Justin's going to make sure I don't make any mistakes. Okay. So we have staffing here. So, it's full-time equivalent counts and ratios, student staff ratios by LEA by function, their role, and then change over time pretty standard. And then retention and vacancies data provided against statewide by LEA and changing the time. Okay? Spending, we have revenue and expenditure data presented much the same way by function and by source for the revenue. Pretty standard overview, but there are some considerations here. So with staffing expenditures, do you want to separate out those expenditures and those staff that are purportedly paid for with PCFP money as opposed to non PCFP money? Okay, so you have, let's say, the expenditures on counselors. Do we want to know expenditures on counselors paid for with P-C-E-F-P money or expenditure and non or just lumped how much are we spending on counselors? So, I've created a pro and con here for your consideration. The pro, the argument there is it provides some transparency about how the funds are being used. That is the (indiscernible) for this commission. So you might of course want to be able to hold districts accountable for spending the PCP in ways that you think are advantageous to students.

Why wouldn't you want to know those expenditures broken down by their source, and I'll say this as gently as I can. Decisions about how to tag expenditures with their revenue source can reflect real programmatic decisions, but they can also be mixed with at the margin arbitrary accounting decisions. So you're going to pay for this counselor with PCFP money. Another district is going to pay for the counselor with Title one money and use PCFP for something else. What's most important is, you know, that there's a counselor there, or there's tutors there after school. It may not be as important to disaggregate by revenue source. So I present those issues to you. I know we all have feelings about it. I'm sure you do too. But that's a decision that you should make for us to analyze the data. Okay we got through that okay?

Chair Hobbs: No, I did. I just wanted to ask you and the commission as we encounter these decision points along the way, do you want to take them one at a time and try to work through them, talk through them or deal with them after we go through the entire presentation? And we're here talking about this right now, so it may make some sense to, to weigh in on it. So, comment, questions?

Dr. David Jensen: Yeah. Member Jensen for the record. And I appreciate slowing down because I've already got three slides where I've got some questions or some suggestions. If we can go back to slide seven, and that's on student performance. I guess the student slide, when we talk about student achievement and how do we provide that, Paul and I had a quick sidebar but we believe the PCFP was intended to go down to the individual school level. And so, I do think that we have a responsibility to be able to report it all the way down to the school level. It's a great question. So can I advance one more slide? Because I talk about school level difference in the next slide. And then there's a recap slide with all of the decision points, and so maybe that would make a good jumping off. So, if you're going to address that, then I'll hold that one. Great. And then, if we go to slide eight, we start looking at performance changes over time compared to a base here, I just have to call out. I have grave concerns. If we use pre-COVID data as a comparison point, it's going to paint us [crosstalk].

Dr. Sean Tanner: A terrible abysmal picture nationwide and in Nevada.

Dr. David Jensen: Yes. So, my recommendation is post-COVID versus pre-COVID. And I just share that with the commission or we're going to come right out of the gate saying we're not doing well. And then number 10, in terms of staffing, I really think we need to report it not by a revenue source. I'll give you an example. Humboldt County, we were very successful and received a 7 million federal project aware grant. All of my mental health services are coming out of there. So, if we looked at PCFP, it would say Humboldt's not supporting mental health. But truly we're providing it and expanded methodology, just not using stateful. So those are real quick points that for me guide my thoughts on how I would recommend we approach those.

Chair Hobbs: Go ahead, Paul.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. Just a couple of reflections, when we transitioned to the PCFP from the Nevada plan, I think there was a desire to contrast ECFP from the prior plan. So I think it's important that we have a base year, fiscal year 2020 for fiscal measures at least. Maybe not student measures. But I think that was an expectation, and it would be interesting to see if this philosophy and change is working, which I think it has. And I think the statistics will show that greater investment has been forthcoming. And I can hear ringing in my ears, legislature saying, we're not going to put more money into a broken formula. Let's fix the formula, and then more money will be forthcoming. So, I think there was evidence to support that. And then the statistics with respect to staffing have to follow the numeric sequence of the chart of accounts, not a grammatical description, because not all school district counselors and positions have the same job descriptions, but we all code them in the same manner in our accounting system. And that's consistent with the annual reports and the way that we organize all our financial data that would be consistent with the financial data as well.

Chair Hobbs: Dusty, just one second. As, as we go through these and these points are raised, I think we need to develop some consensus that there's agreement that it should be done this way or that way to be able to provide the feedback to WestED. So, as we deal with them one at a time, let's talk about them and try to see if there's consensus with the comment that's being made. Otherwise, it'll just simply be a comment on the record and not some kind of decision point on how to move forward. Does that make sense? So Dave, going back to yours, you made a couple of comments and let's make sure that everyone's in line with the comments with you if you don't mind.

Dusty Casey: Yeah. So, we're going to hold on seven because you're going to talk about the reporting at the school level. Then that would go to slide eight, which is performance changes over time, 2020 versus 2019, and 2020 was our COVID year.

Chair Hobbs: Well, Paul raised the point of maybe bifurcating it, having physical information reported from a base year 2020, but not the performance data. Does that work for everybody? Okay.

Dusty Casey: Excellent.

Chair Hobbs: I have one other comment on slide eight. When you have a base year and then just the most recent year, what is that actually telling us as far as trending is concerned? I mean, it's from a single point in time and it doesn't show annual progress. And so, my suggestion would be for the ability to look at more than just a base year and a single year, but to be able to go back to prior years to see if there's some trending one way or the other.

Dr. Sean Tanner: And that's absolutely possible. I think one of the things that when you consider that a base year would be pre-COVID, you get really noisy drop down and then, and everyone knows that it wasn't anything people were doing in this state. It was the pandemic sent scores plummeting, and then they walk back up. But you're right, man, that's behind us. And we may want to look. So we'll take your cue as to how many years back you want to see. Do you want to see that in data tables? Do you want graphs over time?

Chair Hobbs: Well, I suppose it depends on the method of reporting. I mean, if it's being looked at online, for example, I think you should have the ability to look at multiple years much like, I'm used to looking at warning stars and things like that, looking at one year performance, this quarter, this year, five years prior since in seven, all of those kinds of things. And I think it should be adaptable because I think trending is an extremely important thing, not just a single point in time. Now that's my feeling. So, I would think that we would absolutely want the user to have the ability to get a sense of printing.

Dr. David Jensen: Great. And how far back do you think those trends should go for student performance?

Chair Hobbs: Well, I mean, I assume that they can be archived each year, right? And so, it would be up to the user whether or not they would go back one year, two years, three years, five years. But if they're all archived, I would assume you'd have the ability to query whatever period you're interested in.

Dr. David Jensen: Sure.

Chair Hobbs: Now, again, I don't design these things. It just sounds like something that would be nice to be able to do. Oh, go ahead.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Kelsey Krausan for the record. I think you're making a really important point about the different ways that data will be reported. So there's the performance summary that Sean's describing, which it

may make sense to have that less, maybe more so that the public and legislature and others can really read the story of what's happening. Whereas the dashboard, this wire frame we're working on, to your point, I think there's an opportunity to show all the years of data in an interactive way that the commission has recommended through the reporting framework, collection of data for the last five years. So we'll review that again, but already the commission has recommended that we do collect five years of data back to 2020, which we can discuss whether 2020 is really the best year to start, or if we should start in 2019 because of the issues with data in 2020. You did recommend to collect those five years of data, is whether it shows up in the performance summary.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I think what we're talking about is the difference between a single report, it's the multitude of users that I think we're trying to cater to, right? So you have a parent versus a realtor versus a school administrator versus a researcher, and all of them would've different needs as far as the data is concerned. Some may be happy with just a single snapshot, look, "Hey, it looks okay to me." And others need to dive deeper, but as long as the ability exists to go back and make those comparisons and show trending, that could then at a later time, because I've been trying to envision, sorry about this, dusty, I've been trying to envision, you know, having a set of curves that show the level of per person investment, just the fiscal side, so you can see peaks and plateaus and hopefully never anything that goes down, right? And it would seem to me that the shape of that curve is what we wanted to be able to compare to the shape of some of the performance curves. Now, they won't be at the same point in time. Obviously, there's going to be some detachment between making the investment and seeing the results. And I don't know if I'm even saying this the right way, but I think that we need the ability to do that, to be able to answer questions of legislators, to be able to demonstrate that there is a correlation between investment and several different levels of performance.

Dr. David Jensen: Thanks. David Jensen for the record. And just to be clear, what we are talking about with this series of slides is what goes into a paper report that can sit on your desk, not an interactive website, which would have every school's data and everything by revenue source and all of that. And over as many years, or little few as you want it to. This is about, how do we summarize this for you in an annual report that can be printed out and, and put on your desk.

Chair Hobbs: And I think that's perfectly fine. But I think as we talk about these, I think we want to have both capabilities, right? I think that points across, and I don't sense any disagreement with that. Dusty, I'll turn it back over to you.

Dusty Casey: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. I just want to make a quick comment on slide 10. And I appreciate Dave's comment, I want to take the other side of the coin to that though. I do feel it's important we understand which dollars are paying for which services or which personnel in a report. In that example that member Jensen gave, I think we would want to know if Humboldt is able to increase their counselors to decrease that, maybe meet the counselor to student ratio, the only way they're able to do that is using federal dollars. I think we would want to know that because it shows that we're still lacking in state dollars, right? And so, to me, we definitely want to know that they have counselors. We don't want to put that aside, but we want to know. Otherwise, it might appear that some districts or schools are operating more efficiently than others because they were able to hire more counselors, for example, when in reality some event that in folks, a big influx in federal dollars could change in a report, how it appears schools are operating and maybe they're becoming more efficient or getting to where we want them to be quicker, when in reality it's only because they had short term monies associated with that. So I think disaggregating that and understanding how, which dollars are paying for which services, etc., is important to know in the report. So that's just my 2 cents on that particular point.

Kyle Rodriguez: Member Rodriguez for the record. So, I get what member Casey is saying, however, the larger the school district gets, the more strategic decisions you have as you have different timeframes, different deadlines, and different availability. So, I would not want to impose something that reprimanded or

disincentivized using federal funds for positions because the money would cease to exist. So, I get the intent, however, just the feasibility of doing it, I don't see it being advantageous.

Chair Hobbs: We're giving you feedback that you're looking for.

Dusty Casey: It sounds much like our internal meeting, where opinions differed. And so, the great thing about our job is we don't have to make the decision you do. Again, just a reminder, this is not about what is available on a website with a dropdown and the ability to see changes over time. And if a user wants to see PCFP versus federal money, fine. This is what's in a paper report on your desk every year. And so, that's the decision point when, because this is a lot of data. These are going to be a lot of appendix tables with data by district and over time, multiple years potentially broken down by particular elements. So, just for [indiscernible] sake, you want to think about every split of the data as like another table that gets generated. Do you want -- and we are ultimately agnostic. Do you want these expenditures broken down by the purported revenue source that paid for in the paper report? That's the decision before you.

Chair Hobbs: Well, first of all, I think I understand the distinction. Please excuse our excitement about getting to a lot of the other points in all of this, because I think all of us been waiting to get to this. And I think the comments that are being made are still ones that should register with respect to the overall objectives that we have. But I think you're more specifically talking about the report that comes to the commission.

Dusty Casey: That's right.

Chair Hobbs: As opposed to reporting that's available to everybody else.

Dusty Casey: Absolutely right.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Got it.

Paul Johnson: Member Johnson, for the record. I think it would be helpful to identify the source. I mean, you'd have the color barcode that this color is for federal sources. This is for state sources. This is the PCFP. I think it does matter because not all schools get the same per pupil amount of federal funds to be able to do extra things. So, I think we need to be able to identify if that matters, and which portion of the counselors is being funded through Title one or ESSA or something like that, for example. I think it does matter. And all of our reporting is basically designed that way already anyway. The insight, the school nomics reports are that way. The 3D 7303 report is designed that way. To me that makes sense. And as long as it's not incredibly burdensome to do, but I think it does matter.

Kyle Rodriguez: Member Rodriguez for the record. Are we talking about funding source or the revenue source? 'cause if we go revenue source, you have investment earnings, and then, am I supposed to say this fund positions funded by local revenue and not state revenue? I think this is an extremely nuanced reporting nightmare that could come from this. And I'm not sure the benefits. So if we're going by the fund, I think that's different than the monies of which is funding it. And I just wanted to put that clarification out there.

Dusty Casey: Yeah, I think we're, we're conflating two terms here. Revenue, source and fund sometimes get used interchangeably. And I would agree, I'm not going to take the miscellaneous revenue that I get in my general fund and find out what portion of FTE that may have funded. So it would be by the fund source. So whether it's, say, general fund, state fund, federal fund, so on and so forth.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Kelsey Krausan for the record. I also just want the commission -- and also for clarification, another way to break down expenditures is by the PCFP. So, what are they? Are you using your

funding for ELs or base? So I feel like that another component of this discussion about how we would look at expenditures over time,

Chair Hobbs: And I just want to make sure as we go through these, we were giving you useful feedback, maybe too much feedback, but hopefully useful feedback. And I think a part of the problem I'm having is if reports are going to come to this commission sitting on this commission, I'm also thinking to myself, what am I able to infer from that report here? And I tend to think about it, not from the lightest perspective, but a little bit of a deeper perspective. But I'll let that part go for now. In my mind I talk about separating the two, but I understand what our mission is. So, we'll stick with that. Dusty?

Dusty Casey: Member Casey. I would like to move to adopt Member Rodriguez's recommendation that we report by fund.

Chair Hobbs: I don't know if we have to take that as a motion or if we can just indicate consensus. Is there consensus with Dusty's recommendation?

Jason Goudie: Jason Goudie for the record. So I've been listening and I really like the breakdown of the funds, but one piece at Clark County School District that scares me a bit is because of the autonomy under NRS 38G and how schools have a lot more autonomy than what we can do at Central. And that changes the reporting a little bit because we do look at schools that have a lot of Title one money, and the school next to them doesn't have any, and they're getting the same PCFP, right? So, I think segregating it causes problems, but I always like to see it because I understand the fact that understanding whether or not we have enough PCFP money is important. I'm not sure as important because I don't think anybody disagrees that we don't have enough. So I don't want that to be the only decision to where we say we're going to just approve it. Because I think we prove that over and over again. And I've always wanted to see at the district level, everything by the funds. So, I can see where everything is, to be able to understand how schools are using their monies. But we get a lot of pushback from schools on the PCP and they come to us and say, well, I get the same money as other school, and they're Title one and I'm not. And I'm like, I get that. So, I don't know. I don't even know where I am. Because I agree with both sides, but I don't think -- if the only reason that we want it segregated is to prove that we don't have enough PCP, I don't think we can need to do it.

Justin Silverstein: Justin Silverstein for the record. I think internally one of the questions we've had is, what do we think the legislature is going to want to know about the change in behaviors, in use of PCFP funds over time? We know that the new funding system has targeted dollars for certain types of students. We know that as you push in some of those dollars, you actually might free up dollars for the base. And that becomes conundrum, I think, based just what you're talking about, which is some folks have to use one pot of dollars to do one thing, and some other folks can use the other pot of dollars. But in the end, the question is, this report feels like what a lot of legislators will look at to say, how have behaviors changed with the new funding system? And I think we're just trying to make sure that that when they look at it, that question is going to be answered. If you think that's the question they're going to ask, maybe they aren't going to ask that question. But that's kind of been our debate internally.

Paul Johnson: Thanks. Member Johnson for the record. Yeah, I think at least initially I'd like to see more detail and less and later on we can combine it. But I think because the funds, the PCFP is broken into funds as well. We have our general fund, and then each one of the categories that go into the PCFP are separated by fund. So, we could roll those into PCFP or have them separate. But I think at least taking a look at it to see the parts now and later on, we could say, well, we don't need to track that. We just put PCFP down. We don't need to list every single one because it's telling the same story. So, that's my thought.

Jason Goudie: Thanks. Jason Goudie for the record. So, as Johnson was talking, it helps me think about it a

little differently because there were some comments about making sure we have enough. I do think the intent of this legislation and all these requirements is to find out how the PCFP is being done. If we don't have a breakdown of the PCP. And I think in the PCFP, we have to break it down by at risk and by the other, because those moneys are being used differently. They have different rules around them. So, I guess I'm changing where I think it does need to be broken down and we'll use Paul to when it gets too much then we can start consolidating. But I just think with the intent of what the legislature wants is, they want to see the PCP piece and if we don't break it down, and I think once you show PCP, you have to break it down between the general and the adjusted base and the weights.

Paul Johnson: Chairman Hobbs, I would just like to recognize the personal growth that I just witnessed from my colleague to the left. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: I'll make sure to take photos later. So, you mentioned something else. And again, not to belabor this. We're talking about with the report that comes back to the commission, but you also mentioned that it would be one that is shared with legislators. In my mind, those are probably two different levels of reporting. So, we're just talking about --

Justin Silverstein: Justin Silverstein for record. And I think that was my question, Chair Hobbs. Do we believe that the legislature will use this as becomes public? It's kind of their first lens into what's happening. Or do we think she points out there's a much deeper dive? I think it's setting what the use piece is for this document. Well, that got Megan all excited.

Megan Peterson: I did. Megan Peterson for the record. I did just want to jump in and remind, right, we have the first deliverable, which is the quarterly reporting of school districts to the commission. And then the commission takes that information and sends it over to the governor's office and the legislative council, bureau for considerations. And then secondarily, we are all in even departmentally in other areas of NDE talking about how do we more publicly display this information for everyone. So, I think it's all interrelated. So, one thing for us today that's most pressing is the quarterly reports. And that comes back to the paper report conversation that we're talking about for November is, for this first round, what is it that we're really trying to get to that's most meaningful that people can take action on more immediately? And then how do we evolve this and adopt it going forward to make this a really robust system for everyone to make informed decisions on?

Chair Hobbs: No, I appreciate that. And we'll try to stay focused on the quarterly, the quarterly annual report that will come to the commission. But still just want to emphasize that I think the level of reporting that needs to go to legislators to support the mission of the commission and everything else is a completely different level of reporting.

Megan Peterson: Yes. And this first level of reporting, the intent is to go to the governor and the legislature. So I think from that perspective, we'd want to keep that lens in mind. Megan Peterson for the record.

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Dr. Sean Tanner: Sean Tanner for the record. To throw another consideration here now, if you want these expenditures broken down by source, PCFP, at risk PCFP EL, PCFP gate, statewide or by LEA, because again, we're going to look at changes over time as well. So, this is just to think about the exponential explosion in tables that you're going to get every time you want another split in the data.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. That what I think we continue to struggle with because I think if the audience is going to be elected officials, legislators, subsets of interested parties within an LEA, for example, parents, other things like that, it's different. Dusty?

Dusty Casey: Member Casey for the record. I do worry about the accuracy of quarterly data amongst all the districts and schools being broken out at that level of detail versus an annual report. I think it makes more sense particularly with charters reporting at just the LEA level, at the SPSA level, for example, that can be really problematic because of how different the schools operate around the state. So, in general, I think that can be problematic. But on a quarterly basis, to me looking at individual schools and individual districts, the timing of reporting and how people are doing accounting can, I think, skew that data. And I would question the accuracy of really broken down data quarterly versus an annual report.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I believe that the recommendation has already been made to move from quarterly to annual reporting. And I think that had a lot frankly, to do with it is trying to align all the different reporting dates. So, I think we've gone past that speed bump, right? Okay.

Dusty Casey: So, annual report that can be printed out and put on your desk, that nevertheless also goes to the governor and the legislature. That's the minimum right now.

Chair Hobbs: Are we good? Alright.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Of course that does not -- Kelsey Krausan for the record, does not preclude us from providing additional tables and information to guide the commission's work.

Dr. Sean Tanner: Okay. Shoot.

Chair Hobbs: Say that at your own risk.

Dr. Sean Tanner: Very, very good. Let's talk about linking expenditures to performance. Okay. So, I will just reiterate, really difficult to separate cause of correlation, right? You know, that we're just giving a snapshot of performance and expenditures and staffing in a given year, comparing it over time. But you may, and this gets down to the school level. At the school level, it may be better to observe that link right down to the school level. And so, one thing, and this is in the paper report that can be on your desk that nevertheless also goes to the governor of the legislature. So, on a website, of course you can get down to the specific school level, but I don't think, we don't think that you want table after table of individual schools for this report, but you might want to know some disaggregation by types of schools, right? So schools that were, that have a high PCFP student count or a lower per pupil PCP count to disaggregate those changes over time. And it would just be statewide. It would probably not be at the LEA level, unless of course you think that that's something you want. But it would look something like -- this is the flavor of what we had in mind. This is just hypothetical that you could look at low PCP means they don't have a lot of students at those schools that count toward the PCP. And you can say their change in performance. This is just hypothetically math proficiency rate over time. And then you look at the high PCFP schools, which started from a much lower baseline, have a lot of students who qualify for PCFE and you can track their performance over time. I think some relationship between these kinds of schools and change over time, it gets you a little closer to linking, spending and performance. But this is something we wanted to present to you to see -- what you think about is this information that you want, do you just want us to stop the LEA level and I'll leave it there.

Chair Hobbs: Comments. I think we're thinking.

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen, for the record. First, I totally agree. I don't think the commission needs to level down to the LEA level. I don't see that as our role. So, I would agree I am interested in this high PCFP versus low PCFP. I think that does start to get my wheels turning as a commission member asking some questions on allocations and resources. So I see value in that. How extensive that would be, I'm not sure, but

I'd like to see it.

Paul Johnson: Member Johnson, for the record. I just want some clarity on the graphic so that I make sure that I understand that. So when it says that there's high PCFP, that means that the amount per pupil that that school district received was higher than peers.

Dr. Sean Tanner: And now this is fake data that just to illustrate what it might look like. So this isn't the real chart, this is just to show you an example of what we're thinking of. My suggestion, well, I'll put it as a question. You can think about the PCFP dollars that were actually received or the count of PCFP eligible students at that school. So, it's like intent versus actual actually treated. And they tell you different things. And I imagine, just arraying the per pupil PCFP student count across schools in the state. Here we go, chopping them up into piles of thirds. And just looking at the lowest third compared to the highest third. It gives you a better split than the median because there's a lot of noise in the bottom half. In the first half, would it get like a little closer to the tails of the distribution just to see more action in who's been more intensively treated by this policy change versus less intensively treated? And you would have these graphs for performance, expenditures and staffing.

Paul Johnson: And so, the follow up question I had, is this done by school size? Because inherently small schools are going to have a much higher per pupil amount than larger schools. So, but I don't know how you do that across the state.

Justin Silverstein: Justin Silverstein for the record, I think the advantage of using the student characteristics and not the overall spending teases out that additional funding that's taking into account the smaller setting, having [indiscernible] economies of scale. And so, I think that's one of the questions here. If you use the per pupil amount that's going to, you're going to define these groups, including the adjustments for size. If you use student characteristics, you take out that adjustment.

Chair Hobbs: From the questions and comments, is there support? Okay. Any other parameters that we want to discuss or you have enough to move on?

Dusty Casey: I think so.

Chair Hobbs: Alright.

Dusty Casey: You know what, actually, why don't we just -- we'll go there for a second. And for the expenditure data, how should it be broken down at the school level and what is possible and what would tell the most meaningful story? Now we're down to the school level. And so, when you see these graphs and imagine the Y axis no longer math proficiency rate, but Y axis is expenditures per pupil. Do you want expenditures per pupil disaggregated some way state local, FED, PCAP if that's available?

Paul Johnson: Member Johnson for the record. Well, initially just by function, because we have the function codes which identify whether it's instruction, student support, staff support, the school administration operations and maintenance, so on and so forth, that to me makes the most sense. Secondly, if there's a way to identify that by fund, I don't know, for down the road, that would be incredibly helpful immediately for legislators and folks to take a look at. I think it could be put together.

Chair Hobbs: And a few nods. So is there a concurrence with that?

Paul Johnson: Mm-hm.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Thank you.

Dusty Casey: So, I don't think we need to recap. I think we've gone through all the considerations and we've gotten feedback and now Dr. Krausan will take over.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Okay. Kelsey Krausan for the record. Thank you. And just one more comment on this. Performance report is the idea behind the design is that it doesn't take a PhD researcher necessarily to recreate these reports each year, that it's something that could be recreated internally with NDE in future years. So, okay, we're going to go through the recommendations to date, provide a bit of an inventory around the reporting framework. And this is really just a review of recommendations that have already been made, which we thought would make sense to review after thinking about the performance report. And in light of the wire frame, the work around the wire frame and data dashboard, these two different reporting mechanisms. So, recommendations that the commission have made, chair Hobbs mentioned this earlier to change from quarterly to annual reporting. The timing of data reporting is the fall, November was the recommended time. We'll talk a little bit more about that in a minute. And level of reporting to the school level, the commission recommended ensuring that they're we're avoiding any duplicative reporting and has done so in their recommendations. And then a trend analysis. And this is the one point I wanted to pause on because one of the things our team has been talking about internally is just concerns around 2020 when it comes to student outcome data and wanted to see whether or not the commission might be open to shifting that date back to 2019 in the initial collection of data as the baseline year.

Chair Hobbs: Certainly not speaking on behalf of those who may be more knowledgeable on the commission, but I know on all of the economic, and other fiscal analyses that we do. We've tended to shift more to a 2019 base year as opposed to 20 for all the reasons that have already been cited.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Okay.

Chair Hobbs: So let me just from a procedural standpoint, since this was a prior recommendation, do we need to take any specific action to amend the prior recommendation, Megan, or is what we did just did sufficient through consensus? You got that? Want to recommend that Paul?

Paul Johnson: No. But I think we do.

Chair Hobbs: No, I don't know that we do. I just want to make sure that it's clear that we have consensus that we're moving. Oh, there's Greg, there's Greg.

Greg Ott: Apologies, Chair Hobbs, for disturbing but I think to the extent that you're amending a prior action or the decision is to move away from something that was prior, previously acted upon by the commission, you should formalize that in another action to amend the action, if that makes sense.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. I'm not recalling off the top of my head whether or not this was done by a prior direct action by way of motion to cover it. We can go ahead and make a motion.

Paul Johnson: Chair Hobbs, I'll make a motion that we go back and use the 2019 information as opposed to 2020, which we may have made a motion for previously.

Punam Mathur: I'll second the motion.

Chair Hobbs: We have a motion and second, if there isn't any additional discussion, signify your support by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed? Okay. We're covered.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Excellent. Thank you. Kelsey Krausan for the record. I think we can move to the next slide. The next slide provides a summary of the commission's recommendation for the new 8,400 reporting framework. And you'll see that we divided up the categories to align with the performance summary that Sean presented on earlier. So, it looks a little bit different than how it's been presented previously. But I think there was a recommendation from the commission to both just see the overall picture of the data because we've been taking them by data point by component. And so, just to give you a better sense overall of the data that's been recommended for collection, and what that might tell you and where you'll have a lot of data to report on and where there is maybe less but more meaningful data, nonetheless. And the companion to this is an inventory of the recommendations that we included for the commission, which we can put on the screen if it's helpful, which shows the source of all of these data and the dates by which they're collected, and any other relevant notes. I think one thing I want to point out is that the commission successfully recommended a set of data, all of which is already collected. So there is no new data collection necessary from districts and charter schools. At the one complication, we have uncovered, as we did a deeper dive across all the data, is around the expenditure data reporting timeline, which is, those data are received in early November. They're reported by districts in early November and are then cleaned and validated by the end of November, which complicates the performance report inclusion and the performance report. So, there are a couple of choices here. One is to report expenditure data for the year prior, which would mean that you'd have different years for your outcome data and your expenditure data. Another option is to provide a performance summary and in November that doesn't include all the expenditure data and have some sort of addendum in January, perhaps. That includes a deeper dive into the expenditure data, or using the 2, 4, 6 8 report, the planned expenditure data that is reported in January. So, would be available to use. And this is just, I think really to think about for this current year that there's this misalignment in the timing of the data recording. Did I miss anything there?

Chair Hobbs: So you're looking for some guidance on that. And I suppose the other way would be to try to align the reporting dates and that probably is something that's completely inconceivable, right?

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Kelsey Krausan for the record. [Crosstalk]

Chair Hobbs: In the near term it would be. Again, we're thinking a little bit. Megan, I may just ask you to go over the three different alternatives again, and then maybe we can talk about each one of those as we go through.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Okay. So for the first year, you could use student outcome data from 2324, but expenditure data from the prior year 2223 for the November report, that's option one. You could report all of the outcome data in November and then provide an addendum potentially, again, I would want Megan and others to weigh in on this with the same year's expenditure data in January when it's actually audited, it's the validated data. So it would be a bit of a separate report.

Chair Hobbs: I think between the first two. The second one sounds like it makes a lot more sense. So, we're dismissing one.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Dismissing one?

Chair Hobbs: Mm-hm.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: And then the third option is, again, just for this current performance report, using the planned expenditures, which district's report in January, rather than the actual audited expenditures for the analysis. It would then be the same year, but it would be planned expenditures instead of action.

Chair Hobbs: My first reaction to it is, and then you can correct me, is that audited data is already always better than planned data. Go ahead.

Jason Goudie: Jason Goudie for the record. I mean, I agree. I mean, one is in -- at CCSD, we have \$260 million fund spend funds in schools. So if we use plan, it's going to completely distort what actually happens. And there's different reasons. So, I would be afraid of that.

Chair Hobbs: So by process of elimination, are we at a point of consensus with the second, unless Megan has any catastrophic kinds of.

Unidentified Speaker: [Indiscernible]

Chair Hobbs: Okay, then that would be the second alternative. Thank you.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Kelsey Krausan for the record. And if any concerns arise about that or it feels really missing from this first report, we can also put our heads together to think about some other ideas for reporting to some degree on expenditure data in the November report and still providing the addendum.

Chair Hobbs: Just because you have slide 16 up of just a comment to make that has nothing to do with what we were just talking about. As we strike certain metrics from the reporting framework, something that's going to be very important for us to do in the report is justify why each one of those were stricken. I've already encountered this to a mild extent in reporting this to the joint interim legislative committee particularly around exceeding class size objectives, and how could we say that that is unimportant? Because if you strike something, there's an inference that it isn't important. While it may not necessarily fit the objectives of the reporting framework, it's not unimportant for other purposes. So, I think we need to offer that clarity because I had a couple of them rolled their eyes at me and you did. And I rolled with it.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Kelsey Krausan for the record. And it's such an important point, and I think maybe in terms of prioritizing our writeup of the framework, we could bring back to the next meeting or depending on the agenda, the rationale that we're drafting around those from what we heard from the commission and from research, for consideration sooner. [Crosstalk]

Chair Hobbs: Well, I think we have to do that for those that we are recommending to be included as well as rationale for not including something in the framework, but still recognizing its importance as a statistic for other purposes. I think that's the distinction we need to make.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: That's the conclusion. Any additional questions, discussion?

Chair Hobbs: No. Thank you. And sorry we got a little bit sideways at the beginning on that, but all of these, there's a progression and they all have to fit. Again, I know we'll have deeper discussion about other levels of reporting, but thanks very much. At this point, since we're running ahead of schedule, Paul, do you want to give a speech? Anybody object to that. Dave, thank you.

Dr. David Jensen: Thank you, Member Chair. I appreciate you giving me the floor. I just like to thank our consultants. They did a great job, especially Sean, for running my vocabulary. I learned personally today, which I had to look up while he was talking, so I appreciate that. And the personal growth. Again, I wanted to

recognize Mr. Goudie for seeing things my way. If there's anything else you would like me to add, just please feel free to call on me anytime.

Chair Hobbs: Well, let's make sure we get that moment in the report too. So, that brings us to agenda item number nine, future agenda items. Yeah, obviously that's coming back and any other cleanup that we need to do based on the matrix that you saw earlier because we want to bring closure to all of those elements in the September meeting. If possible, if we have to have an interim meeting between the regular September and October meeting to do any cleanup, we'll do that. Hopefully we can avoid that. One item that I would like to put on and have you all contribute to, and I think we talked about this at the last meeting on a going forward basis for this commission. There are a number of things that we have dealt with very directly. There are a number of things that further, this will warrant further research type of responses. I think those are items that we need to put into a form and recommend as future assignments for this commission. And based on where we are with a lot of -- because we've heard it over and over today and in other meetings, this is an ongoing process. We heard it about working groups eight and nine earlier. This is an ongoing process. And I think it would be helpful for us as a commission to provide some recommendations within the report to the governor and the legislature for next interim's work plan for this commission. I mean, let's give ourselves some assignments to complete some of the things that we've started. And this isn't a defense necessarily against waiting then for them to give us assignments, but it's suggesting -- well, maybe it is. But I think if we provide some of those parameters through the work, it allows us to bring some of them to closure, which I think we would feel better about. And also, give the legislature some sense of what the commission intends to do over the next interim. So, if you can think about those, we'll have that agenda item and we can create a list at that point that we can include in the report as additional recommendations for the commission. And I'm not quite sure how to do this. Maybe we need another item, Megan. This is just a discussion item for clarity for everyone on the commission. So we finish everything on the matrix and it all turns the right color. And we work on putting together the report that it includes all of this, and it then gets transmitted to the governor and LCB, I believe. There was a change, I think last time it was transmitted to the joint interim legislative committees on education. And this time it's transmitted. I had this conversation with Alex Rostov just the other day, and this time it's transmitted to the governor and to LCB. And so the question of, well, what happens to the, the information that's in this report and how does it get included in someone's VDR? That question came up and I think we should have some discussion around what we should do as a follow up to filing the report. We also have this now, again, unique situation where we are able to meet after November. Now we have certain deadlines that we have to hit and we'll have to finish the report by the report due date. But we're still able to meet into the session. And I guess what I'm in a very clumsy way trying to say is, do we need to develop a work plan for the commission going into the legislative session? I mean, I would think that knowing a lot of you and your passion, if there's any way for us to reinforce things that are included in the report through additional meetings and transmittals, we probably would want to do that. I don't quite know how to word this, but a discussion item around additional follow up post report filing. You guys are all going to have discussions with people in your areas about what we're doing with legislators in your areas and others. And I don't quite know how to develop that choice.

Joyce Woodhouse: Member Woodhouse for the record. Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's a clumsy process because this you've made the presentations to the Joint Interim Committee on Education. I know that they're looking at it, however, their last meeting is next week. I doubt. I haven't seen their draft yet. There could be some things based upon the presentations you've made. I don't know. It's not a secret. The majority leader of the Senate is going to have an omnibus bill for K-12. I suspect she will pick up some of these things. The report is going to the governor. He could pick up some, I don't know. And I do know there are individual legislators who are interested in the report and what the recommendations are. The incumbents have already put in their BDRs for their first round, but everybody has more BDRs available. Let's see. I think it's February. No, I think they get some more in December. And then everyone has a couple more when the session starts. And that's basically to pick up the newly electeds. So, I think it probably would be a good idea. I don't know that politically we

should identify certain people, but I do think we could come up with a plan of how to reach out to various entities to bring bill drafts forward because we don't have BDRs. The superintendent has some, but typically the Department of Ed has far more needs than they have BDRs, which then they go to legislators and ask them to, to run something. So, I think that's what my thoughts are. But I think we could come up with a general plan and some folks may be willing to take a lead on making sure that that happened and that we get to the right people. Because when the bill draft is dropped, you need someone who is going to be as the champion. So we don't need to have bills just done and then not take care of them.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, I can talk today, for the record. I would also clarify that outside of the BDRs that are adapted by the department, the department is required to be neutral when it comes to any of the other wheel drafts that are dropped for other bodies, whether it's the legislature or an individual legislator. So, are not able to engage in that part of the process, but we can serve as subject matter experts as well. And the department has already -- we were required to submit our BDRs. They were officially submitted at the beginning of this month, so weren't able to make any edits or additions to ours at this time.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I think to maybe restate what the intent was, is to try to determine, I mean, obviously, you're agnostic during the session, and I think it's probably wise for the commission as a whole to be, although individuals will certainly be called upon as experts to explain things. I guess the question is, how do we make constructive use of our time as a commission during the course of the legislative session. I'm not suggesting we form as a lobbying court or anything like that, but how do we make a constructive impact on the process? That's the question that's been in the back of my mind. So, maybe we've already talked about it here in [inaudible] Maybe an item to further discuss it, to understand our parameters would be helpful. Maybe having Greg weigh in on it so we understand that part of it a little bit more. Paul?

Paul Johnson: Chairman Hobbs, Member Johnson, for the record. I think it's a very important discussion to have in our public meeting to identify roles and information that we're going to share, who shares it, and all that information. And I think it's critically important that we make sure that we just don't offer an incredible report and then nothing happens. Because I think maybe all of us have been -- members of committees that have done some tremendous work and it ended right there. So, getting it to be actionable through the legislature. I mean, if we don't do that, then all of this work is for show. So I think it's a critical piece to all of this.

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: Alright. Yes, Member Woodhouse for the record. One thing that I think we all understand, and that is the commission itself cannot be political. But I think that one of the big things that the commission can do once the report comes out, and we can put that in our general plan from that day forward through the November, December, January, and then on into the first part of the session. Commission members can be individuals who could present to the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce about what's in the report to the Vegas Chamber, to the various business groups, the various parent groups, not to sell it, but to provide the information. I think that would be a critical role that, once again, I make sure that Mr. Hobbs says is okay, but I think it is, it's just like all the way through now, our chair has been making presentations to legislative committees and to legislators. So, I think it's just a continuation of that and its information.

Chair Hobbs: Well, we're asking that that item be placed on the agenda and to the extent that great needs to provide us any parameters, I think you just summed it up frankly. I think a lot of us will be asked questions and there is Greg. Greg did pop up.

Greg Ott: Yeah, and I was with you and Member Woodhouse said, we're just adding it to the agenda now. There are some issues about whether you can speak on behalf of the commission and what they're authorizing you to do and making sure that if you were speaking for the commission, they've authorized you to speak on

that topic. So, people don't sort of go speak in areas that are beyond the scope of what the commission wants them to be talking about. But we can certainly get to that at a future agenda item. And I appreciate the flag.

Chair Hobbs: No, that would be a very helpful clarity when someone is speaking on behalf of the commissioner, speaking as an individual or because of the job title that they hold away from this commission. Okay. So, that'll be on the agenda and I think that's takes care of agenda item number nine. There appears to be no agenda item number 10. So we'll go to agenda item number 11, public comment, period number two. And this is an opportunity for anyone from the public to provide comment on anything within the jurisdiction of this commission. So, I would first go to Carson City to see if there's anyone present that wishes to provide public comment.

Secretary: Chair Hobbs, we have no public comment in Carson City.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you so much.

Chair Hobbs: Megan, the same offer down here in Las Vegas?

Megan Peterson: Chair Hobbs, we have no public comments in Las Vegas.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. We'll then ask if there's been any public comments submitted or if there's anyone on the telephone wishing to provide public comment.

Secretary: Chair Hobbs. We do not have any callers on the line.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. And did we receive any emails?

Secretary: No sir, we have no emails as well.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Then we'll close public comment period number two. And that brings us to the end of our agenda for today. And obviously thank everybody for their work. Both the members of the commission, NDE and staff and our subject matter experts. Thank you as always. And with that, the meeting is now adjourned. It is 11:10.