

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
SEPTEMBER 13, 2024
9:00 AM**

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

TRANSCRIPT

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

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

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Megan Peterson
David Monachino
Joseph Baggs

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Amanda Brown
Kelsey Krausan
Sean Tanner

David Monachino: Sorry about that Las Vegas. We're ready to go.

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Thank you very much. Good morning. It's just a little bit after 9:04, and I'm calling the September 13th meeting of the Nevada Commission on School Funding to order. I'd like to welcome our audience here, 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: Here.

Secretary: Vice Chair Woodhouse?

Joyce Woodhouse: Here.

Secretary: Member Brune? I see her. She's there. Member Casey?

Dusty Casey: Here.

Secretary: Member Goudie.

Jason Goudie: Present.

Secretary: Member Jensen.

Dr. David Jensen: Here.

Secretary: Member Johnson?

Paul Johnson: Here.

Secretary: Member Mathur? Member Mathur? Member Mathers?

Mark Mathers: Here.

Secretary: Member McIntosh.

Jim McIntosh: Here.

Secretary: Member Rodriguez.

Kyle Rodriguez: Here.

Secretary: Chair Hobbs. Have a quorum.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much.

Nancy Brune: Member Brune is on the phone.

Chair Hobbs: Did you catch that for roll purposes? Member Brune is with us. Member Mathur, my understanding is she's on her way, so when you see her here, please mark her present.

Secretary: Will do, too. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. I'd also like to note for the record that we're joined by Deputy Attorney General Grey Ott. As we get started, we have the normal housekeeping items. Some participants may join our meeting virtually. As always, we ask for your patience with any technical difficulties we may encounter as we rely on Paul Johnson to fix those. It may take a while. 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 please turn off your microphone or mute yourself when you're not speaking, and remember to turn on your microphone or unmute when you'd like to make a comment. Remember that you're on video and being broadcast via YouTube on the NDE website. If you'd like to be recognized to make a comment, please feel free to gesture on screen and we'll make sure we acknowledge you. If I miss your indication and you'd like to comment, please respectfully or however you wish to jump in to the conversation. All the today's meeting materials available on the Commission's webpage. And I trust when Commission members are not actively engaging on their screen with us, they're reviewing materials. That brings us to public comment period number one. So, I would first go to Northern Nevada to see if we have any public comment in person in Northern Nevada.

Secretary: Chair Hobbs, there are no public comments in Carson City.

Chair Hobbs: Perfect. Thank you very much. Looking here in Las Vegas, it would appear that we have no public comment here. Do we have any public comment by way of email?

Secretary: There are no written or email comments at this time.

Chair Hobbs: Or by way of telephone.

Secretary: We have none on the line.

Chair Hobbs: Perfect. Just to remind everybody to provide public comment or testimony telephonically, you can dial area code 312-584-2401. When prompted provide meeting ID 19042398 and press pound. When prompted for a participant ID press pound again. If you're unable to attend in person, but would like to provide public comment, please submit your written statements to NVCSF@doe.nv.gov before the close of the meeting. Next item. So, we have no public comment. Next item, approval of flexible agenda. This requires a motion and a second.

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen, move to approve flexible agenda.

Secretary: Motion from Member Jensen.

Joyce Woodhouse: Second.

Chair Hobbs: Second from Vice Chair Woodhouse. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: In a little bit of a different format as we move to Agenda Item Number Four, our consent agenda, and hopefully the members have had ample opportunity to review the materials, which I believe in this

case are just made up of minutes. I'm reading through this to see. Is that correct? Is it just -- are there minutes included in the Consent Agenda?

Secretary: Chair Hobbs, that is correct.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. That's the only item in the Consent Agenda. So, we can take a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda.

Joyce Woodhouse: Member Woodhouse speaking. I move approval of the Consent Agenda, item Number Four.

Chair Hobbs: Do we have a motion?

Paul Johnson: Member Johnson, second.

Chair Hobbs: And a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Moving to Agenda Item Number Five, the Commission will receive an update on the progress made by the Nevada Department of Education since the last meeting. So, I'd like to have Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson come forward and give us her report.

Megan Peterson: Good morning, Chair Hobbs, members of the Commission. Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson for the record. I will start with a quick overview of the things that we have been working on, and then per our normal activities, I'll go through the list of outstanding deliverables that the Commission still has at task. So, since our last meeting, we have met with a couple of the work groups, namely Work Group 5 and 4 to wrap up their reports. We'll be reviewing those in more detail in a later agenda item, as well as discuss the results or intended outcomes of those in future agenda items today as well. The department did continue to meet with WestEd and APA to discuss the data pull that's necessary to support the reporting pieces of AB400 and SB98, the performance framework. I think names still to be determined for future reference. But we have been working internally to pull that information together across offices, norming on terminology for the data, so that way we have clear business rules to reference as we move forward in future years and standardizing dates on which to pull that data. And then also we're working with WestEd and APA to discuss timelines of the data as it's available and how that can inform future due dates for this report, and whether it's released as a single report, or whether we release an early release with an amendment or update at a later date as specific information becomes available later on. And again, we'll discuss that in a later agenda item today, so that way we can parse through those details in more finer granularity. Additionally, the Commission's Chair Hobbs presented to the State Board of Education at the September 4th State Board of Education meeting on the progress that the Commission has been making in the work of again 8400 in the performance reporting, as well as gave updates on the revenue projections and discussed the sales and tax revenues and how they relate to that 10-year plan for optimal funding. And then at this point, I will turn it over and hopefully the computer will connect and we'll have the overview of the deliverables that are still outstanding. Okay. So, it's still the black screen of death it looks like. So, I'm going to wait just a few more moments to see if it will connect fully.

Chair Hobbs: I know the silence can be kind of intimidating while you're waiting, Megan. Yeah, it's important we go over this. And yeah, there we go. Thank you.

Megan Peterson: There we go. Okay. So, high level, we have -- we were able to close out the requirements to meet letter of intent submitted by the legislature after the last biennium or after the last session. And so we

did discuss as a refresher Nevada Cost of Education Index, the use of the EL wait for dual language programs, as well as special education. So, based on recommendations from the August meeting, we are updating that report to the legislature. And so, once we deliver that in the next few weeks, we will be able to finalize this and mark this section complete. That brings us to the interim report that was established under SB98 that has a deliverable of November 15th. And that included areas such as the Small School District's ability to acquire capital through either the creation of a revolving fund for loans, the Nevada Infrastructure Bank -- Bank, excuse me, or other options such as the Municipal Bond Bank. Additionally that included, as part of SB98's deliverables, a review of the teacher recruitment and retention pipeline. And those recommendations were discussed at the last meeting as well. And so, this will be part of the package of reports that we provide to the Commission after today's meeting to begin working through finalizing all of that in the single report that we'll be looking to submit in November. Also, part of the Commission's deliverables under AB400 and codified in NRS 387 are the remaining metrics that we've been working through, such as reviewing the statewide adjusted base, again the 10-year plan with the sales and various revenue sources. Reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of the people-centered funding plan as it currently exists. Recommendations as necessary to the cost adjustment factors in CEI, Nevada Cost of Education Index and the attendance area adjustment and then breaking out further into that quarterly report as required under AB400, working through the various metrics, making recommendations based on those metrics for improvement, which will again today will be discussed in a later agenda item. So, we are quickly coming up towards the end, but we will be finalizing a number of these today, so that way, again, the Commission can begin working through that report and fine tuning the recommendations to be finalized for November. And that concludes my presentation.

Chair Hobbs: And Megan, just to talk through the process here for everyone on the Commission, just to be aware, you made mention of the fact that you all have been compiling a report that is made up of the individual subject items that we've been dealing with throughout the course of the last many, many months. And I have look -- started to look through a copy of that, that is going to form the basis of our final report. And I would expect over the next week or two, I'll be going through that with you all just to make sure it's in good form. Now, for the Commission, we intend to bring that full report -- well, first of all, we intend to get it back out to you. It should be a reflection of everything that we have done up to this point. So, there shouldn't really be any surprises in the report, but we want to get it out to all of you in enough time to go through it and review it. And the intent would be to -- and this is where I need a little bit of guidance and direction. If we're super lucky, bring it back before the end of October for everyone to look at. We have left ourselves a meeting date of November 8th, which is one week before the report is due to also provide ourselves a little bit more time to make any additions or modifications to that report before it's finally approved by the Commission, probably on November 8th. Now, we did that in the event that there hopefully will be no unforeseen circumstances that lead to not being able to act on the full report no later than November 8th, but that's the time schedule that we're on at this point. So, our ability to bring some additional closure to items today, as you saw with Megan's report would be extremely helpful in being able to pull all of that together. And of course an agenda item or two that we have on today provides us an opportunity to put additional information into the report above and beyond that, which was mandated for us to do by way of recommendations that we would be making to the legislature for future work assignments to this Commission. So, that's sort of where we are with this. I've been looking forward to getting to this point, but starting this next week for the next few weeks, we will be -- in report, we'll be in the process of filling out the balance of the report and putting it into good order. You know, this one has been a little bit more difficult to deal with in the report that we filed a couple of years ago. The one that we filed a couple of years ago was more limited to a couple of topics, like you know what is optimal funding and how would you go about funding that? And I wouldn't say that was an easy report to write, but again it was a single sort of logical sequence of subjects. This time we have subjects that vary a great deal and don't necessarily link to one another. And so, the thinking was that we would put this report together probably -- and Megan, you can maybe help correct me here, but those things that were mentioned by SB98 and those by AB400, sort of order it that way and then have subtopics within each section and each one of the individual topics, we would -- we'd like to have them be liftable from the overall report in the event any individual

legislator or committees or anyone else wants to take a deeper dive into those. And that's kind of the way we're looking to construct this. So, it's a bit of a different animal than what we dealt with a couple of years ago. Any questions about where we are with that? Okay. Thanks for your report, Megan.

Mark Mathers: Chair Hobbs.

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Mark Mathers: Sorry, Mark Mathers. We had a discussion a while back on At-Risk, and I know there was a lot of concern from a lot of different districts and others about it, where -- and I thought we had directed APA or WestEd to look at that and come back. Maybe I missed it, but what's the -- what's the status of our review of At-Risk?

Chair Hobbs: Well, I'll look for anybody else to give their impressions of where we were. I'll start out and give mine and then you can correct me. My understanding is that we went through a review of At-Risk that was largely focused on the use of the Infinite Campus GRAD score and made some -- a series of recommendations around that. You know, a couple that come to mind were, you know just by way of example, not having a fixed percentage that I think was fixed previously at 20%. We made a recommendation that that should be recalculated, reevaluated and flowed over time. We made recommendations with regard to continual monitoring of the performance of GRAD scores. And I'm sure I'm leaving -- and I'm sure I'm leaving a couple out. I don't have all of them committed to memory, but it was my feeling that from a commission perspective, we brought closure to the discussion of At-Risk. Certainly the topic will continue to be a very sensitive topic on a lot of fronts. It was a topic that came up in the meeting last week with the State Board of Education, and I imagine it will be with the legislature as well. Anybody else want to add anything to where we are or correct anything that I said? Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: Chair Hobbs, Member Woodhouse for the record. No, I think you encapsulated exactly what our action was. And the bottom line is this will be continued to be monitored. And I was present at the State Board of Ed meeting last week when you presented. And for all of you that didn't get a chance to see it and hear it, the board members did have a number of questions for our Chair, which he answered extremely well. And I think we're all on the same page now going forward. And part of that same page is to be working together with the State Board and the Department. And so, as far as -- I think what we what we decided upon at the last meetings regarding the At-Risk definition, what the Chair indicated is correct. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: So, Mark, I'd go back to you. Is there -- do you have any particular discomfort or concern about where we're with that?

Mark Mathers: Thanks for asking. I don't have -- I went online and the last minutes I see that are posted are February. We had a discussion in January. We had two agenda items in February, but I don't see any motions with specific recommendations, at least as of that meeting in February that are noted in the minutes. And I just had not thought we had reached a consensus on the GRAD score -- you know, continued use of the GRAD score versus a weighted index that didn't use AI. I just don't remember that we circled back on certain issues. And if it was at the last meeting that those motions or recommendations were made, I wasn't here at the last meeting, so I apologize that I didn't see that. But I just -- I'm struggling to find where the Commission actually made a recommendation. Again, maybe it happened in March or April, and I just don't have the minutes, but I worry that -- you know, we had pretty lengthy discussions on the issue, and I just -- sorry, I don't remember it coming back with any solid recommendation, but again I could be wrong. I see Megan is wanting to speak, so.

Chair Hobbs: I'm glad Megan came forward because I was going to ask whether or not you all can help point to where those motions or decisions or consensus or however we did it was actually achieved.

Megan Peterson: Thank you, Megan Peterson for the record. So, unfortunately it appears that the meeting minutes for March have not been posted to the Department website yet. But I did pull up the compilation of recommendations that have been made so far. And we did note that on March 22nd, the Commission made a motion to recommend continuing the use of Infinite Campus GRAD score to identify those students at risk of not graduating. And that we would continue to work with third-party experts over the next biennium to evaluate its effectiveness, effectively staying the course so that way we're not subjecting the funding to significant changes as a result of the evaluation. There was also the recommendation, as noted earlier, to potentially remove the quintile of performance from statute and make it a metric that's determined by the State Board of Education and then also renaming that At-Risk Weight to Student Success Support.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you, Megan. That, that's my recollection too. But I'd ask as the, the minutes come together for March, we just provide the additional assurance that all of those were acted on. You know, Mark raises a good point. The last thing we want to do is leave a loose end out there. Again, my recollection was that we took action on those, but then again, I don't want to rely on my recollection at this point. So, let's provide that assurance, and if you can and would let Member Mathers know that indeed was a part of our prior actions, I think that would be helpful. Does that take care of it, Mark?

Mark Mathers: Yes. Thank you very much.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Any other questions for Megan at this time? Seeing none, we'll move to Agenda Item Number Six, Information, discussion and possible action regarding work group activities. And again, this is a possible action item. We're looking to try to bring closure to working group -- subject matters around Working Groups Number 3, 4 and 5. And according to the script that I have here, I am supposed to first turn to a Member Goudie to present his update, so you can proceed whenever you're ready.

Jason Goudie: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. Jason Goudie for the record. Just a pretty brief update. What our team and group has been working on is really working on finalization of the report. We've got a very good draft in place. We've been lucky enough to have Mr. Johnson grab the -- join the subgroup here and there to help as well given the relationship between his final results and what we're doing as well. And so, we've been working through that. Ultimately, right now, the report is in pretty good shape. We've got the group going through it, adding comments and reviewing. And really it just basically encapsulates the summary that we had provided a few meetings ago of the recommendations and ultimately what the Commission agreed to move forward with recommendations. And we'll continue to work on that and have it ready on time. That's where we are.

Chair Hobbs: Just one follow up question to that. So, with regard to that particular report, do we think we would have that report ready for acceptance by the Commission at the October meeting?

Jason Goudie: Yeah, I believe we are in good shape. I'm going to -- you know, I know that either Amanda and/or Kelsey are on. They're helping really kind of do the finalization, but I think based off what we have reviewed last time and the shape of that report, I think we'll certainly be ready for October.

Chair Hobbs: Outstanding. Any questions? Okay. Next up is Paul Johnson to present on Work Group Number 4.

Paul Johnson: Thank you. Chair Hobb. Yeah, so Work Group 4, we have a draft completed and it's been reviewed by all the working group members. So, we think we're ready to go to print on this for the full board to take a -- to take a look at. It's designed to look at strategies to increase the efficacy, efficiency, transparency, and accountability of public schools. Talks about the existing metric within SB98, AB400 and how to

operationalize that with recommendations, if you recall, to eliminate some with the rationale why and to modify some and the rationale as well. And then a little snippet about kind of a forward-looking plan and the need to upgrade the performance framework and come up with a more meaningful framework. So, that's kind of the highlight of the contents of the report and we should have it ready for the October meeting.

Chair Hobbs: Sounds great. Any other questions for Paul before we move on? And of course lastly with regard to Working Group Number 5. Dr. Brune, do you have a report to give?

Nancy Brune: We do. Our group met at least once, if not twice, since the last meeting. Thanks to Amanda and Kelsey, we also have a very succinct, readable report. I think we're still in the process of collecting some last-minute comments about the draft, myself included. But we will -- I feel like we have a -- we'll definitely be ready to present for approval or presentation and approval by the October meeting. And thank you again to Amanda and Kelsey, for pulling all of our conversations into a really nice coherent report. We appreciate the support.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks very much. Questions, comments? Okay. And just to add on to this item it is our hope to also have the updated funding targets and recommendations of alternative funding scenarios for the October meeting. Item Number Seven, Information discussion and possible action regarding updates to the reporting requirements and potential categories for the new reporting framework. So, we have with us Dr. Kelsey Krausan and Dr. Sean Tanner from WestEd. Welcome. Megan, I assume they're with us up North, correct?

Megan Peterson: Chair, we have the team from West Ed calling in, and we have Amanda with APA here in the North. So, they're just getting led into the room and Amanda's just finishing setting up.

Chair Hobbs: Okay, fantastic. Go ahead and proceed whenever you're ready.

Amanda Brown: Thank you, Chair. Sean, I'm wondering, do we maybe want to start with your piece and while Kelsey is getting logged in, we'll switch? Oh, there's Kelsey. Perfect.

Dr. Sean Tanner: Yeah, Kelsey is here.

Amanda Brown: Okay. So, I will turn it over to Kelsey and Sean. I'm just going to Vanna White the slides for them, so that's what I'll be doing here.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Okay. Good morning, Chair Hobbs and, and the Commission. So, today we're going to talk -- provide some -- a summary of the input that we've received from NDE offices about current reporting requirements. As you know Work Group 3 did -- under Chair Goudie did lots of work to gather input from school districts about current reporting requirements. In this next phase of the work we act -- we asked NDE offices to provide input as well to think about ways to further refine, streamline some of the current reporting requirements in the state. And then I'll turn it over to Sean, who, as Megan mentioned earlier, is going to talk about just the timing of future performance reports given when data is received and analyzed by the state. And then we'll open it up to all of you. And of course, as always, please jump in with questions as we're going. Okay. So, just really quickly, the process that we employed to get input from NDE offices, we used the spreadsheet that was put together by Work Group Three, but streamlined it a bit, so it only had those reports that are required by the state. And then we shared those lists out with NDE offices and we focused in on the reports that we got input on that they were actually responsible for working with. So, we wanted those who were most closely familiar with the reports to be weighing in on them. Okay. Next slide. And we asked about for their input on the frequency of the reports, how often they use the information and how often is the information collected, is that too frequent? Do they need the information more frequently or should it remain as is? We also asked about their use of the reports, and we had a selection that they could choose from. And then we

asked them if there was another report that collected similar information and the importance of the report to their work. And then finally, we asked them for their recommendations on whether or not the report could be eliminated, streamlined, or consolidated. Okay. So, we put together a memo on this, which has been shared, and so we invite you to open that up. If it's helpful to you, there's more information in there. But the first area, as I mentioned, was around the frequency, NDE offices' input on the frequency of reporting. And these four reports really raised -- were raised as ones where the frequency was not aligned with need in the state from NDE offices' perspective. And these first two I think that what we see here is that very much aligns with a recommendation that the Commission has already made to eliminate the quarterly reporting, retain a single -- an annual reporting on class size reduction. And then the next, the third and fourth reports listed here, were ones that we hadn't discussed yet around a biannual consultant report, which the NDA offices -- two offices said should only be collected annually. And then a physical conditions of schools report, the recommendation here was to collect this every two years, rather than collecting it annually as it's currently collected. And I should say we're going to present -- there's quite a bit of information that we've collected here. We know that the Commission has already made recommendations on streamlining requirements. So, the sort of there -- it's up to you whether or not you want to take additional action at this time or set another -- you know, put this back on the agenda for another meeting to really dig in more deeply into these reports and make some additional recommendations. Okay. Onto the next one.

Chair Hobbs: Kelsey, to the point that you just raised, if there are items that we can work through sufficiently that Members of the Commission would want to take action on them, the sooner we do that the better for all the reasons that we've already cited with respect to putting together reports and a compilation of recommendations. So, if there are items that you all feel are ready for consideration by this Commission, we would -- I'm looking at everybody to make sure what I'm saying is this works for you, but I would think that we would want to be ready to take action on those as we go through them.

Dr. David Jensen: Chair Hobbs, this is Member Jensen.

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Dr. David Jensen: Kelsey, could we go back to that slide? So, I'm looking at the first two reports, application for Plan of Class Size Reduction in our quarterly CSR reports. I would absolutely love to go to an annual report. I just want to ensure, and maybe Megan can speak to this, sorry to put Megan under pressure, but right now we have to report that quarterly and it goes to the State Board of Education. In particular, it's if we have class sizes that exceed the recommended thresholds. And in Humboldt, I've got a couple of grade levels already now that exceed the CSR expectations. And so, it has to go to the State Board of Education to approve the fact that I'm over. It's never been denied. So, I can see that's why it's there. But does that put us in conflict with the State Board of Education? Would they be comfortable in not seeing this quarterly?

Megan Peterson: Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson for the record. So, the proposal would change that process overall and that would be something that we would certainly have to work through them with. But if it did move to an annual process then that would effectively mean that the State Board wouldn't be reviewing them quarterly and also in turn the Interim Finance Committee. So, that is one piece that quarterly those are submitted to the State Board. Once the State Board approves them or not, then we move it forward to the Interim Finance Committee for their review as well. So, that would be a change to that process that we'd have to address.

Dr. David Jensen: So Member Jensen, with a bit of a follow up, so are we envisioning that there would be an annual report at the conclusion of the school year that looks back and says, Humboldt County, you exceeded class sizes in these. And so, now it's a reflection back of how districts have managed CSR.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. I think that that would ultimately be a recommendation that the Commission would make, but I do think that that would make sense.

Dr. David Jensen: Thank you.

Mark Mathers: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Mark Mathers: Mark Mathers. Just to piggyback on Member Jensen's comments, I was part of these discussions. I think the discussion on the second row CSR reports was somewhat to report on actual class sizes, but not to have to go into the explanation of why we couldn't meet those class sizes. In other words, it's just a numerical reporting of actual class sizes and eliminating the explanations of why we didn't meet it, which boiled down for Washoe largely to, we don't have the funding to do it. So, you know, which seems silly to just say that repeatedly in every waiver situation. So, I think that was the idea. And then on the first row, the CSR plan, I mean, I think actually the recommendation may have been to eliminate that, because again, this goes back to the old CSR categorical program that's been eliminated. And so, I guess I'd want to probe why we even think that plan is useful. And I'll just say I've checked with my staff, you know, we have to annually submit the report now. So, it is -- the CSR plan is an annual plan. We've never gotten any feedback on any of our responses to questions in the -- you know, that we're required to answer in the plan. And so, I just don't know where the plan really goes and what is done with the plan. Maybe this was a kind of a compromise recommendation, but you know again goes back to the lack of funding to meet target class sizes of the state. And so, many districts just repeat kind of year after year, "We don't have the funding to do this." But just I really don't know the value of a plan like that until there is adequate or optimal funding for districts. We're going to be short of the class size targets that the State Board of Education would want us to have.

Amanda Brown: Amanda Brown, for the record, I believe where we landed on the recommendation because what we're seeing here is what NDE staff thought that seemed aligned to what -- where the Commission had landed when they made their recommendation, I believe, was to keep the annual plan report and eliminate quarterly reporting on CCSR because there was discussion of somewhat the appearance of not wanting to have it look like reducing class size wasn't important. So, I believe it was a bit of a compromise to keep the annual plan in place is where the, I believe, Commission's recommendation had landed before. Obviously, subject to change if you all want to reopen that, but I believe that's where we landed. Kelsey, does that seem accurate? I'm seeing a nod in the corner.

Joyce Woodhouse: Mr. Chair?

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: Member Woodhouse for the record. Yes, Amanda, that is exactly what I remember. And I know that I made some comments at the time. Yes, we all know that we don't have the funds for a reduction in class sizes as it should be. But I think the intent is that if we keep the plan in place in statute, the requirement for it annually is certainly enough. But to keep it on the forefront of what the needs are in K12 funding and one of those very basic needs is additional funding for class size. I think it would be a problem if the plan was removed from statute because then it takes it off the table and then it's so easy to just let it go and that would be very detrimental for our students. So, I think we really should continue with what we had already agreed to, and that was to keep the plan in statute as an annual report and definitely the quarterly ones to be consolidated into one annual. And that's my recollection.

Chair Hobbs: And just to provide a couple of other supporting comments to what Vice Chair Woodhouse just

said, in the occasions that I've had to appear in front of the joint interim committees and other groups over the course of the last several months when we've summarized a lot of the recommendations that we've made up to this point, we come to the one on class size, there are always some furrowed brows when that's brought up. And I've had to explain mostly sidebar that it isn't that class size has become a -- become an unimportant statistic. It's a very relevant statistic that supports the arguments that we're trying to make on behalf of funding. However, I think a couple of the comments that we've heard so far, the filing of quarterly reports and the usefulness of those and actions taken as a consequence and mitigation or anything else that you want to bring forward is just not a part of that. You could get the same thing from an annual report that you can from four quarterly reports. So, I think that's why we landed where we landed. So, my question here would be -- and Mark, I want to go back to you because you brought up the questions, and to ensure that any of the questions that you had about the wording here have been satisfied. Let me go back to you first before we move forward with this.

Mark Mathers: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. I think sometimes we mix the reporting, the concept of the reporting, which is line two with the concept of the plan which is line one and we mix those two things. That said I do understand what Senator Woodhouse is saying about keeping class sizes, you know, as an elevated issue for all to consider and can't argue with that rationale. So, I'll let it go. It just sometimes feels like these are processes where everyone's just checking a box, repeating the same language from a prior year. And again, no, no, no -- it doesn't generate any interaction or feedback between the districts and the Department of Ed or Board of Ed. But I totally understand what Senator Woodhouse is saying, and I'll -- I'm fine with it.

Chair Hobbs: Let me just add this before we move forward with whatever we're going to do here. Whenever we make recommendations like this, they need to be accompanied, particularly in the report with a lot of supporting information about why. Otherwise it leaves a number of questions that could make people wonder. Your point is well taken between reporting Mark and the plan itself and we're, you know, certainly not turning a blind eye to the plan, the importance of class size reduction. And I think we need to make that clear. What we're really talking about here is whether there's any efficiencies associated with more frequent reporting on something that can be reported on less often and still achieve the same impact. I think that's what we're talking about, but I -- but my point would be that there needs to be adequate explanation for everything that we're providing, so it isn't misconstrued. So, with that Megan or Kelsey, let me ask, do we need to take any additional action on what appears before us at this time?

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Kelsey Krausen, for the record, I think only -- since the Commission has already made a recommendation related to annual plan for class size reduction and the quarterly reports, no action is necessary to confirm that recommendation. I don't think it sounds like no changes are being made. It's only if you wanted to weigh in on the consultant report or a physical condition of schools report, which would be new recommendations.

Chair Hobbs: No, I would just -- I would just simply say that we do need to -- I've already said it. I mean, we do need to offer as much supporting explanation as possible, so it is clearly understood what the objective is here, so no action needed. We can certainly move forward.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Okay. So I would say there were quite a number of reports that NDE offices provided input on -- recommendation to eliminate 26 reports in total, and then many more that they provided input to suggest that 22 reports either streamlined or consolidated. And then there was a handful of reports also that NDE offices said the reports were rarely or never used, but should be kept as is. And I think in those cases, we think it's worth following up with the offices to really understand if a report is not being used or being used infrequently to understand more deeply why to retain those reports, the function that they're -- that they have in the state.

So, I think we could take a look right now at the memo that shows those recommendations around reports that could be eliminated. And then our team with APA plans to meet with NDE offices and spend some more time really digging into those other reports that NDE offices have recommended for streamlining or elimination, because I think that there's definitely room to understand more of the rationale there. But these 26 reports, there was too much to put on the slide. So, looks like Amanda's pulling up. And we're showing you these to see if there's any that really resonate with you and the Commission thinks would like to make a recommendation to move for elimination. So, you should have this memo also, but just a report on the number of dropouts, the biennial report on class size reduction. We have a few notes here and work-based learning, there's -- so let us know if you'd like us to stop on any of these capital improvement reports.

Jason Goudie: Thanks. Jason Goudie for record. So, I think that as we go through this, similar to the way we kind of reverse engineered, you know, our first attempt at, you know, taking the district components and working with the other groups, you know, I would love to take this detailed list back to our teams and get feedback. I can't imagine anybody at our district is going to say, "Hey, if the NDE wants to get rid of something, we want to keep it, keep doing it." But I just want to validate that piece because I think that would be good and I'm assuming, you know, the other CFOs could take back to their districts as well and just get some feedback very, very quickly, because again we'll be looking at a list. But again, you know, given the size of our district, I don't know enough about any of these reports to opine and I don't want to misspeak. But again, NDE is certainly experts on these pieces, and if they're not being used, they're not useful, I'm pretty sure our team will support, but that would be good to be able to validate.

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen, if I can just chime in, this aligns with one of the recommendations that's come out of NASA [ph] as well to reduce the number of reporting requirements and I see several of these were on our list. So, I agree with what Jason said. The more we can streamline and get rid of, I think you'll have universal support from districts.

Chair Hobbs: So I assume that would apply to both the elimination of reports and the -- I think the word that was used was streamlining of reports, taking those lists back those who -- you know, Paul, Mark, Kyle, others that work -- and obviously Dave, that work in and with those that are preparing the reports to get concurrence on all of those lists. And then for the October meeting, be able to bring it back in the form of a specific recommendation, listing all of the reports for elimination once we know there's concurrence and those for streamlining. If you still want to go through the list of the reports to be streamlined and talk about those, I think that might be helpful. But that I think is the -- that's a good course, Jason.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: That list was less clear on the action that should be taken. And at times there was in -- recommendations that were somewhat like sometimes people use consolidation rather than stream -- when we thought maybe they meant streamline. And so, we decided not to include all of the -- the list of those reports yet, because we'd like to meet with the offices to talk to them a bit more, but we'd be happy to provide that information back. We have it in our records and certainly can provide it. So, it's not included in the memo yet.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. And if that could come back again at the October meeting with some more specifics attached to it so we could move that forward, that would be fantastic.

Jason Goudie: And if we could get --

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Absolutely.

Chair Hobbs: I'm sorry.

Jason Goudie: And if districts can get that in there so we can review that as well, like a comprehensive.

Chair Hobbs: The question from Member Goudie was also providing that to the districts as soon as possible so they can include that in their internal reviews.

Dr. Kelsey Krausan: Happy to. And that really concludes our reporting. I think just the overall take here from our team is that there is considerable additional work to be done in this area, and that this will just be an ongoing and iterative process as you and our research team continues to collect data from those who are involved in using and requiring these reports.

Chair Hobbs: Well, thank you for that additional clarification, Kelsey, because hearing the number of reports and learning what I have over the last, however long it's been, three and a half years or so about all of the different reporting, this is really the first tranche of reports that are being reviewed and recommended for either elimination or merging with other reports. And I would expect it would be an ongoing process. And I think we need to also make that clear in the findings that we put forth in the report, that this isn't it, this is just the beginning. This is the, you know, the first harvest, if you will. Member Mathur had a comment as well.

Punam Mathur: Thanks Chair Hobbs. Member Mathur, for the record. I've seen several of these reports, the reference that it's not useful, but it's required for compliance. So, it would be helpful just to know who we're complying, like whose dumb rule is it that's making us waste our time, right? If it's federal, that may be a war not to wage. Is it regulatory? Can we talk to the State Board? So, I just saw that reference many times and it was just the curiosity in my head is who is the originator of this dumb requirement for a report that no one is using?

Chair Hobbs: Think, you know, the wording that we use, we might want to, you know, soften up a bit.

Punam Mathur: Yeah. I'm not in charge of the drafting of the report, but I just wanted to make real clear the rationale so that [indiscernible] can do a better job of that and avoid use the word dumb in the report.

Chair Hobbs: Whose idea was this? Okay. Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: Member Woodhouse for the record. Thank you, Mr. Chair. One just popped out at me when I turned the pages on that, the ones to consider eliminating and the empowerment school compiled reports and the audit, and then over on the right-hand side they -- this has not existed since 2010. That's a long time ago. It is just -- it's unbelievable that we have not dealt with things like this. So, I think this is just, you know, the -- those of you both WestEd and APA and our teams that are working on this, you are doing a great service to eliminate some of these things that don't exist. And then look at the ones that really need to be looked at whether they are streamlined or consolidated. I just really appreciate the work you're doing because I've heard for years about the number of reports and we just add them, add and add every legislative session. And as I've said before, I have always been one of the culprits who've added reports in legislation. So, I really appreciate the, the fine tuning of this and realizing too, we all have to realize that we can't do all of these this time, but it's something that we'll need to monitor and continue to work on. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Member Johnson.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, thank you, Member Hobbs. I appreciate Member Woodhouse's recognition of her recovery report-aholic syndrome that she has. I think that's amazing. Yeah. First of all, this is -- this is great. I think we all know that we -- there's a lot of effort that goes in to produce information that goes nowhere. And I think this is proof of that. But I think most importantly we want to make sure that we have some sort of recommendation, which I think we have to make sure that we don't repeat this because as people change and players change, and when we forget about where we are at this point in time, there's going to be administrative

creep that happens. And the potential for us to undo this and have it redone again exists. So, I don't know if there's a solution to that. I think what we had recommended at one point is that before there are new reports considered that that kind of be vetted through NDE first so that there's aren't ancillary reports. The reports that will come -- that we produce should be to support and prop up the framework that we're using to judge performance for finance and academic performance. Anything ancillary should not -- it would be dumb by some people's standards. So, I don't know how this Commission can sternly recommend something like that, or whether that would even be beneficial, but there's the potential that we undo this and then a decade from now, you know, the definition of insanity is realized.

Chair Hobbs: So, I think what we need to do is add a reporting requirement for all of the districts to report on all of the reporting that they're doing. That sound right?

Punam Mathur: Quarterly.

Chair Hobbs: But you know you -- quarterly. Yeah. No, you raised a very good point. I mean, there's some things like this that are analogous in taxation. You know, for example sales tax exemptions. There's a very long list of those, and a lot of them were put into place for things that were maybe an issue back in 1967 and they've never been modified. And, you know, we're trying to get them to a point of doing at least an every four year review of the usefulness of, you know, whether or not they're still serving a social purpose. And I think that, you know, what part of this recommendation, that makes it an ongoing process, needs to emphasize the fact that it needs to be reviewed, particularly as new reporting requirements are added. Because that will happen there, there's no question about it. And that maybe the new reporting requirements should go through a process. I think this is what you're alluding to, Paul, that if the data already exists, you don't have to do a new report. You just have to redirect the data to whoever is then not going to pay attention to it. Right? Okay. So, that -- anything else on Agenda Item Number Seven? Agenda Item Number Eight.

Amanda Brown: Chair?

Chair Hobbs: Yes, I'm sorry,

Amanda Brown: Chair. We actually have a few more slides on the timing of future performance reports that I believe are also a part of this agenda item.

Chair Hobbs: Ah, my apologies. Please go ahead.

Dr. Sean Tanner: Okay. This is Sean Tanner with WestEd for the record. Hey everyone, this should be short and sweet. Last time we spoke, we spoke about the report. Remember, this is a summary report of the AB400 metrics that can be printed out and laid on your desk. And we talked about which metrics, what -- you want to go into that and over what time horizon and how to link the funding to the performance. That is all set. What we're talking about now is that there's a mismatch between when some of that data is available for reporting and when you would ideally like to have this report printed out and laid on your desk. So, some data elements are not available until January. You all meet for the last time in December. The legislative session begins the first Monday in February and odd years. So, that means two things. A November report will have a hybrid of data that is five months old, so from the most recent school year, and 17 months old for the data elements that are not ready yet from the prior school year. A March report would have data that is current through the prior June. So about seven months old. Okay? So, by March, a report could be ready, that has all of the prior school year's data. In November it's a hybrid. That is a structural challenge that is not likely to go away. And so, Amanda, if you could advance the slide. Thank you. That sets up a couple of options. There's the option of a comprehensive report in March that just has all of the prior year's data, nothing before that, or an early release report in November that you can see while you're still in meeting. And then a spring supplement that adds in

the data that wasn't ready yet for the fall. And really that those are sort of the choices for timing. So, there's a early release with the spring supplement, or there's just waiting until the spring, but that would sort of rob you of the ability to chew through it before you conclude business in December. So, we just wanted to highlight this and discuss it. I think -- and I think that's it.

Chair Hobbs: Point of clarification with the change that occurred about when this Commission can meet, do we really conclude in December?

Dr. Sean Tanner: That's way above my pay grade. Megan?

Chair Hobbs: That may be a Megan or you or?

Megan Peterson: Deputy Superintendent, Megan Peterson for the record. The statute currently does prescribe that the Commission can meet no later than December 31st of each even numbered year. But can be called upon by members of various offices such as the Legislature, the Governor's Office, to come back to meet during the effectively legislative session period. And then assuming that the Commission does effectively conclude on December 31st, they are able to effectively meet again starting July 1st of each odd numbered year. So, I'm sure that's [indiscernible].

Chair Hobbs: Okay. I think I have that. So, as of the end of December, we go into somewhat of a hiatus, unless called upon.

Megan Peterson: That is correct.

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: This is Member Woodhouse for the record. And this is bringing back to me conversations that we had during the last legislative session when we were -- when we were dealing with the issue of the Commission ends on, at that time, November. And then the ball was kind of dropped until it can be reinstated after the session. So, the concern was, just so that everyone understands, that piece of time between the start of the legislative session and the end of the legislative session, the compromise -- as some of us talked about before the meeting started today, the compromise would be to be able to call us in to address something that had come up so that we could get information to the Governor's Office, to the State Board of Ed, to the Legislature if needed, before the session ended. And so -- and the bottom line for that was NDE staff and legislative staff, both legal and fiscal are running 24/7 all the way through the legislative session. So, we were trying not to have meetings for the sake of having a meeting, you know, per se during the legislative session. But we would stand by to be ready to address something that needed to be addressed for those various entities in that period of time.

Chair Hobbs: As a body?

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes, as a body.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Well, let's see. So, with respect to the timing of the reporting, which is in front of us here, comments, recommendations from members of the Commission? Please.

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. For the record Member Mathur. Thank you, Sean, for laying it out in a way that shows us the twister board, I guess, I also forget where to put our arms and feet. It seems important to get early indication on something as significant as this. And what we've been really trying to do is to shift the mindset in the state to make your decisions based on reliable, useful, and thoughtful data. So, to get an early release report appeals to me, because the earlier the better for purposes of thoughtfulness, especially

given that the Legislature meets after that. It also makes great sense to supplement, refresh, update, to get final reports in March, except for it's awkward that in March we can't meet unless especially called for. Because ultimately, I hope I live long enough to see the day when our accountability systems are really refined, our funding is at least average, and that we are getting serious about looking at what the data says to make real time adjustments to benefit the babies in the state. And so in [indiscernible], it seems like we should receive the report with a lot of fanfare, like the Economic Forum, for example, comes to mind, so that people are looking for that one thing to happen every March. Even though it'll be every other year in the middle of a legislative session, it still is not too late to make decisions in real time to try to -- so in terms of usefulness, the Early Release Report in November, with the supplement in March, makes the most sense to me. And if there's a way that we can extend the compromise by allowing us to have a meeting every March to receive the report so that we can look forward to it, the community can look forward to it, the decision makers, the elected officials can all look forward to it. That to me puts the right kind of emphasis on what I hope someday this will be.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Member Woodhouse for the record. I totally agree with what Member Mathur has just said, and I would like just to add to it. One of the -- I really like the idea of the Early Release Report in November with a spring supplement in March, dealing with the legislative issue. We can handle that. But the report in November is extremely important because there will -- there should be issues that come up that the Commission has made recommendations on that the Legislature in the odd number of years really should take under advisement and possibly provide legislation in order for K12, NDE, the Commission to move forward to address issues that have come up. So, I think -- to have the one comprehensive report in March kind of stymies that even though I love comprehensive reports but I really do like the other one as a way to deal with the fact that we have a -- a legislative session occurs every other year, and they're going to be -- there's going to be issues that have to be resolved. Thank you.

Megan Peterson: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record, I would also like to provide maybe some context and framing of the information too that can help inform the overall concepts. And one of that is that if you think about the report that's provided in March -- I'm sorry, in November, at that time, what we'd be looking to report on would be expenditures or investments made from the prior school year. And then we would be linking it also with the performance data that's available at that time. So, it's kind of a forward and backward looking metric at the same time to say based on these investments these are kind of the outcomes that we saw. And then with the supplement that's available in March, that's when we'd be able to provide more updated expenditure data because that would be then, at that point, the immediately prior school year. The data that would be available in November would be from the year prior, prior. So, you're kind of getting that story told that from -- so if we were to look at this November right now, the best that we would be able to provide is expenditure data from the 22/23 school year. We would be pairing that with performance data of students from the 23/24 school year. And then we would provide a supplement in March that would pair the 23/24 school year performance data with the expenditure data or investment data. So, you're kind of getting this evolving picture of how investments are potentially informing outcomes of students. So, I hope that kind of helps give an overall picture of what the timing of the data would look like in order to perform or inform decisions going forward.

Chair Hobbs: Well, thank you Megan. That is extremely helpful. I want to make sure we get any comments on this from up north. Dave, you, Kyle, Mark, any comments up there?

Dr. David Jensen: Member Hobbs, we have nothing in addition to add. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Sounds like we're leaning in a particular direction here. So, is that something that would be best handled by a motion, Megan, since this looks like a choice that we're making here?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. So, Chair, you can go one of two ways. The intent today was at least to present the concepts and then allow the Commission time if they want to think that over. And then we are intending to come back in October for a decision point. But if you feel comfortable today, we can go ahead and move forward with the recommendation.

Chair Hobbs: I think that -- I'm sensing -- I'm not speaking for everybody else, but I'm sensing that there is some comfort in making this decision. So, if that's the case, we would need a motion in a second.

Punam Mathur: Member Mathur for the record. Thank you, Chairman Hobb. I would make a motion that we first thank those that have put so much time and energy into producing this clarity for us to make decisions about and that we advance a recommendation is really what we're doing for an Early Release Report in November with the spring supplement in March.

Joyce Woodhouse: I will second the motion.

Chair Hobbs: We have a motion and a second. Any additional discussion on that motion?

Megan Peterson: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson. If I could get one point of clarification from the recommendation, we would be looking for a specific date to be identified either -- generally we've been moving towards a specific day in the month, whether it's the third Monday of the month, or whether it would be, for example, November 15th or the earliest or on or before November 15th, for example.

Chair Hobbs: Maker of the motion to have any preference with respect to the date.

Punam Mathur: So a Commission we're -- sorry, just clarification. As a Commission, we are currently on a every second -- the second Friday of the month. What is our schedule routine? Okay, Megan, what's the cadence of our Commission meetings?

Megan Peterson: We've been aiming for the second Friday. It's shifted a little between the second and the third Friday of each month.

Mark Mathers: So, to make sure that we're here to receive the report in November, does it make sense to say before the third Friday, or?

Chair Hobbs: As long as we're able to stick to the third Friday. Megan's right, this year we've been kind of moving between the third and the second.

Punam Mathur: So, to keep options open, do we want to say the second Friday?

Chair Hobbs: I think so. I think so.

Punam Mathur: Okay. Megan does that -- so if we stipulated by the second Friday in November to make sure that the Commission would be meeting to receive that Early Release Report, would that work?

Megan Peterson: I think that makes sense. The other alternative too is we can establish a date or time in November and then the Commission would just review it in October -- I'm sorry. No, that's wrong. December.

Chair Hobbs: Let me add. Megan, let me add this too. That being an important month, the Commission can schedule -- can have regularly scheduled meetings, but also schedule a special meeting, which I would recommend that we do. So, if you have it on something like November 15th, we would probably shoot for the third week of November just to simply receive and review that report.

Jason Goudie: Subject to Thanksgiving.

Chair Hobbs: Subject to Thanksgiving. Thank you, Jason.

Punam Mathur: Yeah, I will modify my motion to specify that by November 15th, if that's acceptable.

Joyce Woodhouse: As the seconder of the motion. I agree.

Chair Hobbs: Additional discussion or questions?

Joyce Woodhouse: Do we need a date for March too?

Chair Hobbs: Do we need to repeat the same thing for March? Should we make that the same date in March?

Megan Peterson: Yes, please.

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Punam Mathur: So, we'll specify the 15th of November -- the 15th of March, presentation of the early release and the supplemental report.

Joyce Woodhouse: Member Woodhouse for the record, for the changes to the motion I agree.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. I think we have that fairly well straightened out. Dave, any questions, comments, up your way?

Dr. David Jensen: Not at this time.

Chair Hobbs: Okay, very good. Other questions, comments down here? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Any opposed? Motion passes. Thank you so much. And Amanda, I'm going to check with you before I move on to the next agenda item to make sure that we have gotten through everything that we needed to get through on your end.

Amanda Brown: Chair, we're good to go? You're ready to move on.

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Thank you so much. Agenda Item Number Eight, Information, discussion, and possible action regarding messaging and how the Commission will engage during the legislative session. The

intent of this item was to get better -- I think there were a couple of reasons why we wanted to have this item on the agenda. One of them was to better understand, and I'm not looking to put Greg Ott on the on the spot here, but better understand what we are able to do as Members of the Commission if called upon during the course of the legislative session to provide support. You know, how -- are we able to indicate whether or not we represent this Commission? Are we representing ourselves individually? Are there any actions that we need to take here that would allow Members of this Commission to represent the Commission if called upon? Those kinds of questions. So, Greg, I know you circulated something to the Members of the Commission. Hopefully everybody's had an opportunity to read that. Are there any key points that we should be aware of, considering taking any action on here to allow us to engage during the course of the session as either representatives of the Commission or people representing recommendations made by this Commission? Just want to make sure that we all understand how we go about doing that.

Greg Ott: Definitely. And apologies to the Commission. I don't believe I sent that legislative guidance to everyone. Chair Hobbs. I think I just sent it to you. The memo that he's talking about, I can't forward to the Commission. It's legislative guidance that our office provided to all boards and commissions prior to the 2023 Session to just give them this sort of guidance that the chair was just talking about. There is going to be an updated version for the 2025 session that I can circulate, but I'll summarize here and I'll make sure that you guys get a copy of it after I'm done talking. The big picture is it's okay to identify yourselves and to say, you know, what your background is. I'm an educator. I serve on this Commission. But we want to make sure when we're communicating with legislators or with other individuals. That we're not speaking on behalf of the Commission unless the Commission has specifically authorized us to do that. So, you know, in your personal capacity, you can say what your history and experience is, but you don't want to take the additional step of saying, "And I'm speaking for the Commission," unless the Commission has taken a specific vote to say, "We authorize, you know, Chair Hobbs to speak on this issue or on this bill, or generally on all bills on behalf of the Commission." That kind of tees up the question of what does the Commission want to do? Do they want to have someone authorized to speak for them? It doesn't happen so much at the beginning of the legislative session where everything tends to be a little bit more orderly and there's notices as far as when bills are coming out and what's going to happen. But things get hectic and they sort of proceed at an accelerating rate towards the end and amendments come fast and furious, and sometimes there's not time to agendaize a meeting so that the Commission can speak about something, and you want to have a representative who is authorized to talk to people who are making these sorts of policy decisions. So, sometimes it's good to authorize or sometimes boards authorize someone to speak on their behalf on legislative matters. They don't always do that, but that can be an option. But the important thing is for the board to sort of think about the way that it wants to act and that the members conduct themselves in accordance with the will of the body. So, that's the maybe longer summary than it should have been. And I will work on getting this guidance out to you, but happy to talk about any questions. Is that kind of what you were hoping for Chair or did I overstep or miss the mark?

Chair Hobbs: No, I think that's -- I think that's right on point. And I've been told that your memorandum that you sent to me was provided to everyone else on the Commission. So, I think they already had the benefit of being able to review that.

Greg Ott: Okay.

Chair Hobbs: You know, I know sometimes it can be -- well, I think you adequately described it at the beginning. It's very orderly and all of that and then it can get a little bit hectic and people want questions answered and they want them answered by the person that they can get ahold of the quickest to answer that question. And then this was as much for the comfort of the Members of the Commission as it was for anything else. You know, I mean, I'm thinking here that, you know, I've presented to, I don't know, five or six different legislative bodies up to this point. I never had formal authorization from this Commission to do that. So, I don't know if that means I'm going to get hauled off here after the meeting or something. But I know all of you

-- all of you will be asked questions by legislators that represent your areas and I wanted to get it out for discussion that any and all of you should be able to answer questions, I think, about what the Commission did and explain rationale and the importance of it and all of those sorts of things. I don't -- do we need to designate everyone to be able to do that, Greg? I mean, we're not looking to be lobbyists, right, at all. We're technical resources. And again it's better if all of us have the ability to answer questions as they come forward and not have to then, you know, point to somebody else as the, you know, singular authority or representative or something along those lines. So, I just wanted to get to this discussion.

Greg Ott: Member Goudie wanted to say something before I talked.

Jason Goudie: Thanks. Sorry. It wasn't necessarily before you talked. But I think that given the question that Member Mathur asked earlier and kind of our trying to figure out what we have decided, I mean, I think having the recommendations that once we get the reports and we get those pieces so that we all have speaking points, I completely agree, right? Because I don't remember what we decided in March and February and all the different changes. I know that we're not talking about NCI anymore for now, so that's good news. But besides that, so I think once we get that, I would completely agree that we have the recommendations there. We are able to walk through those components. Not opine on, you know, personal agendas, but to provide the factual context of what we were provided in the meetings. And that way we can all reach out because I think we are going to have to all reach out, otherwise guy's not going to get any real work done.

Greg Ott: Yeah. And, and I think you know, Member Goudie brings up an important point, right? How difficult it is to remember all of the detailed and, you know, thorny conversations that you've had over the past couple years. It's incredibly difficult. And I think the purpose of that memorandum is not to scare people away from having conversations and providing some context. It's just to make sure that the Commission knows that when you're doing that, you're saying, "Oh, as a member, this is what I remember, but I can't speak for the Commission. Our official action is the official action in these recommendations that we've provided." So, that whenever you're talking to someone, they know that, you know, you're trying to give them some context and some information that you may be privy to that they don't have. But it's not an official, "Oh, I talked to the Commission on school funding and they told me this, that, or the other thing." It's more of an individual recollection based on the meetings that you've been to. Unless of course, you know, you all want to be deputized to speak officially, which creates some other issues because there could be conflicting perspectives on non-official actions.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I think you're getting -- you're getting to one of the other points of clarification. So, we are all members of this Commission, and we could all answer questions about different actions that the Commission took and rationale and that sort of thing. To the extent that someone has a dissenting viewpoint on a topic or two. I can't remember if we've had votes where it was, you know, four to two or, you know, anything like that. But if somebody has a dissenting viewpoint that is contrary to an action that the Commission took, at what point do they have to clarify that they're not speaking on behalf of the Commission, but speaking as an individual I would hope this doesn't happen, but just wanted to get it out there.

Greg Ott: So, I don't think that -- I mean, to the extent there's a dissenting viewpoint, there's going to be a public record of who stood where and what the official record of the Commission was. And I think everybody should be trying to make whoever they're speaking to aware of the factual record of, "Hey, you know, this was a contentious issue before the Commission. I don't actually agree with what we did here. They did this thing. I think that they were wrong because of this, that, and the other." And make sure that you are presenting things factually and not sort of twisting the record. And I don't -- normally, I will say the commissions that have this conversation prior to the legislative sessions are not the ones that that end up with trouble later on. It's the ones where they don't have this conversation and people go and freelance a little bit usually out of, you know, best intentions, but they just don't operate from a position of thinking about you know, their individual perspective

versus the Commission perspective.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Hobbs. I appreciate that. You know, in prior sessions, I thought what we thought was a great idea was that we had two ambassadors really of the Commission who would speak on behalf of the Commission. That was our Chair and our Vice Chair, and then that was it. The rest of us could provide information as individuals, or you could call -- the Chair or Vice Chair, could call on others as, you know, experts in certain area to assist. But as far as the speaking voice on behalf of the Commission, that would be our two designated leaders. And one would fill the role if the other was not able to make it. So, that was my recollection. We do have a little bit of a platform being on this member, because I can speak for myself personally, I've been invited to talk to things because of being a member on different commissions, but it's always been a shared perspective of what the Commission has done, not as -- or, you know, information from myself, but never speaking as the voice of the Commission.

Punam Mathur: Thank you Chair Hobbs. Member Mathur for the record. So, I was trying to sort of figure out what the extensions were on this topic, because it can get real big, real fast. And on the beginning of the third paragraph in the memo, it begins with, "May not appear on behalf of the -- of the Board, or the Commission, and in front of the Legislature. So, those are the features that must be true that we're speaking on behalf of the Commission in front of the Legislature. That's very specific scenario. And I think although we have been remiss in not officially nominating you as the man, you've certainly played that role every time the State Board, anytime any of the legislative bodies have asked for presentation, you've been our go-to. Normally, I think Chair and Vice Chair makes sense, except for our Vice Chair will be in an active role in the Legislature. So, it feels unfair to say to her, "Figure that out please." And the other thing that is unique this time around, and I think we touched on it at the beginning of the meeting Chair Hobbs, is there's a bunch of topics this time. We were much more focused in what our deliverables were the last session. This time we've been really doing a bunch of things simultaneously and we have had the good fortune of certain members going deep as work team leaders into certain topics. And there could be a hearing in which the accountability system is going to be the thing that people want to talk about. In that moment to have Paul Johnson, who's been in it every day for the last two years seems to make great sense to me, to speak on behalf of the Commission representing our work in front of a legislative body. And so, to the extent that there's something that we can sort agree to that says, "Whenever possible, you're always the first call." Because I think there's a credibility that you bring, a continuity and a consistency that you bring that serves our recommendations well. So, selfishly, you'd be my first draft pick. See what I did with the sports. You're welcome. And then also though, to delegate, I have complete trust that any of the work team leads who've done deep work during this interim period to develop the recommendations that will be advancing, that if there's a moment in a legislative hearing where Paul Johnson's expertise is required because he's the one that knows it, because he's lived it, I've complete confidence that he could speak on behalf of the Commission. And then the separate set of issues about any time I'm not speaking on behalf of the Board or if I'm not speaking in front of a legislative group, to me feels outside this topic, which is sort of compliance with this memo.

Chair Hobbs: So, as Member Mathur was speaking, Greg, I was kind of watching you to see if there was anything that we need. I agree with everything she said, other than the fact that I need to do more of that. But is there any other action we should take? For example, yes, Paul would be an excellent person, or Jason would be an excellent person, you know, with respect to the reporting elements. You know, admittedly, there are some topics that I'm very, very comfortable talking about and there are some if you hit me with them, I'm looking to phone a friend, right?

Punam Mathur: Then we empower you with the ability to phone friends.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. And maybe we're -- maybe we're getting into this a little bit too deeply. You know, I think that if we're called upon, one of the things we want to do is send the best resource that we can to explain

the topic. That will not always be Joyce. That will not always be me. It may not even be Paul. And we would have the latitude to respond, but we would have to be aware of how we identify ourselves in such a role. Is that kind of what it comes down to?

Greg Ott: So there was -- there's a couple different questions in there, I think, is if you want to -- sort of what I heard from Member Mathur was, "Hey, let's deputize the Chair to do everything and then also deputize the subject -- the working group leads to speak to whatever is in their working group." Which I think would be a fine motion. And then everybody would know, I think, the rules of their specific communications. You could also choose to do something more narrow where it was just one or two people, or you could choose to do something a little bit -- giving more power to the Chair, whereas the Chair has the authority to speak on anything or deputize subject matter leads as needed. So, it would be kind of up to you to call those people. So, you can go a number of different ways. I think you're going to get to a place where people are going to have the authority to speak on the issues that they're experts in.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I think at very minimum, one of the things we should do is, it's a weird word to use, deputize each of the working group leads to speak on behalf of the Commission, specifically in those areas that they coordinated on behalf of the Commission. Yeah.

Punam Mathur: Member Mathur for the record. Yeah. I love that. And I think that makes great sense. And I would prefer that you make that call so that we don't ever run into, "Oops, fancy meeting you here." So, that the Chair has an evergreen empowerment from the Commission to speak on behalf of the Commission. And as needed you can call upon the individual members of the Commission for the expertise that they represent through their working group. But you would make --

Chair Hobbs: So, Greg, would that work as a motion if that's what Member Mathur intended?

Greg Ott: Yes. And let me just restate, what I understood was basically you have the authority to speak on anything whenever you want to. You also have the authority to call in subject matter experts, but your authority to call in subject matter experts is limited to the working group leads. But you get to be the herder of the sheep and the cats.

Punam Mathur: That works. Notwithstanding that you're referring to my colleagues as sheeps and cats.

Chair Hobbs: Not a good time to bring up cats. There could have been --

Punam Mathur: We're not talking about --

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. Okay. I think that worked. I mean, that's what we would've done anyway.

Paul Johnson: That's what we've done.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. I think that's consistent with --

Chair Hobbs: So, if it formalizes what we've been doing then --

Paul Johnson: We done it before.

Punam Mathur: Formalizes what we've been doing.

Paul Johnson: Yes.

Punam Mathur: So, that would be my motion.

Joyce Woodhouse: I will second the motion.

Chair Hobbs: Any other discussion?

Dusty Casey: Chair Hobbs, this is Member Casey. I just have a question.

Chair Hobbs: Sure.

Dusty Casey: So are we -- is the motion then to -- I just want to clarify the motion to deputize, if you will, you as well as allow you to deputize only the group leaders or anyone you might deem appropriate.

Chair Hobbs: Well, we'll have to get concurrence from Greg on exactly what we're doing here. I think the notion was to make sure that we -- that each of the working groups have representation that is enabled by this Commission to speak on behalf of the Commission. That's I think the very minimum we're looking for. Now, you bring a different element into it that may provide more flexibility. I'm not quite sure how to word it or anyone else that may be deemed appropriate for a topic. I don't know. I'm sorry. Is that too vague, Greg?

Greg Ott: So, what I heard -- and this is Member Mathur's motion so she can correct me. What I heard from her was, I'm completely comfortable with the chairs of the working group and I'm completely comfortable with the Chair. So, it would be the Chair and his ability to delegate to the heads of the working groups, but not beyond that. That was what I took from her comments.

Punam Mathur: Thanks Chair Hobb. Member Mather for the record. So, I'm going to change my mind if I could, because I think the key is to provide you the flexibility of invoking the right expertise on behalf of the Commission in front of the legislature. And so, there could be a scenario under which a work group lead is for whatever reason not a member of the Commission, and now we've just shut off, in our approach, the ability to get that expertise at the table. So, we've got members of work groups and you should have the ability to say, "Oops, that lead happens not be available or cannot. But I still want the work group's perspective represented, because Jason can't be there, but he's got people that have worked with him or Paul is in Tahiti," which I don't think ever happens, yeah, "But there's others that have worked with them." So, I would expand that to rather than work group leads to allow the Chair the discretionary flexibility to ask any member of the Commission to present on behalf of the Commission in front of the Legislature based on their expertise or involvement on a specific topic.

Chair Hobbs: That works. Greg?

Greg Ott: That works. I think it's clear as long as the second is okay with it and it answers Member Casey's question. I'm good with that.

Punam Mathur: Yeah.

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes, the chair concurs. I'm sorry, the seconder concurs.

Chair Hobbs: And Dusty are you good with that?

Dusty Casey: Yes, that clarify -- and I think that's a better motion in my opinion.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for raising that and helping to clarify it. And the other part of that would be that if I call, you know, Paul for example and say, "Hey, this would be a pretty good topic for you," that you cannot say, "No."

Paul Johnson: I'll be in Tahiti.

Chair Hobbs: I know you too well. Okay. So, we have that motion and second. Any additional discussion? If there isn't any signify your support by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed? Thank you for the clarification. Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Member Woodhouse for the record. Just to allay some concerns maybe about how Chair Hobbs may be called up to testify on a bill that has a whole bunch of our recommendations in it. For example it doesn't, -- especially the first February through April, it doesn't happen overnight. Usually LCB staff working with the chair of whatever committee of education or finance, they will reach out to the sponsor of the bill asking, "Who do you want to testify?" Typically, they will contact Superintendent Ebert about who would be at the table. It's usually someone from her staff, and it -- because of what the topic is, Chair Hobbs may be asked. And if it is the accountability measure, then Member Johnson may be asked. But that would all proceed. It's not -- it's because those agendas are posted three days in advance. So, you will know. It's when you get into May that you have to be very, very nimble. But I think we would -- because of our motion that we have passed, we've set a process for how we will address it, and we will certainly be in very close contact with the superintendent so that -- as the measures come forward that Mr. Hobbs may be asked to make a report on or to testify on, we'll be ready. I can guarantee that there's two to four committees that are going to ask him early on in a session to come up and present what we've done. It's going to happen. So, just be ready.

Chair Hobbs: With that depressing note, moving on to Agenda Item Number Nine. This is one we talked about last time where we have an opportunity that we probably should take to identify some topics and include recommendations in the report for ongoing work on behalf of the Commission on school funding. I think there are two reasons why this is important to us. You know, one, there are some things that we brought closure to over the last several months. There are other things that we've made recommendations to continue to monitor, continue to evaluate. So, we want to follow up on those by including those responsibilities, I believe, into those that are given to us formally by the Legislature. But there also is another opportunity here to allow us to get into areas that may not have been specifically designated for us that we feel would bring value. And so, this item was placed on to have this discussion and begin to compile a list of what those recommendations may be. And, you know, I can certainly start off and give a couple of examples and a lot of these are no-brainers, but for example, all of the issues around the funding targets and the funding is [indiscernible] updated every year. We're dealing with a 10-year horizon that tends to -- well, 10-year horizon always stays there and moves by two years, every two years right? So, it continues to move forward. But repeating all of those -- repeating all of those assignments to this Commission, I think would be very important to do. I think we want to make sure that information continues to get out there, that that information has standing and that there's some -- by getting it out there, there's some accountability on the part of the decision makers with respect to how much progress they've made toward them. So, that's one I would put at the top of the list. We've talked about -- well earlier in this meeting, the subject at-risk came up and we had previously made a recommendation to monitor the implementation of Infinite Campus and the application of the GRAD score that certainly should be there proactively as an assignment that we're giving ourselves to do.

And anything -- anything else that's a part of the recommendations that we have made that refer to continuing to review and evaluate should be a part of that list. We don't have to itemize all of those at this time. Are there other thoughts that you all have as to topics that would be sensible for us to recommend to ourselves to do, please?

Jason Goudie: Thanks Chair Hobbs. Jason Goudie for record. I think one of the pieces that as it relates to weighted funding primarily around EL and At-Risk, I think that we have to have continued discussions on how we can utilize more updated specific student data to address the needs. Because the way that we receive the data -- we get funded from the state based off data that is very stale. I get that. I don't have any problems with that. That's the way it is, right? But especially on GRAD score, we have daily information. So, the district should be utilizing daily data in order to update that to make sure we're really addressing the kids at-risk and not a kid that was at risk two years ago. And ELs the same sort of components that we need to look at how we can better be nimble with that to better address the needs there. And as we discussed the At-Risk component, you know, I brought this up before is that, you know, the way our data works out is pure At-Risk gives all money to elementary schools in the bottom quintile. And I'm not sure -- I think long term that's probably the right idea, so the better you address. But if we completely adapted that or adopted that right now without any concern of how the Zoom and Victory schools were previously funded, we will destroy some programs at high schools. And so, understanding how there's some flexibility, and we have some [indiscernible 01:47:49], we've kind of built in kind of the way the state has done it to help this process. But I think we need to monitor those pieces, understand how we could better address the current students, which we have. I think districts have the data and just include that in discussions. So, to expand kind of what you said there.

Chair Hobbs: You know, as we go through these, Megan not to put this on you, but maybe there's somebody on staff, if Bo is there or somebody else that could, you know, jot a couple of these down. And I think what we need to do is take the concept, for example, that Jason just spoke about and reduce it to words that can be included in a recommendation.

Megan Peterson: Chair Hobbs, we are actively taking notes and we'll be prepared to summarize those for a list to review maybe at the next meeting.

Chair Hobbs: Fantastic. Paul?

Paul Johnson: Yeah, thank you Chair Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. Yeah, I don't think we want to -- I think we want to continue to monitor all weights, not just a couple of the weights. And one of the examples is gifted and talented, although it's not a material dollar amount on the grand scheme of thing, there's just a handful of school districts actually get funding for that and the rest of us don't. And there's conditions why some of them don't qualify for whatever reason, which doesn't mean they don't have gifted and talented students. They just simply don't meet the criteria. So, that would be an example of why we might want to explore one of the other weights as well. So, I would just include that for all weights. Then the other thing, that I don't know if it's the purview of this Commission or whether it's the Department of Education, was to come up with more standardized way that school districts record the data that goes into the weights, to make sure that we all have similar consistent practices and the information that's going into whatever metrics that we're using to measure these programs are, are comparable and similar. And then I have been trying to wrap my head around coming up with similar ratio analysis that corporations have. They have it for profitability, but we would have it for our return on achievement for example or efficiency models that might help with some sort of industry measure that's similar to a corporate measure to help users of this information identify, you know, performance measures based on ratio analysis. I don't know if that's too deep for something for us to do or whether that has value, but I keep hearing the concept of return on investment and that makes sense on a corporate model because it's kind of more profit motivated. But I haven't been able to figure out what those

things would mean with respect to education.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. Let's talk about that one for a few minutes because this is a recurring theme that pops up at least, you know, when I have these types of conversations, and I think I get it and then I think I don't, and now I think I understand why. The reporting and accountability, take the word accountability for a moment. There are so many different levels of accountability. You know, you all do an annual audit that's accountability on strictly the financial side relative to your budget, right? Okay. That works pretty well. But that's -- I don't think that's the type of accountability that everybody else is talking about. So, there's accountability that would be of interest to the Governor and the legislators, you know, "Did we make a good investment and did they spend the money wisely? And are we seeing benefit?" Then there would be accountability to other stakeholders like the parents and the students, you know, "Did they progress the way that they were supposed to progress?" I've heard it all the way down to the level of purchasing real estate and looking at the star rating to make sure I'm, you know, not fumbling that decision. Right? I mean, it occurs at so many different levels. It is not one thing. And I think the return on investment topic, at least the way I view it, is probably more other speak for the accountability at the executive and legislative levels, I think. And I don't know if that means, you know, one large reporting framework that could then be, click on a tab if you're a parent, click on a tab if you're an elected official, click on a tab if you're, you know, a local business and see the information that would be more salient to each group. I think that's kind of what it means. And to that point, Paul I think we need to prescribe the continued development of what we've started here with working groups three, four, and five. I think that is really super important because I believe that there are some people that have the expectation that coming out of this interim, you know this report that we will file in November, there's going to be a little floppy disc attached to it that if you plug it in, we will tell you all of these things. And that is simply not going to be the case. Right? Floppy discs, that's old school.

Paul Johnson: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: You know but I think there's some expectation and I think that what we need to do is make it clear that what we've done is build a foundation to get us to that point.

Paul Johnson: Chair Hobbs, Member Johnson for the record. Yeah, I absolutely agree. And you know, the reason why I mentioned this is because, you know, after being here for quite a long time and not quite as long as you, because I would not have used the floppy disc preference. But nonetheless, you know, we're at a point -- there's only been two times in the history of me working here for the school district that we've had significant contributions to education. One was earlier on the heels of the 2006 study at APA, and then we had the recession hit and kind of, you know, all bets were off after that point. And then we had this reboot. And now we've had -- I think back then was a 13% increase. Now, had a 21% increase, which is great. But I have to remind people that's only halfway there. We're still 4000, \$4500 per student short from being average. And we're 2.5 to \$2.6 billion short in total from being average. And if we are going to ask people for more money, we have to build trust, which means there has to be a system of reporting and accountability that gives them the information they need to build trust and gives the cover for legislators to say, yeah, we're being good stewards of the money. Here's the evidence that shows it. Here's the things that we feel were important measures to confirm exactly that. So thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Well, again, I think we're taking this discussion and trying to convert it into a recommendation that points toward that continued development of that reporting system that would check all of those different boxes, right? So, that's certainly one. You know, I don't want to leave -- I don't want to leave Mark Mathers out. You know, I think continuing to look for a rational method of identifying regional cost differences, you know, we -- I think that's been part of our recommendation and I think we need to keep that out there. Now, we're either going to find it or we're not. And at some point, you know, we'll need to just make a call on that.

But I think heading into the next go around, you know, we would be putting it out there to some subject matter experts to help us identify what can and can't be done and then ultimately make a decision. Is this something that we're going to continue to include? Because right now we include it by name only, not by math. So, you know, some of those things that we've left dangling, that's an example of one that I think we need to continue to take responsibility for. But any other -- you don't have to decide all of this here today, but before the report is done, we do. So, if you have thoughts about other things that should be included for us as responsibilities send, you know, send an email whatever, we'll bring them up. We'll put them in the report. The report will come back to this body. So, any of those recommendations would be discussed in a public meeting before they're included in the report. Please.

Punam Mathur: Thanks, Chair Hobbs. So, it strikes me that from our initial formation, we had two jobs stand up a formula and continue to reexamine and monitor each of its elements and the way it was structured. And that is an evergreen job. So, we'd have to do that anyway. So, that applies to the formula elements, everything from NCEI to -- for me, is it working? Could it work better? How could we evolve it? So, that's one sort of evergreen responsibility that I feel like we were given at our birth. Second one was 10-year plan to somewhere better than where we are right now. So, funding strategies, all of that. So, that's an evergreen thing, because that 10-year horizon is two years away every two years. And then this time, by coming out of this session, I don't know that it was designed in a way that made sense to me, but I think the end result was the right one. And that was this really significant priority around accountability and metrics. And it was sloppy in the way it happened because we just had so many different honeydew things flying out of the legislature and different bills that in some instances were completely random and fairly and lacked veracity, logic or benefit. But we've now spent -- between the department and the experts that we've contracted, we spent a lot of time getting those letters complete and ticking off the homework assignments. And so, is there a way to just really drive in on these are the three reasons that we exist and we are serious about doing these things with the highest degree of excellence that we can, and here's how you can help. So, rather than giving us two or three different bills that have partisan objectives, or the last thing that a constituent said to me and having us then go through an exercise that feels a bit like chasing our tail and in the process and in the course of that we are wasting this incredible resource that is [indiscernible 01:59:36] NDE, the benefit and the value of these amazing consultants, because it sure would've been nice to not have them spend any time on those other things that now will go back as recommendations to say, I'm going to say it again, dummy dear, which is what some of our responses are going to be to some of the things that we were asked. So, if there's a way to just really sort of double down in an acknowledgement of why we exist and what we pledge to do with excellence for the Legislation and Governor and as part of that to say, so if you can mute some of the background noise or deal differently -- I don't know how you do that without offending people. My intention is not to offend people, but it is to say this stuff out loud because we spend a lot of time on meeting the [indiscernible] to get complete things that aren't materially important to educating kids in Nevada.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Member Woodhouse, for the record. I totally understand your frustration, Member Mathur. However, once the legislative session starts I think, you know, many of them -- many of them realize the amount of work that they put on the NDE staff and their board and the Commission, but you will never be able to stop an individual legislator who has something they want pursued. They see an organization that can do it, that they're not going to put in a bill. And if they can get enough votes for it, it's going to happen. So, I think, you know, one of the things that we can do in testimony when the Chair and others are making presentations we can make clear the process of the whole work projects that we had, but they're the Legislature. They have the right to do -- they have a right to pass a bill to tell you to do whatever. And that's part of our democracy. It's why it works that way. And sometimes it is messy. So, I just -- I wish we could, you know, put some guard rails around it, but we just -- it's going to be as hard to do now. Yeah. And, you know, we have friends who are sitting legislators that can help kind of strategize, can kind of help move things along, but just be prepared for various and sometimes may not really fit in our picture, our mission of what we're to do. But we are an entity that's dealing with K12 education, so they're going to look to us. So,

just being practical.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. That is the reality.

Joyce Woodhouse: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you so much. Well, you know, again, I think part of this was to ensure that in that basket of things that we get, there are some things that we feel are important to continue to pursue, and we're never going to completely stop that. So, I totally get it. But I would also mention to NDE and WestEd and APA, if anything has crossed your minds as assignments that would make sense for the Commission from a functional standpoint, you know, can -- that would improve the implementation of the pupil-centered funding plan, which is very broad. We would love to hear your thoughts on that as well. I'm not putting you on the spot today, but again, this is for inclusion in the report. Dave, anything up there before we move on?

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen, for the record, I really appreciate the conversation around the accountability measures. And Dr. Brune can speak to this probably better than I, but when you see Working Group Five's recommendations it's going to center around a lot of what you just talked about. I can imagine that we're going to gain more insight onto what we need to focus on as Three and Four, finalize their reports as well. So, this will be a good follow up once all three of those come to conclusion.

Chair Hobbs: Well, thank you so much. Thank you so much. Okay, with that we can move along to Agenda Item Number 10, Discussion/possible action regarding the Commission's responsibilities to make recommendations to improve the implementation of the pupil-centered funding plan. And Megan, let me ask you, I think I remember why we put this item on the agenda, but if you could help clarify any specific direction we were looking for here, that would be helpful.

Megan Peterson: Chair Hobbs, happy to. Megan Peterson for the record. So, this is going back to that terminology and evergreen task of the Commission. It is explicitly identified in NRS 387, which is more specifically to identify areas of opportunity for the Department to work on based on recommendations from the Commission. So, this is your opportunity to assign tasks to the Department to focus on over the biennium.

Chair Hobbs: Well, everybody's reaching for their mics at the same time. Any thoughts, comments? Paul, go ahead.

Paul Johnson: I don't have any specific requests from the Department of Education, but I just want to take this opportunity to express my thank you to the team at NDE. They're willfully under-resourced, but doing a tremendous job with the personnel that they have, and I deeply appreciate all of their support and assistance.

Mark Mathers: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Yes, please.

Mark Mathers: Mark Mathers. I would echo everything Paul said, but I just wouldn't let this opportunity go by of course. One of the areas that we've kind of worked with the Department of Ed on, but I feel like could be modified is the use of weighted funding. And the bill creating the pupil-centered funding plan borrowed -- basically copied and pasted eligible uses of funding for At-Risk and EL funding from the old Zoom and Victory Bills. And in kind of working through how to spend the money, I feel like there are some tweaks that need to be made to that statutory language and or just made more specific through possibly regulation or just business rules or what have you.

So, I would request that, you know, the work be done by Department of Ed either in recommending changes to the statutes and or kind of laying out requirements more specifically than the statutory language through business rules or regulations. And I can give examples of what I'm talking about if it helps.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, I'm actually going to flip this on its head a little bit and identify that that was something that we had identified that we were going to add to the list from the previous agenda item of topics for the Commission to review in the upcoming biennium. So, more specifically looking at what the impact is if we stacked weights, also if we -- and I think this goes back to Member Goudie's comments earlier, the point in time at which we pull the counts that are used for weighted funding. As you all may know, within the pupil-centered funding plan, when we pay out on adjusted base we're utilizing quarterly average daily enrollment reports. Whereas when we pay on the weighted funding, it is the information collected through count day. And so I think that's more what you're referring to, Member Mathers, in terms of what is the data source refining it for the weighted funding. So, we had identified those as opportunities for the Commission to research and we're gearing up in terms of identifying scopes of work for the next round of contracts with subject matter experts to have those identified as topics to discuss with the Commission during the next biennium.

Mark Mathers: This is Member Mathers again, those are great ideas. Just to give an example of what I'm referring to for weighted funding, and I think we've had this discussion before, but maybe not the Zoom and Victory Statutes for example indicated that eligible use of funding are Pre-k programs, which is awesome. The problem though now in applying it to the pupil-centered funding plan, right, you've got EL counts of students right from kindergarten on up that determines your funding. And I don't know for Pre-k EL funded program, how many of those children are EL students, right? So, it says I can fund a Pre-k program through English learners funding, but how do I faithfully and in the spirit of the law do that? And we've kind of worked out, you know, kind of an idea with Department of Ed, you know, that we would look at geographic areas with, you know, heavy concentration of English learner students in our schools from K through 12. And that's where we would cite Pre-k sites that are funded by EL funding. But that's kind of like an offline kind of understanding that we have and, you know, would be better, I think to kind of just be specific and nail that down in writing somewhere that that's how you would do that. And there may be other permissible uses of EL funding we would want to enumerate versus the six that are there now. So, that's just where I was going. It just feels like we've been doing this a while and those are some of the issues that have come up when we have implemented weighted funding.

Megan Peterson: I thank you Member Mather. I will also share in that same vein I can't share explicit details right now, but I would say stay tuned to session. The Department does have some work that we're doing in those areas, Pre-k and within language cleanup. But also, and I we haven't shared very much of this yet because we have been working very closely with our subject matter experts on this, but the department also has a contract in place that we had originally envisioned happening in 2020. But then obviously we had some interesting times with budgets and so the contracts didn't move forward. But we are working on developing a number of what we've called Change Management Documents that support the implementation of the pupil-centered funding plan and provide a variety of documents that help explain and go into detail of how to apply braided funding, how to work with the pupil-centered funding plan and multi-tiered systems of support and go into some details about how to utilize those funds in those areas. So, we will definitely keep this on our task list, but we are getting very close to being able to share those documents. They also include sort of an interactive module that you can click through and say, "Here's the pupil-centered funding plan, here are the revenues, here's kind of how it all interacts together." So, once we're able to share those here in the next few months we've definitely like to solicit the feedback and continue to improve those documents. So, just some teasers of what we do have in the pipeline.

Dr. David Jensen: This is -- Chair Hobbs, Member Jensen for the record. And just to follow up, and perhaps

the document that you're talking about is going to help alleviate some of my concerns, but recognizing NDE gets access to preliminary budget figures before districts start to see these. And again, I want to tread lightly for NDE because I don't want to put you in a bad position. But we've made some progress over this last biennium. There's already conversations about flat funding for this biennium that's been articulated to the superintendents. We need to advocate very strongly that failure to continue to move the pupil-centered funding plan forward will just put us back in the position that we were at, widen the gap. And if we don't have a detailed attention to the PCFP, it'll become neglected just like the Nevada plan. And that's one of my greatest worries. We've got to have frontline folks, which in d you are our frontline folks, starting to call out our legislators when we see these proposed budgets that fail to start moving us towards optimal.

Jason Goudie: Thank you. Chair Hobbs, Jason Goudie for the record. So, I'm going to elaborate and agree with Member Mathers a little bit and then also provide a slightly different opinion as well. So, I think that the Zoom and Victory services defined in the PCFP [ph] need to be -- I think they actually need to be expanded. I think those are -- and maybe some of them go away and some of them added. So, I guess revised is probably a better term. And I really think that -- I'm not sure NDE, like pushing NDE or then push the Commission, I really think this needs to get back to the school districts that actually have experts in these areas and get some feedback that that could then come back to both NDE and the Commission itself to provide what has been out there. And then I also know that Ms. Peterson mentioned that we'd also engage some experts to provide some data maybe outside of Nevada and maybe some inside as to what are some of the programs, because I think those need to be expanded. My fear is the comment about making it more prescriptive, making requirements more prescriptive and restrictive tend to make it more challenging. We as a district, were the only one that have to send funds to schools in a very determined way, and then they have a lot more autonomy. So, I think that we be -- we have a specific challenge there that by making it more prescriptive actually challenges us significantly more while making it more restrictive may help a larger district that can actually distribute the funds to different schools in different ways. So, I just want to be careful about that. I really believe that we should get feedback from the experts at districts as well as what Ms. Peterson mentioned experts as to what the allowable expenditure should be under EL and At-Risk, because I think it was the right way to do it, to start it, but now we've got a few years under our belt and I think things have changed, and how we spend those dollars should be addressed. So, I agree with that piece. Thanks.

Chair Hobbs: Other comments? Okay. Alright. Thank you so much, Megan.

Megan Peterson: Chair, if I could also, I would like to just share some concepts that the Department had already looked at self assigning in the same vein as the Commission identifying their work. One of the things that we have also been simultaneously working on this fiscal year and we'll be continuing, is we have worked to hire a project manager who will be supporting the Department in writing an RFP request for proposal to procure a software that will help us in compiling all of the different reports from the school districts in the various states that they currently exist in. And so, this is intended to streamline the submission process so that way we can collect all the data identified in AB400 and then how to visually display that data within the Nevada report card or its future version of that. And so, that is an ongoing project that we have identified to support all of this work and trying to, again, streamline and improve the efficiencies in our work. I think I had mentioned several things, but that is a large one with multiple tasks that touch various areas within the work of the Commission. So, I did want to flag that that is something we are working on. It would also incorporate things like the HR information, teacher recruitment, salaries, tracking of all of that class sizes, a variety of those kind of components. And so, not only can the school districts expect in the near future that that subject matter expert will be reaching out to compile and understand all the data, but we'll be working with you all throughout the next couple of years to implement that as well.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you. You know, I had another thought that I was kind of reluctant to share, but I want to see if there is any way -- I mean, again, reflecting back to a meeting last week with the State Board of

Education, there seemed to be some concern on their part, and they're an elected body obviously, have a very important role, that the clarity of what our work relative to their work is, isn't perhaps what they would like to see. Is there -- and this is to think about is there something that we can do on a going forward basis to better communicate with the State Board of Education regarding, you know, what our tasks are, which are driven by law. They're not a matter of discretion for this group, although today we were talking about assigning ourselves things, right? I just want to make sure on a going forward basis that we have a better line of communication with them. And I don't know if that's something that needs to be handled by this Commission. I mean, it can just simply occur by us reaching out periodically to inform them, you know, here are the things that we have been asked to do. Here's how we're going to do them. We certainly invite you all to participate along with us, and we're happy to support anything that you're doing as well. But I think that would be helpful for us to consider because that door is certainly open. And I tried to clarify last week that, you know, it's not so much us getting into their lane and swimming in a parallel lane toward the same finish line, right? I mean, that really is what we're all about. So, just give that some thought. It brings us to Agenda Item Number 11, "Future agenda items. I think we've talked a lot about that already. We will be bringing back Working Groups Three, Four, and Five hopefully to accept those reports. That will be a huge accomplishment that day. And then they'll be inserted into the main body of the report that we'll continue to work on. It is my hope and this one's on me to have the update of the calculation of the funding targets and explanation of the different scenarios that would achieve the funding targets working on trying to update that report right now. And it would be my hope that we would have that one back as well and could check that box off. That'll add some thickness to the overall report, if it ends up being the way that it looks like it's going to be. And I think we have some closure on some items that we were talking with Kelsey and Amanda about bringing back a more specific listing of reports to be eliminated and modified. I think that will be on our next agenda. Anything else that anybody has? Okay. Then that brings us to Public Comment period Number Two. Public Comment period Number Two is for the public to have an opportunity to comment on anything under the jurisdiction of the Commission on school funding. So, I would first go to you Dave up north. Do we have anybody there to make public comment?

Dr. David Jensen: We do not see anybody up North.

Chair Hobbs: Likewise, I don't see any cards that have been submitted here down South. So, I would turn to Joseph to see if we have any that have been provided by way of email.

Megan Peterson: Chair, Megan Peterson, there have been no emails, comments.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Telephonically.

Megan Peterson: We also have no telephonic public comment.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Then that concludes today's meeting of the Commission on School funding. Once again, thanks to everybody for all the hard work that has been done by members of the Commission and certainly by NDE staff. I echo what Paul said earlier, been nothing short of remarkable in terms of responsiveness and quality of work and we appreciate you more than you know. And also to our subject matter experts for you know, coming in a little bit late in the process, but producing a lot of great content for us. So, we appreciate all that. And with that, I wish everybody a very pleasant weekend and stay safe. We are adjourned.