

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
JANUARY 26, 2024
9:00 AM**

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

TRANSCRIPT OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

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

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent of Student Investment Division, NDE
Beau Bennett, State Education Funding Specialist, NDE
James Kirkpatrick, State Education Funding Manager, NDE
Joseph Baggs

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Todd Weiss, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Amanda Morgan, Executive Director of Educate Nevada Now, Rogers Foundation
Ryan Reeves, Chief Operating Officer of Academica Nevada

Chair Hobbs: -- January 26 Meeting of the Nevada Commission on School Funding to order. I would like to welcome our audience to join in-person as well as by livestream on the Nevada Department of Education website. I would like to also welcome our audience joining us in person here and those watching via the Nevada Department of Education YouTube channel. Will the Secretary please call roll?

Joseph Baggs: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Present.

Joseph Baggs: Vice Chair Woodhouse?

Joyce Woodhouse: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Mr. Jensen?

David Jensen: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Mr. Casey?

Dusty Casey: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Mr. Goudie?

Chair Hobbs: You can mark him here. He, uh, just left the room for a moment.

Joseph Baggs: Thank you, sir. Mr. McIntosh?

Jim McIntosh: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Mr. Rodriguez?

Kyle Rodriguez: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Mr. Mathers?

Mark Mathers: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Member Mathur?

Punam Mathur: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Member Brune?

Chair Hobbs: When she arrives -- I've marked her that she is not coming. When, when she does arrive, just please mark her present.

Joseph Baggs: Will do. Thank you. And Mr. Johnson?

Paul Johnson: Here.

Joseph Baggs: Chair Hobbs, you have a quorum.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. I also like to note for the record that we're joined by, and then you can see him right there, Deputy Attorney General Todd Weiss. Thank you for being here Todd. We'll start with a few normal housekeeping items. The Commission on School Funding is holding a meeting with members in the Las Vegas Bighorn and Bristlecone Conference Rooms, which are not that easy to find, with public comments in Carson City and here as well. As always, we, we'll be listening to public comment on agenda items at the beginning of the meeting and we'll have a second period of public comment for any item under the Commission's jurisdiction at the end of the meeting. Members of the public who attend in person and would like to provide public comment must fill out a comment card and provide it to the secretary. I see that we've received one. To provide public comment or testimony telephonically, dial 312--584--2401. When prompted provide Meeting ID, 19042398, then press pound. When prompted for a participant ID, press pound. Alternatively, members of the public may submit public comments and writing by email to NVCSF@doe.nv.gov to be read into the record. Public comment will be accepted via email before and during public comment for the duration of the meeting and shared with the Commission. Members of the public must indicate an email subject line if the comment is for public comment period number one or public comment period number two. Well, Commission members may be using their computers to view comments and other documents during the meeting, certainly don't take this as a sign of disrespect, a lot of times the documents are more readily viewable on devices that are in front of us. For Members, please remember to silence your electronic devices, and I'm demonstrating that right now, when you're not speaking please mute your microphone, although that doesn't seem to be as big as an issue today here, and unmute when you're ready to speak, remember to state your name prior to speaking. Please remember that we're all on camera and the meeting is being live streamed as always. Hold the questions till the end of any presentations unless otherwise invited, at which time, we'll allow for questions and discussion. The next item on our agenda is public comment period number one, and we have one card, and I would like to invite Amanda Morgan. No, we have two cards. Okay. Amanda.

Amanda Morgan: Where do you want me?

Chair Hobbs: I think probably right up at the table.

Amanda Morgan: Okay. Alright. Good morning. My name is Amanda Morgan. I'm the Executive Director of Educate Nevada Now powered by the Rogers Foundation. Thank you Chair Hobbs and Members of the Commission for the opportunity to speak on agenda item nine, the discussion of the definition of at-risk as utilized by the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. We've submitted written testimony that goes into greater detail on what we've learned through records plus different school and community feedback. I don't know if you all have received that yet, but I'm happy to share it again or it'll be on Twitter, you know, we'll find a way to get to you. We sincerely urge the Commission to review that and I'm just going to be highlighting a few things here. The theme of our testimony is that all the questions and concerns that have been brought up over the past three and a half years are now coming to fruition. Suspected issues and problems are being confirmed and now there's real world consequences. As suspected, we've learned through internal documents that not, not only did this formula happen to reduce eligibility, that was a key feature, a selling point. Infinite Campus advertised the ability to adjust the number of students, their customer in the case NDE wanted to serve. There's a tool in the formula to adjust the GRAD Scores and percentiles based on the customers' "bandwidth." ENN had asked if the formula could adjust upwards over time to serve more students, and we were told that these carefully calculated factors in machine learning wouldn't allow that. That was false. We learned that there's a lack of understanding on where the target weight comes from and how it can or rather can't be used under the Infinite Campus Model. We learned that Infinite Campus openly states that this GRAD Score ranking is only applicable to grades 6 through 12 and this lines up with feedback that we've received from principals. Why are we using it to determine eligibility for all grades? And we learned that no one is really keeping school level

data, um, to track eligibility figures and shifts in funding. Why aren't we? Why don't we know what's happening in our schools? But I really wanted to highlight the feedback that we've received from schools and the community. We have been inundated with questions and concerns since the implementation of this model. The written testimony provides greater detail, but I wanted to offer some broad strokes here. For one, schools we've talked to have no idea how this formula works. Some don't use Infinite Campus to document all 75 factors. Some use other software for certain factors. Many don't know all the factors or how they interact. They don't understand how the factors could possibly overlook students in their schools. One school noticed that a girl was denied the weight despite having the exact same risk factors as a boy who received it. They question whether this discrimination is even legal and that's a great question. One school noted that some of their homeless students didn't qualify. Several principals feel that the model must not consider academic proficiency at all, because students that desperately need academic support are not qualifying for the weight. Likewise, many schools are blindsided. They attempted to budget conservatively but had no idea the drastic shift that was going to occur. One school that is considered 100% FRL due to the community eligibility program knew they weren't going to get support for all their students, but anticipated some kind of meaningful funding for its large population of economically disadvantaged students. They ended up getting support for their single --

Joseph Baggs: Ms. Morgan. Unfortunately, that is time.

Amanda Morgan: Okay. Well, I provide, provided a written comment. Thank you so much. I really appreciate it.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you so much, Amanda. Next public comment, Ryan Reeves. Am I reading that right?

Ryan Reeves: Yeah, well Ryan. Yes.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Okay.

Ryan Reeves: Hello. My name is Ryan Reeves and I am an attorney and the Chief Operating Officer of Academica Nevada. For those unfamiliar with Academica, we provide accounting, legal, human resources, and reporting compliance support to dozens of charter schools in the State of Nevada. As of this year, we are supporting schools serving over up to 30,000 students. That puts us in support of more than half of the charter school students in the State and one in every 10 students attending public schools in Clark County. Uh, our team of 75 professionals is a tremendous resource and we would welcome the opportunity to work open and often with this Commission. I'm grateful to the Commission, to the Nevada Legislature, and to the Department of Education Staff in dramatically expanding school funding over the past two years. Many of the changes made were long overdue and I believe the creation and work of this Commission with the support of staff made those changes happen. I'm also grateful to see that at-risk funding is being revisited in today's agenda and has been made an item of discussion. GRAD Score is an amazing tool and not -- a technological advancement in the monitoring of student progress and nothing I say today is meant to discourage the State of Nevada from purchasing GRAD Score access from Infinite Campus and using it to help monitor students in need of support. However, it is a school counseling tool, a school monitoring tool, and not a school funding tool. You can make the best hammer in the world, but the moment you try and, and use that to put a screw into wood, it will not work very well, and GRAD Score is not a funding tool and things are not working very well. Public funding must be race neutral, gender neutral, nationality neutral, transparent and open to review and auditable. GRAD Score is none of those things. We have run the numbers. We have tested the program. We have put student data into Infinite Campus and workshop spaces, altered these protected characteristics to see if their GRAD Score changes and it does. Changing even one point is not allowed, because that one point is going to be the difference between at-risk funding eligibility for students close to the cutoff score.

With regard to transparency, daily GRAD Scores are deleted after 30 days and no longer available for review. There are at least three Charter Schools whose students had no GRAD Scores computed for them and zero fund -- at-risk funding. One of these schools is an all female, 90% min-- minority, a 100% FRL School in East Las Vegas. That is simply wrong. Finally GRAD Score looks not just at the nature of the student, but at the failings of the school and then funds that failure. Mater Academy in Las Vegas serves students who by any reasonable measure are at-risk, but because they have great interventions to improve behavior, attendance, and academics, their funding went down under this new model.

At-risk funding in the State tripled and they got fewer dollars. Funding grid by GRAD Score rewards poor academics with more money and punishes programs that improve academics by lowering funding. So [Indiscernible] of your upcoming presentation poses the question, is there a better way to identify [Indiscernible] for funding purposes? Yes, and we would love to work with you in helping --

Joseph Baggs: Sir.

Ryan Reeves: -- to identify those and making that change. Thank you.

Joseph Baggs: Unfortunately. That is time.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Joseph, I'll turn it back over to you to facilitate any comments from members of the public who are up north that wish to also make comments.

Joseph Baggs: Chair Hobbs, we have no in--person comments. I do have one write--in.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Go ahead.

Joseph Baggs: So our written comment comes from Sarah Adler, Principal for Silver State Government Relations. Ms. Adler writes: "Good morning Chair Hobbs, Vice-Chair Woodhouse, and Members of the Commission. On behalf of five independent charter schools in Northern Nevada with whom I work, we appreciate the opportunity to offer this comment on agenda item nine, review and discussion of at-risk formula. While we have shared these concerns previously and with the Committees on the Nevada Legislature, we feel it is worth reiterating as well as adding new information. In brief, the 70 plus factors that create the at-risk formula are strongly weighted toward high school and middle school experiences causing students who were previously identified as at-risk in elementary schools to receive less recognition in the formula. By pushing at-risk designation to higher grades, the formula has removed at-risk funding from earlier grades where the strongest need exists for resources to build fundamental proficiency in English Language, Arts, and Mathematics. These proficiencies are what make students successful in school and encourage them to fully engage in their education through graduation. It is worth noting that it has been stated that pushing up the dollars at-risk students was asking to provide the depth of resources previously provided to Zoom and Victory Schools. A Guinn Center report from 2019 states that during the 2016-17 and the 2017-18 years of Zoom and Victory Schools, 86% of the Zoom schools and 83% of the Victory schools were elementary schools with 14% and 17% being middle schools, none of them were high schools. A preponderance of the at-risk factors are based on an efficient model where the student earns more at-risk points for displaying weaknesses, such as chronic absenteeism. In a dollar seeking -- excuse me -- in a dollar seeking scenario, a school might be disincentivized to tackle these weaknesses, because doing so would reduce its at-risk funding, missing homework, or will risk out on at-risk funding or will have to put precious teaching time to counting demerits. Finally the new information, the schools in our group are told how many at-risk students they have, but not who those at-risk students are. One Elementary School went from 156 at-risk, which was the entire school population to funding equal to one at-risk student without knowing which student that is. Similarly, a K-8 school went from 78 at-risk students to funding commensurate -- to commensurate with 23 unnamed students.

The funding cannot follow the student nor is that small of amount funding enough to create a meaningful intervention or support. It just goes to the general fund. Thank you for this opportunity to provide public comment. Sarah Adler.”

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Thanks very much. Do we have any callers wishing to provide public comment?

Joseph Baggs: We have one on the line we believe. Let me double check.

Unidentified Speaker: Caller Maria, if you could unmute yourself, state your full name, and if you're providing public comment.

Maria Soder: I apologize. This is Maria Soder (ph) with the Nevada Department of Education and I am just listening.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Thank you very much.

Joseph Baggs: That completes the comment in person.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Appreciate it. So we've received in-person public comment one by way of email and we had no caller, so we'll close public comment period number one. Next item on the agenda is approval of the flexible agenda that would require a motion and a second.

Paul Johnson: Move to approve the flexible agenda.

Nancy Brunes: Second.

Chair Hobbs: Motion and second. All of those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed? Thank you. Next item is approval of the Minutes from the December 15th Meeting, same thing, we would need a motion and a second.

Paul Johnson: Move to approve the minutes.

Punam Mathur: Second.

Chair Hobbs: Motion and a second. Any discussion on the Minutes? Not hearing any. All of those in favor of approving the Minutes, signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Paul Johnson: Can I make a comment on the Minutes?

Chair Hobbs: You certainly can.

Paul Johnson: I didn't realize how many times I said um and uh during my discussion until I read the minutes, so appreciate that it'll help me be more eloquent as I speak. This would not happen again.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I, personally I appreciated it, because I took it over at a 150.

Paul Johnson: Anyway, it sounded great. Great.

Chair Hobbs: Item number five, a report from the Nevada Department of Education. Megan if you're ready.

Megan Peterson: Good morning, Chair. Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson. Commission Members, good morning. We have a lot to share this morning. I'm finally happy to say it would not necessarily be a broken record.

Chair Hobbs: We appreciate it.

Megan Peterson: What I'm going to start with is the Work Back Schedule that had been previously discussed. We have been able to build it into a software in a system that we have started using known as Smartsheet, and so we have developed a Gantt chart and I'm hoping -- I'm just waiting -- here we go -- for my screen to upload, and so that document that we had been working off of, as I mentioned, we've put it into a Gantt chart, identified each one of the tasks. I have condensed this down, so that way you're not all completely overwhelmed with the amount of information, but you can kind of get a sense of how this is flowing.

And so for each one of the, um, tasks or objectives of the Commission, we do have it built out in here with time frames showing where there's overlap and work that, uh, needs to occur. So this does hopefully help visualize a little bit more the path and the tasks that are ahead and the time frame in which we need to complete them.

Um, in order to assist the Commission and the work groups that have since been developed in, um, dividing out this work and staying on track, we have also developed a dashboard -- there we go -- um, that we are going to be making available to not only the full Commission, but, as I mentioned, we've developed these for each one of the work groups that have been developed. It has, um, a little bit different information on each one. So I'm not going to go over every one of them today, but this is the one that's made available to the full Commission and you can see a list of all the upcoming dates, the locations that will occur.

We have links to the meeting materials that are also available on the Department website as well as links to previous materials. Um, flowing down, you can see here we have links for, and this is intended for -- intended for internal use, so that way we can collaborate and share the information as we need, um, but we have dashboards set up for our work groups as well as identifying our upcoming action items on the agendas that will be discussed. Um, we have a quick link to the Gantt Chart as well as the Progress Plan for all the deliverables within the Commission's work, and then we have a lovely, um, section at the bottom identifying all of our Commission Members and the work groups that they have all been linked to, so that way we have a clear a -- a clear picture of our work and where we overlap

I, I am, I'm not quite sure that I can make that link work in Zoom today, but we can work on that. Um, and that being said, we also, uh, have an update in terms of our contracts that are in play and so this will also be a page that will be available to Commission Members, so that they can click in and see where we are in the process. Um, this is all still very high level as we've been trying to get the framework in place, but as time goes on, we'll be updating this and making it more transparent to where each of these are in their process flow.

Um, we also have within the Gantt Chart, and again I won't bring it up just because of the extreme amount of information that does not fit friendly on this screen, um, but we have tied each one of these contracts to the deliverables to make sure that we do have subject matter expertise available for each one of those deliverables. And then we also obviously have our budget here available, so that way we can track how much money we have set aside for each one of the projects, um, so that way we can use our resources wisely. So with that, um, you can see we are still in development and working through the economy support and we are just working

through the final stages of our evaluation committee for that, so that way we can hire -- I'm sorry -- submit the RFP in order to do the 10--year plan for the, um, revenues we have our accountability and this refers to our wire framework and the quarterly reporting and the items that are identified there.

We have, um, the NCEI update in terms of the materials and content for updating that annually as we discussed, that is currently pending vendor signature. Same with our CWI, um, Regression Analysis, this is also pending a vendor signature, and then we have been working with WestEd and applied analyt -- I'm sorry -- [Indiscernible] Associates on a different contract that we have in place under change management into relations to supporting the Commission and so we're expanding that scope currently and we're waiting for signatures on that as well. So we are hoping to have, um, some updates and information on those contracts and the timelines in next Commission Meeting. Um, also since --

Chair Hobbs: So Megan --

Megan Peterson: Umm.

Chair Hobbs: If, if, if I may, um, on, on the point that you were just raising. So those that are leading working groups that are thinking about the type of subject matter expert support that they need, um, what's the best way to -- for them to determine which is the best match for them? You know, what, what -- for example, um, what is the scope of the, the WestEd and APA contracts or contract revisions and how might that, you know, help with, uh, one of the working groups that has specific tasks in the area of, uh, accountability and reporting, any of those elements. I don't know if I made sense in asking that question, but I think everyone that has a working group would like to know where do I get the additional resources or we already contracted to be able to provide what we think we need and who do we talk to then about discharging that part of the work.

Megan Peterson: Yes, I'm Megan Peterson for the record. So that information, I have, um, tied in, in our Gantt Chart that will be available to the Commission Members to go in through their dashboard to identify that, also, um, in working with Department Staff will be able to provide the scopes of work, so they can see where those items do align and we'll have copy of those available, um, within the dashboards as well.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So that's where we get all --

Megan Peterson: It's a little difficult -- yeah. It's a little --

Chair Hobbs: That's where we all need to, to look. That, that's where all the resources are to support the working groups?

Megan Peterson: Correct. It's a little difficult to demonstrate on the screen. Um, we do plan to give a, a short tutorial when the work groups meet, so that way they can learn how to navigate the dashboards. Um, and we did start having those meetings last week with each of the work groups, um, but this was still in the development phase, and so in our next meetings, we should be able to roll these out and really connect all of those dots.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Thank you. Sorry to have interrupted.

Megan Peterson: Happy to answer any questions that do come up.

Chair Hobbs: Paul.

Paul Johnson: Well, I don't have a question, uh, I just have a compliment. Um, I would, uh, like to express

my appreciation and gratitude for Megan and Beau and James for all of the work that they are doing. I know that we've magnified their workload by splitting into these subcategories, uh, but, you know, they do a, a tremendous volume of work, uh, they are great to work with and I just would like to say thank you and I appreciate them.

Chair Hobbs: Uh, ditto. I thank for all of us. And by the way, Joseph, you probably have noticed Dr. Bruner is here, so you can certainly Mark her present, but, yeah, I, I appreciate that, uh, and we, we'll get to the working group reports and I suppose to get into it a little bit more with respect to, you know, how each of those groups are trying to attack their tasks. So anything else, Megan?

Megan Peterson: No, I think that covered it for today.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks very much. Any other questions from Members of the Commission? Okay. That takes us to item number six where we'll have the working group leaders providing updates on the information gathering or their progress up to date and I suppose we have nine different working groups. So let's see how this goes. Um, the first working group that we have is the Performance of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan --

Joyce Woodhouse: That's me.

Chair Hobbs: -- and that would be Vice Chair Woodhouse.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Chair. Um, Joyce Woodhouse, for the record. We, we have met with, um -- Dr. Jensen and I have met with, uh, Beau and James, um, and I think Megan was there as well. Um, so we have our first meeting scheduled for next week, um, and we're meeting with the Superintendents, um, and all, all of them that can attend, uh, via Zoom to get their perspectives on how things are working with the formula itself, um, identify pluses and minuses, so that we can address any of the, the, uh, imperfections, shall I say, um, in the formula itself. And the following day, uh, we have, we have also, uh, meeting with the CFOs from around the State, uh, via Zoom again with the same intent.

Um, and then Dr. Jensen and I just spoke the other day and our third meeting is not scheduled yet, but we're going to be reaching out to, uh, the Governor's Finance Office and the LC -- the Legislative Council Bureau Fiscal Office to meet with their lead people on the funding formula itself, um, and again how it's working from their side. Uh, I did hear from, um, a member of the -- or what the vice -- I heard from the Vice-Chair of the, the IFC that, um, an issue has arisen recently, um, that they're working on, so hopefully, we'll be able to assist with that. I've not received yet what that question is, um, but it, it came up in a, in a conversation that they were having some struggles with some of the language that was in 543. So we'll take a look at that and then we'll move on from there, um, as to what else we need to do with, uh, just a few minutes -- months to do it in, but that's where we are so far.

Chair Hobbs: You know, I appreciate that. So in, in the -- under the category of Performance of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, that's pretty broad. You know, I think the, the main question was, is the formula performing as intended and I think we want to get, um, you know, get a affirmation of, of, uh, whether or not it is. And then I suppose the second part would encompass some of the other items that we've been tasked with that deal directly with elements of the formula. Right? I mean, uh, one of our ongoing responsibilities is to continue to monitor and improve the implementation. And I'm not sure if, if things like the, you know, discussion that we, we heard this morning during public comment of the at-risk pieces and other sort of fit under that, but they would seem to. Right? Um, so that's a lot.

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes.

Chair Hobbs: A lot to handle.

Joyce Woodhouse: It is. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Any question -- these are meant to be interactive, since we've divided into working groups and working groups have a, a couple to three members of the Commission directly working on and no one else on the Commission is excluded from participating in that or being aware of it. So as we go through these, if anybody has questions or comments about any one of these topical areas, this would be a great time to bring it up.

Joyce Woodhouse: And as a Chair -- Joyce Woodhouse, for the record -- or not Chair, I'm a lead person, um, I would really appreciate any in-- information or questions you have that you would like this work group to look at, because all of you are, are coming from other areas, some of you are in the finance world, some of you are in the community, so, uh, any question or concerns or problems that, uh, have arisen that you're aware of that I haven't addressed yet, um, we're happy to hear from that. So you can always call or email me at any time.

Paul Johnson: And Joyce, who are the members of that work group [Indiscernible].

Joyce Woodhouse: Dr. Jensen is. I can't remember who the others are. Megan, do you have those?

Paul Johnson: I thought I might have been on that, I just want to make sure I'm not shirking my responsibility.

Chair Hobbs: You're on every one of them.

Joyce Woodhouse: We just don't want to, uh, have a problem with the open meeting law.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah.

Megan Peterson: Yes, we do have the members. Um, give me one second to pull it up. So we have you, Vice-Chair Woodhouse, we have Dr. Jensen, Member Casey, and Member Johnson on the PCFP Technical Updates Work Group.

Joyce Woodhouse: And I don't believe we sent out a notice yet for those Tuesday meetings, um, which, uh, we'll get on that today.

Chair Hobbs: So as we go through these, um, one of the things I think we all need to bear in mind is that and thinking back to the work back schedule that, uh, Megan and those folks have developed, we need to be, for each of the working groups establishing, um, target and dates for that work and any milestone dates along the way, so those can be put in and, and then we, we can all then see how all of the other working groups are, are, uh, performing. Uh, that's, that's one thing that needs to be established fairly quickly, like probably in the next couple of weeks.

And I don't know the meeting schedules of all the working groups, but certainly that would be helpful to transmit those, um, identifying the, the scopes of work for each one of the working groups and what work needs to be done to complete the task. And we'll talk about what it means to complete the task in a, in a moment or so. Uh, identifying what other support may be needed for that working group from NDE or from subject matter experts, uh, the sooner the better on that. Um, there may be things that -- as you develop your topics, um, there may be things that you want to look into, want to have research that haven't been contemplated yet in putting together any of the, the contracts or the RFPs that are in process, so that's exceedingly important to make sure that you have that level of support. And I think the other thing, um, need to be thinking about what does

completion of that task look like. Um, is it as simple as, as the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan working as we envisioned, you know.

Paul Johnson: Yes.

Chair Hobbs: Um, okay. Um, at the end of all of this, uh, there will be a report that we'll be putting together. And I've started, just FYI, I've started to outline that report and work on -- working on the front end of that report, uh, because I continue to look at the number of months remaining and that is, is extremely frightening, but, you know, everything that would describe what our process has been up to this point and how we're approaching all of the, the tasks, so I'm starting to put all of that material together. So I think those are the things as we go through these reports, we each need to be thinking about and, and reporting back to the, the rest of the Commission.

And would not you know the next item, uh, is mine anyway, Optimal Funding. Um, on this one, and we, we've talked about this in previous meetings. You know, we, we filed a report a year ago. Well, it's over a year ago, uh, that identified different levels of funding based on benchmarks we have established whether it be national averages or subject matter expert recommendations. Uh, those targets have been updated.

We also identified methods of funding. Uh, we identified a wide variety of methods of funding. Uh, those numbers are -- work is being done to update those numbers notwithstanding the fact that the, the, uh -- the subject matter expert contract for the economist, uh, has yet to be completed, um, because that's a, that's a lot of work. And, you know, the idea right now is to update that report pretty much in the same form that that report previously existed except we'll be narrowing the, the recommended funding paths that we could take and obviously that'll be in discussion, uh, for this Commission when we get down to that level, but where we gave them, I'm trying to remember, 12 to 15 different scenarios, you know, between doing this with property tax or doing this with sales tax and different elements, different combinations of things. Uh, the goal would be to get it down to three or four. That would be more along the lines of recommendations than an exploration of the universe of ways of funding, if that makes sense. So a lot of that technical work is in process right now to enable us to get to that point and essentially take the same framework of the report that we filed previously, update that, and have that ready for the Commission.

Now as a, as a part of all of that, if there, if there is a desire to have additional discussion on Optimal Funding, we can certainly have that. You know, the, the Commission previously took a position that, uh, we would look at national average as sort of the lower bar and subject matter expert recommendations as the next bar and the recommendations from the Association of School Superintendents as the, the next bar. So I think we, we've developed a pretty good range, uh, at this point, and even at the low bar part of that, the, the funding challenges are significant, but anyway technically that work is all being done and the notion would be to complete that report and hopefully we can complete that, my thinking is, uh, hopefully by May. That's the timeline I'm thinking about right now, and again the final product would look something like the previous prod -- product looked and how that would fit into a report from this version of our Commission since some of these subjects are so different. I'm not sure if at the end of the day, it's one report that has all of these very divergent chapters in it or if it's a series of reports. You guys have any thoughts on that?

Nancy Bruner: I was thinking about that, because, um, as you were speaking, because I was thinking part of Senator Woodhouse's work, I think this edition has a section in the report to the legislators or like how is the, the principal Pupil-Centered Funding Formula working now, um, but there you can, I guess, you could envision a mini report being included as an appendix, but maybe a summary of the work being included in the final report that we submit to the legislature.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, I think we should all be thinking about, you know, what that form should look like,

because again, you know, some of these are, you know, the optimal funding piece maybe 40 pages or, you know, whatever it is. Some of the rest of these, you know, particularly those that deal with like, uh, questions posed by legislative memorandum, um, might be one page.

Nancy Brunes: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: You know, and then trying to make it into something cohesive. At the end of the day, we want to check all those boxes, but I think we want to make, uh, whatever we file is impactful as possible.

Punam Mathur: Yeah. Um, thank you. For the record, Member Mathur. I've been thinking about this a lot, probably more than as productive, very useful. Um, there's going to be so much energy around avoiding the issue of funding. It is just really difficult for elected officials. And so whatever we can do to make it easier to focus and to stay focused, and so if it's contained with other things, I understand about the natural human desire to say, well, let's talk about one through 18 and 19 through 322 and not take on the one that we need to deal with. And so I think actually creating it as a single, uh, document, uh, is in the long--term better in terms of helping us stay focused, um, because we can and we will evolve and improve the way it works, the way it's structured, the way it operates, and we should, um, but fundamentally, it's we got to get on a path to adequacy or hopefully optimal in terms of funding. [Interposing].

Chair Hobbs: You know, I think, I, I think one way of, at least this is the way I've been kind of thinking about, it is, you know, the tasks that we had the last go around were to, well, we had number of them, but, you know, largely it was identify optimal funding and ways you could get there. I mean, aside from a lot of the other things that we -- boxes we had to check and, uh, then during the last session, education received some additional funding, but of course, you know, because of the, the way the political process works, um, there was a strong desire and I think this is responsible certainly too to ensure that the additional funding is being spent wisely and in a way that creates improvement and return. Right? And so this time, we're really focused more on that part of it, um, so I'm -- I may be actually speaking contrary to what I've said before, but I think the, the, you know, the optimal funding and how to fund it part of it may stand alone and separate from the accountability part of it, but I may, may be wrong there. I just wanted to throw that out there.

Jim McIntosh: Go ahead.

Chair Hobbs: I mean they're linked.

Joyce Woodhouse: Yeah.

Punam Mathur: Member Mathur, for the record. Just, historically, there's just [Indiscernible] closely that we get stuck in, would not fund it until it performs better, would not fund it until it performs better, if it's not performing better, we can't fund it, would not fund it. It just goes on and on. Right? So I am an absolute believer that we should invest and be eyes wide open in evaluating the impact, impact and the accountability. I am not a believer that, when, when it comes to something as critical public education, which for me is still an HR function, it is a people function.

Unless we are willing to pay people and invest enough to hire people, retain people, develop people, celebrate people, no amount of discussion around the accountability is ever going to make the case. Right? And so I do believe that they -- it was, it was a really prudent, I agreed with what the legislature did in terms of [Indiscernible] saying okay. This, thank you, we now, we know order of magnitude of optimal and now we know there's ways that we can get there. That's good. We've got a formula that we think is working. Let's get some accountability established on a go forward basis that we live with the formula forever, I think that's good. Um, for me this session really, I hope, is one where they look at the fiscal policy of the State of Nevada and

recognize that it is in -- has a desperate need of modernization as was the formula and that's kind of slightly different for me, so I don't have a strong feeling about it, but it --

Chair Hobbs: Jim.

Jim McIntosh: I, I, I agree. Member McIntosh, for the record. I agree with Member Mathur, um, I, and I, you know, um, having previously worked at the school district and then now working at a, uh, local government, I think the discussion surrounding funding is always difficult actually like you speak to, um, and, I, I feel like the trap we always get into is when we just approach from -- uh, we're approaching this from fund education and, um, we talk about optimal funding and the possibilities or the ways we could get there through property tax, sales tax and then I always feel like the discussion moves to, well, we need to have a larger discussion than about just the tax structure for the State of Nevada, which is an even bigger discussion, right, and then it sort of moves everything off into when might we do that, there would be a study first, it would be a couple more years before we fix all of this, and that's where we fall into that where we -- when we're going to have this discussion, we got to talk about all of it and so, and I, and then I worry that we, we get away from where we are in our target.

I, I don't have an answer to that, so in terms of, I don't want to get off the track either where you're trying to figure out how this report gets moved out. I think, the, um -- I think the, the funding parts are so very important, because that was our initial charge. I think the accountability is tied to all of that. I am -- I don't want to confuse legislature. I completely agree with you, we have a limited amount of time and a limited attention span when it comes to dealing with the Nevada Legislature. I want them to know that we're doing our job as a Commission and we've done a lot of work and it's been -- I would, I think, your group, Senator Woodhouse, is very important in terms of hearing from the Superintendents that it is working the way we thought, now let's get these accountability measures in place and let's start paying people appropriately.

I, I'm on a group that is, um, regarding, uh, open zoning and accessibility within the schools and there's also one regarding small school funding as well and I'm not saying those are not important, I'm just saying I don't know if that distracts in terms of a report as all these other things we could be doing, right, and so, um, I want to make sure the report is focused enough that we, we know what we're supposed to do, it is working, uh, the money is flowing through, let's get the accountability component set up, um, and we -- let's start talking about how we can fund this thing going forward.

Chair Hobbs: That's a good point, Jim, because I think there are a couple of things that sort of can be separated and addressed outside of confusing the main objective that we're trying to deal with. And I understand what both of you are saying, because I've watched this happen, you know, probably, I don't know eight times over the last 40 years, where, well, we really can't do that until we do a study of the overall fiscal system, so again that's going to take two years.

And then, then you give the report while, while you're in a downturn of the economy, well, this is a terrible time to make any of those changes or you give report during a time when the economy is doing really well, why do we need to do, you know, so it's almost seemed to me over the years, you had to find that point in between a fiscal down cycle and an up cycle and that probably doesn't work either, because what you're talking, you know, -- when you, when you start talking about things like property and sales tax, because they are such formidable elements of the overall fiscal structure of the State, you are talking about fiscal reform for the State, I mean, essentially you are, and, and, you know, it also brings into the discussion of other forms of funding, because nobody really likes talking about property tax, nobody likes talking about taxes in general, but that one in specifically, and so it brings in other elements.

And yeah, it can get out of control and I think the one thing that we have going for us is that we've identified a

need based on a couple of different metrics and it's linked to something that is in arguably one of the most critical things that a State government does and that's provide for education. The further we get away from that, that linkage to this being for the kids of Nevada and the future of Nevada, the more I think it distracts from us. So with all of that in mind, I don't think we've solved the problem.

Paul Johnson: I have a, I have a limited thought, but you want to check up north to see.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I have seen, but I, I absolutely do and then we're going to be getting reports from some of them as well, but, uh, certainly if any of you want to chime in on this part of the conversation or sort of short circuited it after we gave, after Joyce gave her update, you know, because I just started to think about how, how all of these pieces mesh together.

Paul Johnson: Well, I, I just have one thought in alignment with that. I think it needs to be one comprehensive report or subcommittee or subgroup committee reports could be an appendix, so if there's additional detail that they can go and identify that, but, I, I personally think, uh, whatever we put in there has to be prioritized, like this is the most important thing first, let's address these things first, let's -- and, and, so, so I think when we do this, we need to identify the things that are most important and explain that in a way why they're most important, um, and format in that manner.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I think, I would absolutely agree. I think we need to prioritize them and, and make them in the form of recommendations through the legislature for modifications to the current system. Yeah.

Punam Mathur: Sorry. Member Mathur. It also -- although working groups that is going to really looking at salary like compensation for teachers, for educators, and support personnel. Um, there were several things that we were given as honey-do list items, um, coming out of this session that frankly make no sense to me. Um, so I know that it was someone who had a priority, and at some moment in the legislative process, it was determined that we were going to get to do the job.

It still doesn't change the fact that some of those are quite random from the mission that we have, um, and so we should do them, because we have an obligation, we got to submit the homework assignment that we should, but I don't even see those as warranting space in the reports. Right? I think there, there's a report that say, we owe you the homework that you assigned us, here's what it is, um, but in terms of our mission, it is -- we had two jobs, sand thing up and buff it and improve it over time and we should stay focus and then two, put us and fund us on, on a path in your journey to optimal. Those are the two, um, and so I think for us, if we just can keep bringing it back to that conversation, it serves, um, it just serves us better.

Chair Hobbs: You know what I'm getting out of this, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that we want to build the body of the report that way to keep the focus on that and then note in the report that we were given, you know, assignments A through Z --

Punam Mathur: [Interposing].

Chair Hobbs: -- and then attach them in the appendix as Paul have suggested earlier, because that's part of our --

Punam Mathur: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: -- that's part of our assignment. Right? But they don't have to necessarily be in the main body of the report.

Punam Mathur: And they're just -- sorry, Member Mathur. They're distractions from the two reasons would exist.. We could spend months and do all kind of diligence on salary compensation, um, but fundamentally.

Paul Johnson: [Indiscernible] importance to.

Punam Mathur: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So I, one of, I guess just to fin-- finish this particular point, each of the working groups would have some form of report on their particular set of tasks that would perhaps go into an appendix and be liftable for discussion, you know, if somebody wanted to talk about the small school capital things for example, you go get that piece of it and you can focus on it. Does that sound like correct?

Paul Johnson: I, yeah, makes sense to me.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you. That's something I -- when I started to work on the outline, uh, I thought well I better not presuppose what the best way of putting, this is better that have this discussion. Dr. Jensen, I'm going to go up to you, um, because the four of you are sitting there and, and all of you, uh, always have something valuable to add. So let's, um, let's give you guys an opportunity.

David Jensen: Member Jensen, for the record. I think our value came from the picture, um, your picture from the Commission. You know, we, we'll work on getting a new picture for you there, Mr. Hobbs, Chair. In terms of the report, we, we've just kind of had some sidebar conversations. We agree one unified document is the direction to go. I also agree with Member Johnson as much as we can prioritize that is going to be essential. I think we've got one shot to provide a meaningful document to our legislators, and if we're not clear and concise and it can be found in one document, we're going to lose them, so that was kind of our, our sidebar conversation. So thank you for the opportunity to weigh in. Any other comments from down here?

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Well, continuing on with the working group reports, uh, next I would turn to, uh, to you Jason, Accountability Reporting and Data.

Jason Goudie: Yeah, Jason Goudie got for the record. So, um, we've had a couple of brief meetings, um, and, and a lot of what we've discussed was previously discussed in one of the working groups I think that Paul led, um, early on, um, to, to really try, and the first step that we see is to really try and get what we call a comprehensive list of, of reports that were required. Um, my team and CCSD started working on this a couple months ago or a month or so ago, and so we've put together at least from the business finance unit, um, what we think it's in there, um, in a format that kind of talks about the title of it, why it's required, frequency, and then at the end a notes column for anybody that's out there that's putting these in saying, hey, this is really duplicate of X,Y,Z or I sent this off and nobody is ever questioning things like that, so we can start to gather the, the usage of, of these reports. Um, and so we at CCSD since we're the largest, we've taken this on, I've, I've now sent it out to all the Chiefs, um, of every district unit and ask them to include everything that they do from a Federal -- from State perspective.

And is it going to be complete? No, there's no way we could do everything, but I mean right now it's gargantuan and so, um, I've also met with, with both, um, James and, um, Beau and they've provided some inventory type list that we've put together, so we're going to incorporate that. Um, and I've also talked to, um, both Mark and Kyle a couple times about the progress and sent them a copy of the spreadsheet that we started, Google doc or whatever it is, right, Google sheet I guess. And, um, the plan is essentially for CCSD to complete this as much as we can and ultimately distribute it to, to the small group, NDE, and Kyle and Mark just to kind of look at, get their teams looking at it and then essentially send it back out to all CFOs, and they can use it as a checklist and plan on just kind of putting a check box like, I'll list all the, all the groups and, and,

and Charters and just to make they can put a check, if they haven't we have to recreate. They can then notify us of anything else they see, uh, things we missed, things that might not -- should not be on there, because they're not really a State requirement or Federal and, and we've got Council of the Great City Schools reports on there. I'm going to take those off eventually, but we're trying to make it as comprehensive as possible.

Once we get into that, um, then, then we're going to work with NDE. NDE is going to be involved as well talking about how they utilize some of these reports and, and I know that we've talked about -- Mark has talked about class size reduction. Right? We need the data, we know we need the data, but why is every single district in the State creating a quarterly report telling you what we're going to do to address class size what is impossible to address. So we just keep creating this report that [Indiscernible] work and I don't think anybody does anything with it, because what is there to do with it. Right? Those are the things that we're going to try and then ultimately we're going to try and gather some of that data and put it in a, um, definable and, and kind of, uh, editable format and then discuss whether or not we can utilize some of the, um, third party experts to kind of validate some of our assumptions, because we would much prefer a third party to, to recommend amending NRS or eliminating reports than just coming from a CFO group and making it seem like it's self-serving, which it isn't, it's really to kind of get to, let's get to the reports that, that work and then, then tying this into the next groups as to how these reports can help, um, the actual new accountability standards we have. So that's where we are.

Chair Hobbs: Fantastic. Any questions, comments?

Paul Johnson: Yeah, that's exciting. I can't wait to see the -- I know the list is huge, um, so I'm looking forward to seeing that and sharing that with the people who are not -- that don't understand what they have asked, because those asks have been independent over decades of years, um, and, um, we've all had to do these bits and pieces, and it to me, it has been, yes, of course, some of them are dated, they no longer relevant, it's just, it's, um -- I'm really curious to see the report.

Chair Hobbs: So just out of, out of curiosity, Joyce, question for you from, from a legislative standpoint. What, what type of openness or reaction or I'm not sure what, what the right word is, would they have to, as Jason said and Paul said, you know, a lot of these reports have been required over a series of many, many years for some reason that, that must have made sense at the time and there is a ton of duplication and, and then we, we become aware that in some cases, those reports aren't terribly impactful to anything. Um, do, does the legislature -- are they -- do you think they're open to cleaning that up?

Joyce Woodhouse: I think that they would be, um, in, in working with, uh, Superintendent Ebert and Superintendent (ph) Canavero before that, um, it's always been, it's usually been a Bill brought by the Department, um, and I think what happens normally is frankly falls through the cracks, because there's so many other big issues with, uh, the budget and the various other issues that come before the Finance Committees and Education and Government Affairs Committees, I would say those three, that it probably they get lost. Um, I know that legislators are hearing from teachers, principals, you know, and, and Jason, I think, you know, the people that you work with, um, are letting some legislators know too, uh, because I've been hearing it for years, it's just, it's never been, it's never been front burner legislation or Bill drafts whatever, um, but I think in -- with it being addressed in this report, I'll be, I'll be my typical optimist that it might happen this time, but it's coming from school districts, it's coming from the classroom, it's coming from the Department of Ed that a lot of this -- you know, I know Jim, you complained about this when you were with the school district too.

So, uh, I, I think maybe it's time now that we can make something really happen with this, that, that it's just legislators need to have something very succinct in front of them about what we need to do and hear from the people who are, who are having the greatest inks over it, um, and I think it would be easy, because I think, I think it can happen, I really do. It's just, it's been a Bill in the past that the Department has testified on and then

it just kind of falls on deaf years, but there needs to be momentum behind it, and I think, we -- this report can make that happen.

Jim McIntosh: If, if I may, Member McIntosh for the record. Very briefly, I would just say, all those reports are always requested for accountability purposes, right, that's been my experience. They want to know in a simple report, you know, you say one of those reports are used to punish you, right, in some way, right, so, um, but I -- my experience has been there's a very unique issue or an issue and they want to report, somebody wants for an ad hoc report in order to, you know, hold school districts accountable, because they don't have time for all of them to come up and testify in front of them about a particular issue.

They want a simple report put in front of them and know that it's uniformly being created across, you know, school districts and I feel like it's been duplicative over time, we, we are actually providing somewhat the same information sometimes, um, in the same reports, because we don't realize we have one report that already doing that, and when you do that, you know, sometimes you pull in from different accounting systems and this numbers off from this report and you're spending a lot of time just trying to reconcile numbers between two reports that are doing the same thing.

So I fully support, I, I would hope the legislature would see, we would like to provide you with something that's uniform in terms of how everybody preparing it and the methodology they're using to prepare, comparative between those school districts and hopefully it's what you can use, what -- the information you need to help, however, you feel that will help hold school districts accountable.

Joyce Woodhouse: And I would like to piggyback on what Jason said about class size for example, because that was one when, when I was a Teacher Association Leader, and that goes back in long ways, the class size issue was one that we always pushed, um, one that getting class sizes to, to a point where teachers can really do the job that they want to do, but then it gets turned off, because you don't have the money for it, and so I think the links between the reports that are necessary and the other things that we are doing, those links can help make these things happen, but it's just sometimes the issue is, we want the report, because we're trying to put pressure on raising more money for education, but we can't, so, you know, we have a report of how many kids are in classrooms across the State, but we don't do anything with it, so, and others have the same kinds of things and others are just frankly a lot of paperwork put on people to do.

Paul Johnson: Agreed.

Joyce Woodhouse: But there needs to be a reason why we're asking for those reports.

Nancy Bruner: Um, can I add just sort of linking this conversation back to the previous one, I think I agree with your point that we need a report, we can stay focused on our tasks, but I think this is a really important conversation, I can almost envision like a parallel legislative conversation that just focuses on this issue and maybe other people help carry that all forward like, I don't know, if NDE or the State Board of Education would be a natural ally or the Superintendents. I think it's a, a really important conversation that would help everyone, but again we maybe we don't or maybe we have a subcommittee that sort of works on both of these conversations, I don't want to muddy them, but I think they're both really important and need, to need to happen.

Punam Mathur: And if I could just pull that string a little further -- Member Mathur, for the record. Um, the Governor at the beginning of session, if I recall, issued a challenge to all departments to say, cut the bureaucracy, cut with needless reports, um, and give me the rationale for it. I think it fits there, um, I also think that any business person would look at the result -- whatever its going to, to result from this full assessment and be like, oh, my God, that's incredible, how many -- how much time is being spent by people in 8--hour function, right, doing something there's absolutely not serving your mission, and so I think to have people served on a

SAGE Commission, sort of, you know, be the, the stewards of this sensibility, would make it an entirely different conversation, because I do think that there's a little bit of, NDE is probably trying to hide the ball, because they have a lot to gain, CFOs don't want to work so hard and so let's discount the, the, you know, the value of their perspective, but I think it, it will be supported, because you're doing the work to say here it is and here's how many are not used for anything and here's how many are very similar and here's how many, um, are antiquated, because they deal with class size reduction for example. I think, business will be like, oh, that just makes a bizarre logic, and then the Governor cut --

Nancy Brunes: [Indiscernible] retirement.

Punam Mathur: I thought of actually is their CFOs, you know, they, they were there at the SAGE Commission. They've been there long time doing this work to try to get some more coherency, sensibility, and efficiencies. Right?

Jim McIntosh: And Member McIntosh. To, for Member Brunes' point, um, I think you do need to involve some of those organizations, and I use a very specific example, school districts have always provided, at least when I worked at the school district, and finance, um, uh, per pupil information by school, I understand the need for that, we have, uh, methodologies for pulling that. Uh, Legislative Council Bureau at time, uh, I don't know whether they felt we weren't providing it in an appropriate enough manner, they wanted their own reporting, and they wanted their own reporting system and they purchased their own reporting system that we then had to go, at the time it was called Insight, and I don't know what it is called --

Paul Johnson: School Nomics.

Jason Goudie: [Indiscernible].

Jim McIntosh: -- and so then we had to provide a separate set of reporting regarding for people that we were already doing, but in this new format and under a new accountability structure where the numbers wouldn't always tie back perfectly. Right? And so, um, but when we ask about sort of consolidating all of that at one point where we had been using it for several years, we told no, that's a PO under the Legislative Council Bureau, that's their purview they still want this report, and so that's why I think you're going to have some of the difficulties in trying to consolidate all this.

There's a reason they wanted it, there's a reason they still want that information, and if that's the decision where we decide this is the system we're going to use, fine. My -- unfortunately, my experience has been reusing several systems, and we are -- at least when I worked at CCSD, we were providing data by school seven different ways, and you could get a per-pupil number seven different ways, and then it was which one is the correct one, it's like, well, they're all correct in some way, um, the counting used to do it. Right? And so and I just always, there always my story like, you have, um, one watch, you know what time it is, you have two watches, you're never quite sure, right, because when you using two different systems, both of those could be, you don't know which one is correct, um, or the exact way of doing it, but you can account for things multiple ways. I just think it's an example of you need to bring these groups to say what was the purpose of us doing this and how can we consolidate some of this information, but we consistently been told, no, by the Legislative Council, they wanted to continue that system.

Chair Hobbs: It, it sounds to me like all of this is, you know, things that we've talked about over the last few years, it's symptomatic of, of confusion over really important numbers, you know, for example like what is Nevada per--pupil spending, and, you know, until we focused it in on a couple of numbers and define that methodology, I probably heard six or seven different numbers and never really understood the differences between them and I think some of are being used, you know, as a matter of convenience, uh, sometimes, and

then when that happens, they all lose their credibility. You know, I mean it's, it's kind of, kind of crazy, but, you know, with -- and Paul, you're, you're next with the New Reporting Framework, which is supposed to define the type of data that we should, at least in part should be collecting, evaluating, and presenting to answer certain important questions that hopefully sets aside. I know there, I know understand what the reality may be down, but hopefully would set aside some of these other layers, these other layers and layers and layers of reports and, you know, one could replace the other, I -- maybe that's too hopeful. I don't know, but before we go to yours, I just want to head back up north again, um, we have some CFOs up there that probably want to chime in on what Jason's group is doing.

Mark Mathers: Thanks. Thanks, Chairman Hobbs. Mark Mathers, I, I would just add one of the things that we've seen is a number of reports go back to the old Nevada plan and they, you know, hinge on calculations and adjustments that were part of that plan, but are not part of Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. So that's a clear reason why those kinds of reports are no longer necessary. So, you know, that that I think will be part of our analysis, um, or the consultants' analysis going forward.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Anyone else from up north? Kyle, Dusty, Dr. Jensen? Okay. Well, thanks, Jason. Paul, the New Reporting Framework.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thank you, Chairman Hobbs. Um, so, uh, my group is, um, myself, Punam is the assistant coordinator, and Jim McIntosh is the member on there. Those are the folks that were on the list and have received any, uh, requests to be on that committee from anybody else. We welcome the input. Um, one of the things that we are going to be taking a look at is, um, the information from SB 98 and 400 that we are mandatorily required to report and how that aligns with the existing performance framework that we have, um, so that we can align, not create a new wheel, but work with something that has already been in place that everybody is familiar with.

Community and parents are already familiar with that. Perhaps making that more meaningful and useful and putting those data points in the logical categories that they belong, not necessarily the way that they were described in the legislative authorization, um, and then also I would imagine, uh, that we would have to, uh, commission somebody at some point to explain those essential data points for success that we have talked about, um, that are not specifically identified in statute, that probably should be indicators of excess -- success, so that we can have something that with the intention that whatever reporting format is developed we as a school district use.

The State Department of Education uses and legislators use to extract the same meaningful data in order to make decisions. Uh, right now we have reports that are only used -- honestly, at the district level, we have our own system of reporting that we use to extract meaningful information about student performance that really isn't used. The budget would be one example. That's a document that we prepare but has no meaningful data that we use from a management perspective. Um, so that's some of the things we'll be working on.

I, I think it'll tie directly with what the working group member three is going to be doing I see that at some point maybe being one committee after we develop our individual work splicing that information together to figure out how we present all of that information that we currently have with the information that we want to have and how that fits in with student achievement and growth, student engagement, community engagement, and all of those other subcategories.

Um, we've had one meeting -- I've had one meeting with Beau and, uh, James. Uh, due to some snow that they had in their area, we had to, we had to cancel a couple of days, I was hoping to have a subcommittee meeting prior to this meeting, uh, but we have a meeting scheduled for Friday, um, the 8th --

Punam Mathur: Next week.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, next week.

Chair Hobbs: Next week.

Punam Mathur: Yeah.

Paul Johnson: So we'll be able to talk about that as a group and kind of get some input, so that I can get, um, better clarity and direction on, you know, what the, what the group wants to do, collect and gather and move forward.

Chair Hobbs: So Paul, um, part of it is identifying all of the data elements that would be a part of the reporting and I suppose part of it too is the design for the reporting vehicle itself.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, I, I would think that the, uh, you know, we want to first of all collect all of the, the data points that we think are important, put them in logical categories based on a framework and we can modify the existing framework. We can't change the framework that's in existence. I don't want anybody to think we're going to go and change the NSPF at this point, because that is something that is federally mandated, but we can certainly align all of the data that we have with that. So that is, if we want to incorporate that into the NSPF at some later point, we can do so.

Chair Hobbs: The NSPF.

Paul Johnson: That's star rating system --

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Paul Johnson: -- that we currently have.

Nancy Bruner: It's Nevada State Performance Framework.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, I'm sorry. Nevada State Performance Framework. Thank you. You know, I'm so critical when other people do that and I did -- myself. Um, and, uh, then we want to be able to, um, have that data and be able to explain what it means, how, and how it is, um, how it should be used in order to inform decisions for us to either make changes to the data or influence funding or pro--provide a more meaningful holistic measure of what's going on in education.

Chair Hobbs: So going back to this NSPF, that star rating system, which I think we've all seen. That's a mandated form of reporting?

Paul Johnson: Yes. There are 51 Nevada School Performance Frameworks. Um, every State has one and DC -- so they have a similar format and there are minimums -- Federal minimums that have to be in that. There's a lot of flexibility for States to put other data in there. Some States have just done the Federal minimum and I think Nevada has close to doing the minimum. Other States have, have much more elaborate plans, and I actually have a, a, a spreadsheet that compares all 51 of those, so we can see what data points are in ours compared with any other State. Um, so, uh, but I think because that rating system people are familiar with and I do like the dashboard those with the color bubbles that we took a look at that had student achievement, um, and it had -- but they are very limited data points within that. For example, uh, student engagement has one data point, chronic absenteeism, that's it.

Chair Hobbs: Alright.

Paul Johnson: That's the measure of student engagement. You cannot tell me at the elementary level with everything that goes on with teachers [Indiscernible] everything else, that student chronic absenteeism is the measure for student engagement. And then, family engagement is, I, I think, um, another component that we would like to measure as well our community engagement, how we want to do that, but so I think there's things that align within the framework that we currently have, but I also think there are bubbles that probably need to be, be developed in addition to that.

So to identify that concept, put the data in there and try to extract what that means, uh, and how, how to, how to compare that, uh, and one of the things I think is essential in this point is we have to have longitudinal data, we just can't have a point in time, we have to have like a five-year comparison of this data, so we can show trends. Uh, so, uh, I mean this is going to be a huge, um, data collection, data piece. Um, it is, if you want to take an -- see an example, there's the Nevada Report Card you can go on online and you can see kind of a glimpse of, of the depth of the data that you can collect and have, um, connected to this or you can -- if I want to see Carson City School District at West population performance, you can go click on a dashboard and you can pull up the data that's in the Carson City School District.

Chair Hobbs: So it's a thinking that we would use an existing reporting structure and then modify and enhance it. Is that where you've gotten there yet?

Paul Johnson: I think it would be existing, uh, labels of where the data should go to identify student achievement. There are student achievement assessments and scores on tests and, you know, other things that we can use to identify how students are performing on various types of assessments more than just standardized tests. Then, you can go to the, the other categories that identify growth, um, and, uh, closing opportunity gaps and, you know, the, the types of, uh, opportunities that are available for, for students whether you have limited or a lot of vocational classes as secondary level for example.

So we'll be able to take a look at, at those in line. I think it'll make more sense for me. I'm very visual, I have to see it in order to, to better explain it, but I have not had a chance to work with my partners in crime on this. So I'm really looking forward to getting their input, especially somebody who has been in education and now is, um, on a, uh, -- somebody who receives, you know, the benefit of, of that those who are going through education and who is, who has a different lens completely. So I'm really excited to, to, to go through that and find out for things that I -- that my bias has not allowed me to see yet.

Well, there one thing that I wanted to address also. One of the key things I think in, in both of these data collection pieces is something, Jim had actually touched on, is the, the repository of all of this information, um, and how -- at one point, we had tried to design a system where the information from the school districts gets uploaded into a system and then is simply extracted from NDE. There's not data entry, manual data entry where they have to go through and identify those types of things. I think some sweat equity needs to be involved in and perhaps resources to identify that data collection piece, so that we aren't filling out manual reports, sending manual reports to NDE, who is now creating manual reports.

Um, one of the examples of that is the School Nomics data that, uh, Jim was talking about. We upload our, our trial balances into, um, a, a system and they take the data and try to put it in their financial buckets to make the data comparable from school district. School district, the reason why it's not comparable if we just report individually is our cost allocation methods are different than Clark County's cost allocation methods. So how we define a unit of cost is going to be different than unit of cost that they have. This School Nomics tries to, um, min -- minimize those differences and put the data into more consistent, uh, information.

At one point, we were trying to do that through NDE, through the NRS 387.303 report and then they ended up not doing this data collection, spending the money on the data collection piece, and going with the School Nomics, uh, so it created independent financial information, and I'm not sure who, what decision makers use which data.

Chair Hobbs: Any other questions or comments? So whenever you and Jason feel that the two working groups should merge or --

Paul Johnson: The Power Rangers. It's powers combined [Interposing].

Chair Hobbs: -- yeah, feel free. Feel free.

Jason Goudie: We, we'll be working together one or the other anyway so.

Paul Johnson: That's why we're dressed in the same hue.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. That was a very strong move, yeah. I like that. And that leads us to the, the next one, which is all -- which also complements this area, you know, we have the -- what data do we have and what data do we not need to have part of it and what data do we need to now begin to present and how do we best present that meeting the, the mandates of the legislation as well as, you know, some of those beyond that, because, you know, it didn't include everything to, um, Dr. Brunes' working group, uh, which, you know, what do you do with the data. Right? I think that's the large part of that, so I would go to you next.

Nancy Brunes: I would say, we haven't met, but I was going to suggest, humbly submit that. Um, it feels like -- the work of this committee really does depend on the work of the proceeding committee, and so I was looking at the membership of both and I think the membership is the same except, um, I'm not on that committee and so I was thinking, maybe I join this committee and then when the work is done, we, then the core members of my committee with Jim and Punam -- oh, sorry, um, -- with Senator Woodhouse and Jim, we break off and talk about the presentation. I've done some of the, the research. I have a big folder with some data, um, so I could join and share that with you and then you see there's a through line we can join up and work on the presentation once we know what the right data points are.

Chair Hobbs: [Interposing].

Nancy Brunes: So it feels like it's consequential or sequential in terms of the timing of the work.

Chair Hobbs: I think, I think that makes --

Nancy Brunes: If that's okay.

Chair Hobbs: -- a ton of sense. I'm sure Paul will require you to fill out an application to fit in his -- [Interposing] four of us.

Nancy Brunes: I don't think that's --

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, I think we have another working group with four. Yeah.

Nancy Brunes: It was a group, it was four of us on the group that we met.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, we four.

Chair Hobbs: Todd [Indiscernible] his mind, so everything looks good.

Punam Mathur: That is a relax looking DAG, it's a calm DAG.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah.

Paul Johnson: [Indiscernible].

Nancy Brunes: Sunday.

Paul Johnson: I know [Indiscernible].

Chair Hobbs: Got it, got it. No, I think that's, I think that's great, because those, all of those are interrelated.

Nancy Brunes: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: So the next one is, is one of those sort of, I don't want to call it a one--off thing, but it's very specific assignment. But, you know, the, the accessibility or, um, open zoning or whatever the right term is.

Jim McIntosh: Yeah, so Member McIntosh, for the record. Um, I, you know, there, I am embarrassed to say we're very slow in getting this up and going and I apologize. I just only met with Beau and James yesterday. There was a snow issue in Carson that did prohibit our first meeting, um, but we have been doing some background work. When I worked at the school district, we used to call this voice and choice, get the parents voice, get them some school choice, right, as to where they would attend a school, not necessarily the school they might be zoned for, so there are studies out there, there's a lot of work that's been done here in the State itself, and so we're beginning to pull together those pieces. Um, my team members are Member Mathur and Member Woodhouse, and so I only recently met with James and Beau yesterday, and, um, we began talking about what we might consider here, but we have been pulling together some information that I will -- and we'll pull together and maybe begin sharing with both of you.

Punam Mathur: Voice and choice --

Chair Hobbs: Is, is this one more of an analytical thing or a political thing?

Jim McIntosh: I think it's both. I think it's, it's a political issue, uh, definitely about, uh, and now you've got a funding formula, where the funding follows the students, so I think there's a thinking that now that the funding follows the students, maybe there's less of a, of a need to have, you know, specific zones the money is going to follow wherever the student goes, and so, um, I think that kind of, I think, I, I want to say naturally follows, but people mind --

Chair Hobbs: Breaks down a barrier.

Jim McIntosh: Yes.

Chair Hobbs: So is that is -- is this is one, do you feel that we can bring this one to conclusion pretty quickly.

Jim McIntosh: I, I, I think we can. I think there's some summaries we can provide. I would certainly rely on my education expert here, some thoughts she might have. Um, there is certainly studies out there, there has

certainly been some, uh, things that even CCSD has done to allow for open zoning, and so I think we can take a look at those things. I don't know whether we can speak to that this requires strategy surrounding that and we could certainly provide strategies.

I don't know whether we have data to say this works or this works from a financial perspective. You know, transportation is always an issue when you talk about open zoning and transportation is very expensive. So, um, I, I think there's things that we're going to have to look at and I, I think the recommendation here is really strategy surrounding, um, accessibility within schools, within the school district, and I think we can do that.

Chair Hobbs: Well, that sounds, that sounds great, and to the extent that any of these can be brought to closure, you know, we'll put them on an agenda, have the full Commission talk about them, move them aside, and then the members can re-deploy to other groups, if that works. The next one may fit into the same category, you know, we spent some time with this one previously, even had a Bill draft. Um, I think it's one of those that sort of got lost in the, you know -- in the, in the shuffle, because of everything else that was going on, it was never a front burner item, but we did have some support from the, the Governor on this as well, at least I believe we did, and, uh, I, you know, it's a matter of taking some of those concepts that we previously put together and refining them and making another run at this.

Now maybe there'll be some additional thoughts that go into it. Um, this group hasn't met yet. Uh, it's one of my groups, but I have Paul and I believe Kyle and Mark has indicated a desire to be a part of this discussion, and when I kind of get those pulled back together, I'll get everybody on the, on the phone, we'll talk through those, and I think this is one that we may be able to bring back in the next month or two at least in terms of the concepts, get some approval on them, and maybe bring some closure to it. The next one is Teacher Pipeline and we go up north to Dusty.

Dusty Casey: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. Member Casey, for the record. Um, we've recently got started, had a brief meeting with Beau last week and a meeting -- um, Kyle is the other person on my group and so we had a brief meeting as well this week to start identifying. Um, our discussions have started with what types of data do we want to see, because it sounds like a, a relatively, um, easy metric, if you will, to identify, but I think it's bigger than just what our vacancies look like in Nevada and so we started talking about what types of data. Um, should it be regionally some historical components to it.

Obviously, we compete a lot with other States, administrators go out of State to recruit, and so there's a, there's a broader picture than just, just Nevada and our graduation rates at NSHE and what not. There is a lot of data out there. Um, Beau has started sending us some data that NDE has based on, um, previous studies that are done. So we've just kind of started identifying where that data is at and what that might look like. Um, I haven't had a chance to talk with the Compensation Group yet, which I believe is led by Punam, but I think there's some possibility of some coordination there that might make sense to get a complete picture of the labor market, um, to bring forward rather than bits and pieces of it, um, but obviously a very important component and really one of the, um -- really one of the leading factors in my opinion, um, of moving needle obviously on education, and as Punam alluded to before, it's really hard to move the needle on student performance when you don't have qualified people in classrooms and so on and so forth. So I think getting that complete picture of the labor market and really what we're facing is going to be key, but I do think it's something we could probably wrap up this spring and bring to conclusion.

Chair Hobbs: Comments? Questions?

Joyce Woodhouse: I have a question.

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Joyce Woodhouse: Um, Member Woodhouse, for the record. Um, Dusty, um, in looking at what you're doing, um, I'm, my mind is going back to the presentations that we had, I think at our last meeting, it might have been before that, um, when we had the NSHE folks in, uh, and we were I was -- I was hoping at some point that we can, uh, get good data from all of our institutions in State of Nevada that have Teacher Ed programs, uh, both undergraduate and master's degrees to see what, one, what they are producing now and then what are their plans for the future, because I know some of them are working hard to try to grow, well maybe they all are, trying to grow those numbers, so that we have more Nevada students coming out into, uh, our schools here in Nevada, because it just the same thing it works in medical is if you have your student teaching, if you have your, uh, medical, uh, internships and externships in the -- in a certain community, then those students stay there, and so, uh, just want to make sure that we really dig in deep to what NSHE is able to provide you with, uh, as to far as how they're addressing the pipeline.

Dusty Casey: Definitely. Thank you, uh, Member Woodhouse. And yeah, so I think that's a, a very good point, um, also understanding the alternative programs, you know, we've had the community partners come forward and talk about those. Um, I personally, I don't have a clear picture of what, you know, NSHE's rates or our graduation rates, I mean we have that data versus what some of these other alternative programs offer to the Teacher Pipeline, and so I think we need to make sure that we, uh, gather that as part of the whole picture as best we can.

Chair Hobbs: Hey, Dusty, one other question I had was, this will include some analysis of the existing pipeline and the deficiencies in the existing pipeline, I presume, but will it also include any recommendations for, and I'm not sure what these would be and I'm not sure this is what we mandated to do, but recommendations for how to improve the pipeline. I mean, those would seem to be making recommendations for system of higher education. Right? So you're anticipating that as well?

Dusty Casey: I think that's something we could absolutely look at. I mean, I think the first part is really gathering the data. Um, I think the historical data to identify trends is really important, not just in Nevada but regionally as well. Um, but, yeah, I think that's something that really the commission could have a broader conversation about. I know different districts are doing different things to address different teacher pipelines and so gathering some of those ideas to put forth like, hey, you know, um, possible tuition reimbursement or, or those kinds of things and, and again looking at our community partners, um, at some of the ideas that they're implementing, um, to promote, uh, the growing the teacher workforce and stuff like that are, are good things that we should probably present as ideas.

David Jensen: Chairman Hobbs.

Chair Hobbs: I know we had -- uh, oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead please.

David Jensen: Uh, Member Jensen, for the record. And, and just to build on the discussion, I know, that NDE has done a lot of work on Teacher Recruitment and Retention, and I was part of that working group for a while and then had to step off, because I was too busy, but they've had a tremendous amount of work and so there's some -- there's already some data that's collected that I know can be shared, and Beau and James probably have access to that and can get that to Dusty, so we don't have to replicate a lot of this work, a lot of it has already been done, um, but I think would be meaningful for us to, to insert into our final document. So it's there now, we just need to compile it.

Dusty Casey: Member Casey, for the record. Um, and real quick, if I could. One, one component we did talk about with Beau is, is how we might use one of the consultants, um, to help pull some of this together, especially when we start looking at possibly the regional component, there is definitely a lot of data there, um,

as, as Dr. Jensen referenced, and so I think pulling that data first, but then looking a little broader and pulling that together. We have had presentations in the past addressing this and looking at it. So I think, I think everything is there, the pieces are there, we may just need a little help pulling it all together.

Chair Hobbs: Before you -- before we go any further, when I see the DAG raise his hand, it's kind of a hold the phone moment.

Punam Mathur: He is giving you the finger.

Todd Weiss: Yeah, uh, real quick, Chair. The only thing I want to caution is work groups cannot put together recommendations. Um, that's, that's where the line of OML gets crossed. Um, working groups can, can, uh, research and assemble data for presentation to the larger Commission, but they, they cannot pre -- prescript recommendations. Um, that's something that has to be done with larger group during a public meeting.

Chair Hobbs: Oh, thank you for the caution. Paul.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thanks. Member Johnson, for the record. Yeah, Dusty, so in a lot of the research and key findings, the, the -- some of the problems with respect to the early exit of teachers or the problems they have with teaching and the reason why they, uh, don't stick till retirement or working conditions, teacher prep and mentoring and support, so are you guys going to be taking a look at those anecdotally and or, or otherwise to see if there are changes in working conditions, support, and preparation that might influence the teacher pipeline.

Dusty Casey: Um, Member Casey, for the record. I think that's something we can try to gather. I, um, I worry that, that's very subjective, and, and like you said, anecdotal, um, and so I'm not positive what's out there as far as like climate surveys of staff and what's meaningful to collect and, and what we could look at maybe to compare it historically, you know, what did those same surveys look like 10 years ago, so I'll have to work with NDE a little closer to see what they might have as far as those kind of climate and culture surveys, if they exist, and um, how far back they might go. I mean, I think it's obviously a great point and, um, something that is talked about a lot, but identifying data maybe or identifying what those root causes are is in my opinion could be very subjective, and, and I'm not sure, um, what we can really identify historically or currently with that, but we'll definitely look into it.

Chair Hobbs: Any other questions, comments?

Punam Mathur: Just one. I think I've got the next one.

Chair Hobbs: You do.

Punam Mathur: I do, which is, um, so ours is focused on Teacher and Support Staff comp-- compensation. So it feels quite random, I don't know what the conversation was in, in the legislature, but it's ours, so we're going to do a good job. Um, and so we probably are going to need a SME to help us just do some salary comps, which is very commonly done in any HR role, in any large enterprise. So that's not so difficult, but then the next question is going to be, we've got teacher pipeline data comp that extends to support personnel. So what's the pipeline for support personnel? It just seems like a natural progression, so I just wonder just whether you think for any of us, they're both kind of random, someone wanted to know they are critical to the success of our system, because we are at the end of the day in a child business. Right? And given that, um, we focus on teacher shortage, because it is so essential to everything. We do, but that doesn't necessarily acknowledge the complexity of the conditions in which, um, kids are living today around their mental -- their emotional wellbeing, their mental wellbeing, their social emotional wellbeing, um, and so to not have counselors and to

not have social workers, which I think we have an even more intense need. Am I right?

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes.

Nancy Brunes: Yeah.

Joyce Woodhouse: Yeah, they are in shortages.

Punam Mathur: Or, or even more intense --

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes.

Punam Mathur: -- in those, in those respects, but for us as the people watching a funding formula, that has as one of its, um, key design elements to contemporize, to meet contemporary needs of schools and education today, which is whole child. Um, I just wonder whether we should voluntarily just expand the pipeline conversation to include those other, um, pipelines. Right? Because, Dusty, if you maybe think about doing that there, um, you know, we can do it with a common set of job classifications, if you will, and maybe get something that's useful out of something that it feels quite random.

Chair Hobbs: So is that -- let me just ask a question, because, well, I probably know least about those. I'm looking at Jason, looking at Paul, looking at a couple of folks up north, um, to maybe chime in on this, but should we identify the support personnel that we're talking about specifically?

Jason Goudie: [Indiscernible] I, I think, I think, yes, because I don't think that we need a pipeline for all. I mean, a lot of support professional positions are what you call entry, so there's not really a pipeline. What I think we're really focusing on and we've talked about this is the pipeline from support professional to teacher, because that's important. Right? Um, positions like bus drivers. Right? It's, it's, it's hard to drive a, a pipeline, but that's one of the pieces that you, you can kind of, I say quasi do it, because it's, it's CDL driven, you have to have a special license things like that. So I think there may be some key positions that you may be able to do that, um, but, but our group, the SEA, um, we've started to try and work on the last few years is create pipelines within support to not only go to teachers, but to drive to some of these other positions that are one higher paying, um, require different certifications and things like that. So I think it's a different model. I think you can -- I don't think you can treat the, the support pipeline the same as you can, the teacher, um, because I think it's a different model, but I know Paul had some comments too.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thanks. Member Johnson, for the record. Yeah, it absolutely makes sense. Um, it's a little bit more difficult, because it's easier to find a teacher, but it's harder to find what a paraprofessional does at Clark County versus ours or even a secretary for, for that matter. If you take a look the job descriptions, there are so many different job duties for very similar items, it's, it's hard to do that comparison of what a position does in one school district versus what a position does in another school district. So standardization is, is a really challenge when it comes to support staff with the nonacademic support for counseling, mental health, and all those other things. Yes, I think, I think that is something that could be a component of and maybe instead of teacher, it could be certified instructional or certified personnel. I think that makes more sense, but when you start talking about the support staff, the, the -- it get, it gets a little gray in that area as what, what the position is, um, but it certainly makes sense to do so.

Uh, also in the, uh, APA studies, there were tables that were developed for prototypical schools that identified job descriptions of personnel, teachers, administrators, um, student support, staff support, and administration that's supposed to be in a school and that is what our adequacy targets were based on and did a comparison of those job descriptions with the information that we have and what's called our 387.303 report, we came with

this huge gap of the personnel that we're supposed to have in a school versus the personnel that we actually have in a school and it did include instructional, uh, certified and not certified staff. So I think it makes sense to say even if we have the capacity to, to meet the prototypical recommendations that we have who should be in a school, and also I think that's important, because I don't know that we have the space currently in the schools, if we were to hire all of those people that are identified in those prototypical tables, um, in the APA study.

So I think it's important, but the easier one to do, maybe do it in pieces, the first one to do and maybe the more important one to do is those, the staffs that directly interface with the students, which are the instruction and the instructional support, student support personnel that are licensed, because that's easier to find and it's easier to compare.

Punam Mathur: I guess the question is, Dusty, I mean, what does the group think so that -- before Dusty gets going on the, um, pipeline surveys, should that that be cast to include certified positions, not just teachers?

Chair Hobbs: Thoughts?

Punam Mathur: Right? What's exactly the same thing that he said which is longitudinal as well, I think that's really productive.

Chair Hobbs: Go ahead, Dusty.

Dusty Casey: Member Casey, for the record. I, I absolutely agree with that and, and that was kind of our thinking as well to expand, you know, cast a broader net to include licensed personnel to capture that, uh, the student -- the counselors, and if there's, there's, a way we can capture administrative staff as well, um, but I agree with, uh, Member Goudie that the other, um -- the other, uh, positions may be difficult, especially if we try to coordinate with compensation, because of their roles and job descriptions and whatnot, I think that could be difficult, something specific like bus drivers of course could probably be identified, but I think our starting focus is, is licensed personnel for sure.

Punam Mathur: Okay. Great.

Chair Hobbs: Everyone agree?

Paul Johnson: Yeah.

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes. And, and I would just add, I, I think we will be creating a hole for ourselves, if we don't, because it's going to come up. So just to be, uh, as transparent as possible that all of licensed personnel should probably be in this part of the work.

Chair Hobbs: So Todd, we've expanded, uh, the scope a bit for that working group by way of this discussion. I don't think we have to take a motion on that, so I just wanted to double check with you.

Todd Weiss: No, that's totally administrative, Chair.

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Very good.

Punam Mathur: I also think long-term, I was kind of gob smacked by just how much our community partners were doing inside schools to directly benefit kids, that taxpayers get the benefit of, but aren't contributing a nickel towards, um, and so I think that getting a sense of pipeline and how we're actually meeting it by spackling in some of these community resources, um, helps from the perspective of we're in charge of the

formula and going to make a case to the public that it warrants additional funding.

Chair Hobbs: You know, Punam, I wondered the same thing as, as -- I mean, for me, it was a learning experience to, to hear from two or three of the community partners that are actually present in schools doing things that didn't appear to be instructional, they appeared to be, you know, intervention and some level of counseling and to what degree that interfaced with the professional staff that the different schools actually have, um, and I wasn't quite sure how to account for all of that.

Jim McIntosh: Go ahead.

Paul Johnson: Member Johnson, for the record. You know, that is, you know, a philosophical discussion that maybe needed to be added at some point as well, what services should be provided by the school, and what services should be provided outside of the school, because that directly affects the [Indiscernible] costs and weight associated with the services that we deliver. And honestly, I know, um, uh, Dr. Dave up in Humboldt, um, they are working on actually integrating Medical Services in bringing the medical services to the school, and I think they can leverage a federal grant to do so, and based on his presentation at a School Board Conference, we're actually looking at trying to adopt a similar model with our local hospital to try and bring those medical services to those students that are at-risk who for whatever reason don't seek that medical attention for their own health and that health affects their performance.

So, um, and then we have the Psychological Services, we have the Social Services. I mean, you almost have to have a full set of Social Services in the school district for the students at the school, which kind of is not the purpose for education being there to begin with, but it's morphed over that time to where we, we feed them, we clothe them, we provide all of these other services that are nonacademic, um, and it's even become more apparent post-COVID, the need for all of those other non-academic services as well. Um, so it's, you know, it's, it's a difficult, uh, issue, but standardizing that may help identify what we should be funding through education through a funding formula versus what cooperative agreements we should have with other local education agencies or non-education agencies.

Nancy Brunes: And I, I'll just add, and maybe to draw and ask NDE, if they have any more accurate information, but my understanding is that NDE has given money to the Guinn Center to actually look at the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Formula and they're looking at how much money schools have received, but also including, um, all of the PTA sort of extra --

Jim McIntosh: The wraparound.

Nancy Brunes: -- the wraparound, so I don't know if they're actually also looking at quantifying if CS isn't a school like what is, what sort of additional money is there, but I believe there is an analysis, um, being done that's looking at how much money a school receives after the Pupil-Centered Funding Formula implementation, but in addition to the wraparound support service. So, um, we may want to --

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, that's a question. Maybe ask Megan that question.

Nancy Brunes: Megan, I don't know if you can confirm or have any additional information on the scope of that particular report, but that was my understanding.

Megan Peterson: Yes. Megan Peterson, for the record. We do have a contract in place with Guinn Center to do that analysis. We also have received a grant, State Longitudinal Data System Grant that is extending some work, where we are also expanding and doing additional, um, research and understanding into Per Pupil Level Expenditures, so we do have that being addressed on two different fronts currently.

Chair Hobbs: So the wraparound funding that you're talking about is nonpublic funding that complements what the schools do that's coming from --

Nancy Brunes: Correct.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Some of these other folks, because that would seem to interface with this at-risk discussion, right?

Jim McIntosh: Students can't learn, if they are -- I'm sorry. Member McIntosh. And I think everybody knows this and I hope we all use the term wraparound, but, um, because that's generally what we refer to it, and if students can't learn, if they're not clothed, if they're in pain, or if they're, they're unhealthy, and, so, um, and those are all, you know, attributes that go towards them being at-risk and so -- and I think, that's I think again a natural progression of teachers and administrators recognizing that, um, kids are not going to learn, if they, if they don't have these things. These services are needed to be provided to them, and I've always [Indiscernible] wraparound services for the school, so outside instructional, but at what point, what is Pupil-Centered Funding Plan or school districts responsible for providing, I know at CCSD is very relied on a lot of community partners to assist with those things.

Paul Johnson: And, and -- Member Johnson for the record. And CCSD has those community partners, smaller places do not have those partners, so it, it -- but then it goes back to what should we be doing, what should we not be doing, what we have the capability for, what we don't have capability for, what should be funded through the PCPF versus what should be going on outside the PCPF.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I'm back over to you Punam [Indiscernible].

Punam Mathur: So I met, I just met with Beau and James last week or is it -- early this -- recently, um, and we are set, I think he does need to connect with you next week and then we've got a conversation that's happening next week [Indiscernible]. This has been really helpful by the way just to know that, um, that's I look forward to working together to figure out what comp stuff we should be doing that makes sense and is in alignment with the work that you'll be doing as well. And then just I would just welcome a little bit, you know, the assignment here is do a salary analysis, do a compensation analysis, easy to submit homework, would not actually matter much, um, so what -- should we just do that, because we can do that pretty quickly, not need to spend a bunch of --

Chair Hobbs: Um, well, I think that this becomes part of a, a question that probably every one of these topics has to deal with, you know, that's you can do that and check the box in terms of the assignment, but I think we have to take that a bit further, right, I mean, it's, it's part of the justification for additional funding very clearly and I think we need to, you know, tie, tie that part of it. Um, you know, sometimes, I think a lot of the -- and this may be just me, but a lot of the, the compensation discussion gets conflated with a lot of the stuff, stuff that you read in the papers about collective bargaining negotiations and things like that and posturing that's, that's done, uh, relative to that, and I'm not sure how that's taken by the, the general public, you know.

Jim McIntosh: Member Mc, if I may. Member McIntosh. I, I don't want to complicate this in any way, um, I do know we have, we have a comparable wage index, I mean to me, when you're talking about the sufficiency of teacher compensation, that could vary depending upon the district you were in and the cost of living within that district, and I know there's a component that we have within that formula that sort of recognizes the cost of education right there. So I know that ties. I don't want to make --

Chair Hobbs: No, I think it absolutely -- I think that's a great point, because I think that you, you can do the

compensation analysis and it'll say what we think it's probably going to say. Right? But I think it also needs to be noted that, you know, one size doesn't fit all or for, for every district, you know, because it may work well for an urban district and may not work at all for a rural district.

Jason Goudie: Yeah, and, and I think that we, we've done a number of studies, we've had different groups do it, HR do it, um, we've had Applied Analysis do it, and when you look at Clark County, uh, um, School District compared to states, because it's hard to necessarily get the data you really need on a on a district by district, um, we have done it against the large -- 10 largest and we cost adjust it, um, prior to our recent contract that approved us. We were, we were still ranked very high comparably. Um, the challenges that I think that we, we need to consider in this is as soon as you apply a student ratio to that, we fall dramatically. Right? So the compensation is, is, is, is a component, but you go back to, I think, Paul's comment and Jim's about working conditions, class size is, is probably the most significant impact on conditions, period, right, which is why it gets back to pipeline and, and drive.

If we had no more than 25 students in every high school classroom and 20 students in every elementary, I think working conditions would dramatically increase, productivity would increase, education would increase. So looking at salaries in the silo is, is a start, but I think it's going to skew the results for what Nevada has seen, because we've seen this a lot where people talk about our salaries that they're not that low compared, especially as soon as you put in a cost of, a cost of living index, you look at New York, you look at Hawaii, I mean Hawaii is dismally low, um, you look at the cost of living there, um, but their class size are lower, right, and that is the piece that is driving so much of the challenges from an educational perspective and so layering that in as a secondary component to that kind of analysis I think is key, because if we don't, we're probably not going to get the result everybody believes out there, that that we're significantly underpaid, no it's significant underpaid for the work you're doing, because of all the additional challenges.

Punam Mathur: So that's fascinating point. Um, so then theoretically Dusty is looking at pipeline issues is one of the critical questions that we should be asking, also getting data on retention, right, of us against other places, us against -- so it's not just, this what we've been asked to do, but our job is to move towards an optimal scenario at all times, right, and so if -- because that is a really important consideration for citizens in the State, for potential taxpayers, for lawmakers, um, as so could we take this and add retention without going probing into the exactly what needs to be done, but at least it'll then convey to the legislature that it isn't just a function of compensation, because if you look at compensation, we actually do pretty well, we've been working hard to try to get funding into this thing, so we're doing better, but we have gaping holes in vacancies, especially if we look at licensed personnel, those mental health, those positions are -- that's the problem and we're not retaining what we're getting and that could be because of the regional differences and how difficult it is to live in different places, it could be because we are not -- we don't have the systems to support, we don't have the, the student ratios that makes it possible to be a teacher for more than five years as they're getting completely burnt out.

Jason Goudie: Yeah, I, I -- Jason Goudie, for the record. I still think that, you know, the, the pipeline is the key, I mean, we, we talk about, and, and I don't remember the numbers exactly, but, you know, we hire 2000, 3000 new teachers here or try to, right, and the Nevada, um, Higher Education is putting out about half of what we need. Now, we're not only drawing from here, but if, you know, less and less students are, are choosing teaching as a profession, less and less students are choosing accounting as a profession, I mean, there's a lot of these professions in general, because everybody go make money on TikTok, right, and, and, you know, they just, they, they do. Right?

I mean, there's ways to make money that don't necessarily provide value, um, but that pipeline piece, it doesn't matter how much you pay people, you know, unless you're going to pay a teacher a million a year, right, that would drive students to start doing, but, but that's, it's not affordable for any State. The pipeline issue is the single biggest issue that we, we have. Right? Pay, you can only, we can -- we only have so much resource, we

can keep getting better, but unless you're going to leap frog all these other States and take everybody, and then they're going to have to increase, and it's, it's, it's the pipeline and how, how you get more people into the profession. Without that, I, I don't see any way to reasonably reduce class sizes, reasonably increase, um, the working conditions, and address those pieces.

Nancy Brunes: Can I ask a, a clarifying question, um, speaking of the pipeline or retention. Under Governor Sandoval, he put a lot of money into teacher incentives to try to get teachers to move to high--risk schools or to enter the teaching profession. Are we still funding those at the legislature or did those phase out and were there -- was there any analysis to show that those were successful and that teachers actually stayed beyond the required commitment?

Jason Goudie: I don't, I don't know.

Chair Hobbs: Anybody?

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Yeah, Member Johnson, for the record. So the State funded incentives, I think, were replaced by Federal incentives through the ESSER funds. Um, so I think when they leave, school districts are going to be under their, they're going to have to come up with those incentives on their own, but, yeah, I, we did not collect any data, we just have anecdotal data of asking folks, you know, hey, did this -- was this something that attracted you to our education system.

Nancy Brunes: So Governor Sandoval funded those through ESSER Funds or [Indiscernible].

Paul Johnson: It was SB 178 [Interposing].

Jason Goudie: Yeah, he funded them way back [Indiscernible] but they, they, they expired --

Paul Johnson: Yeah.

Jason Goudie: -- and then, because they were -- I thought they were really, it was a short--term component, um, at, at the beginning of that time and then ultimately they, they were phased out from a funding perspective, and then ESSER was a mechanism that districts could utilize, which we did. We had to sets of recruiting retention, one at 2000 and one at 5,000 for the two years of 7,000 in total. We additionally utilized ESSER funding for relocation, um, incentives for people moving more than a 100 miles or whatever it was, um, and again similar to what, what Paul spoke about, we talked about that was this a important factor you moving here and, of course, most people said, yes, right and you're getting an extra 4,000, of course, that's going to help you, whether or not they would have made the decision on their own, without that is hard to say, but it certainly helps, we know it, it doesn't hurt and it certainly improved it.

Jim McIntosh: Member McIntosh, if I may, and, I, I know this is a huge discussion, that's why each one of these, it could be its own report in its own. In terms of the teacher pipeline, I appreciate all the comments. For me, I, I agree with Jason, it's a supply and demand issue, we're not supplying it, there are not enough teachers coming in to supply for the demand that's needed, and unfortunately, if Higher Ed in Nevada, my experience was when I work there at least, and I can only speak for CCSD, when I worked there at that time, was, there was not enough output from the Nevada Higher Ed System to meet that 2,000 to 3,000 teachers when there isn't enough output from your own system, you're going to go outside of that system, you're going to go across the country and that's probably with its own complications, because you're hiring a 22-year-old, 23-year-old many times asking them to move to a whole new community, move away from their families, and now you got to provide them with Support Services to retain them, many of them are leaving after two years, what, what CCSD was experiencing, which is why you had two to 3,000 vacancies every year, because you couldn't retain this

young teacher who is now far away from her fam -- or -- her or his family, uh, in many cases, and so now you had a whole separate set of issues, even providing these bonuses, and the bonuses and incentives were [Indiscernible] with all sorts of issues as well, because you still have to negotiate them many times, um, and I think the discussion with the Union is very important, because CCEA holds a lot power in terms of what you're going to provide a teacher and they have this extra complication in terms of -- you can't just say we're going to pay a teacher this amount based off of these things, you've got to negotiate that into the mandatory subject department.

Paul Johnson: Well, I completely agree and we've talked about that, you know, if we put, you know, \$100 million in our pot of money at White Pine County School District, how more teachers can we attract? If there aren't any teachers to attract, the answer is zero. So I, I agree with that; however, uh, what influences people whether they go into education is compensation. So what I, I hope we don't have is a, a, um, a decision that, well, we might as well not do anything anyway with respect to that, because there aren't any teachers anyway. So what's the point of increasing, raising tax? What's tough, what's the point of me taking my political risk to increase taxes when we're not going to be able to hire anybody anyway?

So and it goes kind of back, if you want to tie this back to a point that Punam earlier, we, this is going to be longitudinal data, this is going to have to be studied over 10 years, so we have to plant that seed now before we find out what kind of tree we grow later, um, but it's, it's something, I think, the compensation is something that is important to people when they're looking for job, we need to recognize that and that it may influence people within our own system to go into education and it may influence people to go from other systems into our, into ours, so it is a competition, it is supply and demand, but part of supply and demand is competition, and if you're not poised to compete against and attract from other places, then compensation is probably even more important in that environment than an environment where we're flushed with, with staff.

Jim McIntosh: And you're competing amongst the other school districts within in the State.

Paul Johnson: Exactly, yeah.

Punam Mathur: And from, from the business perspective, um, it is, I mean, 90 cents of every dollar that we spend is Nevadans on K-12 as a person, so I worked in an environment that was kind of like that as well, it was hospitality business, um, and when, when it got tough to try to find employees to make beds, to greet, to check in folks, you don't have control over the macro, so what you have to do is up your game in the micro, which is compensation, which is a cooler on boarding experience, which is a real effort to create working conditions in which a person want to stick around. That's all you can do.

Jim McIntosh: Agreed, and I, but you can also, I don't know if this is going to be explored, you can also look at what are your requirements to be a teacher right and so there's some barriers there in terms of becoming a teacher that I think prevent people from entering into the field, and I know, sometimes as you is lowering the bar, we don't want to lower the bar, but I think and I don't know if this group is going to look at that, but in terms of a pipeline, maybe there are things we can do as a State to say here's how we can make it easier for you to become a teacher and or move from another State and become a teacher here.

Punam Mathur: It's true.

Chair Hobbs: Wow.

Punam Mathur: Well, we saw that [Interposing].

Chair Hobbs: No, I, I mean these are exactly the discussions that this is supposed to promote, but going back

to your working group and the ask from the legislation, you know, there's a way to check the box minimum, but I think Jason raised a, a point that really stuck with me, how the, the compensation analysis moves forward. I think it's important for it to be cast in the appropriate light, uh, not necessarily just, you know, are we paying teachers in Nevada, you know, similarly to the rest of the country or better or less or whatever the case may be, but, but put it in its appropriate context, because of something that would incorporate the conditions that, that were mentioned. Right?

I think that's super important, but it obviously, you know, that part of it creates as many questions as it answers, right, because, you know, one way to, one way to approach that would be, well, then remove some of those conditions. Right? How do you remove those conditions? Well, you have to increase the total number of teachers, right, to from what I'm hearing. That's a quantity, quantity issue not a price issue with respect to what you're paying or is it? I, I, I, I don't know, but I mean if you take it that far, you are doing an in--depth, a very in--depth type of analysis. Jason.

Jason Goudie: Yeah. No, I think, I mean but Paul's quite right, I mean, I'm not saying that compensation isn't important, because obviously it is, but we can't use compensation, it can't go grow large enough to fully solve the problem and, and truly drive it, but it has to be right. If we don't increase it, we're never going to have a chance. So at this point, we shouldn't give up on it. Right? That should be a huge component. That is, you know, one of the most significant factors in any job decision. Right? So that, that's there, but, um, my point was that, you know, when we do this analysis, I think it's going to show that we're, we're higher on the, on the scale and most people think comparably to other large school districts, I mean, we did it against all the 10 largest and we rate very high, cost living adjusted, um, but that doesn't tell the whole story, it's, it's, it's part of it. So I just want to make sure we try and tell that whole story, because I don't want to have the wrong concept, perception that we, we looked at it and like, oh, we're actually, we've done well, that's part of it, but unfortunately, our, our teachers are dealing with 45 students in a class where the people in, in, in another district that may be making similar amounts [Indiscernible] 25 and that's a huge difference.

Punam Mathur: I think not only, not only is it important to include comp factor, it is dangerous not to, because I do think that we've gone big steps forward in terms of trying to pay entry level teachers all the way up, all the way through, I think, we've made some positive strokes, and so we won't be in, we won't be 50th, right, and yet for my neighbor to get that without any explanation or context to say, but, wait, if we're paying number three at the first at the third level and we're getting performance at the 50th level, then it ain't about money, it's about holding their feet to the fire. Right? So I think it's really risky not have the contacts. Okay. This has been so helpful. Thank you.

Nancy Bruner: I'm also just wondering though it sounds like we've already done a lot of the research that was pretty – to like have a SME, sort of like, you know, reinvent the [Indiscernible] I don't know, how recent it was [interposing] take that maybe add some context, apply the formula to the other school district, right, to get the salary per student [Interposing].

Jason Goudie: Yeah, I mean, we, we did ours very recently, um, within the past five months at least, um, and Applied Analysis, so I just got to talk to them and look at the report and make sure, you know, they don't have any issues with it, but I can certainly, um, you know, make sure they're fine with it and forward that on to Kyle's group, right, and then at least we had it, because we, we, we looked at the 10 largest school districts and I think they also looked at districts within the State itself and then, um, cost adjust to the best you can based off either counties or cities or states in different areas, and, um, kind of laid it out from there.

So I mean, it's, it's, it's a decent start to look for those pieces, um, because comparing us to every single school district location doesn't make sense, right, but when you start thinking about, you know, we are number five, right, that, that doesn't, then we compare to the other ones and so, the other point is it's very hard to compare us

to White Pine, you have different needs, Esmeralda has different needs, right, and so why we had such a problem with NCI, right, is that, it's, it's hard to apply it Statewide, but at least we can get some basis as to, as to where we might, might need to be.

Jim McIntosh: Does it include benefits?

Jason Goudie: Um, no, we just did, I, I believe, it was just pay, and I can't remember what other components in, but, um, because of the time constraint, it, it was -- it would have taken longer to layer in the other components to it, so I think we stuck with, you know, the general pay component to it, salary tables.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I appreciate all of the, the comments, and the, the reports. This will be an item that'll be on every agenda, uh, and just to remind everybody again, uh, particularly the leaders of those groups, one of the things we need to do is communicate, uh, end dates and milestones to Megan. Um, you can do that any time, um, and also contact NDE about the type of subject matter expert help and support that is needed. Hopefully, we have some of that on board already and hopefully the rest of it will be on board very, very soon, and be thinking too about the form of whatever your group is going to be reporting may take. Um, so hopefully by the next meeting, we have all of that information and some more substantial progress and maybe we can bring a couple of these, these nine things to conclusion over the next meeting or two.

Uh, under the spirit of the flexible agenda, um, I believe that the working group reports under agenda item number six, Todd hopefully you concur with this, uh, the discussion that was, uh, under item seven occurred during item six, so I think we, uh, merge those two items and can move to, uh, item number eight. Item number eight are reports from Community Partners and we did have one scheduled today, but that has been rescheduled, so today we do not have any reports from Community Partners, but at the next meeting would expect to have, uh, (ph) Peter Guzman back as well as some, um, hopefully some from the, the north and rural areas. I know that that they've been approached about making presentations. So that brings us to agenda item number nine. We're good? Agenda item number nine, uh, the commission will receive a presentation on the history and development of at-risk students within the context of the Pupil Centered--Funding Plan. Uh, I believe we have Beau Bennett, uh, who will be the Master of Ceremonies up north for this one and representatives from Infinite Campus as well. Beau, I'll turn this to you.

Beau Bennett: Thank you. Beau Bennett for the record. Let's see, let's do, uh, come on baby. Okay. Uh, so the purpose of this presentation is just to rein -- reintroduce, uh, the Commission to the topic of at-risk, uh, by going over the migration of the definition of at-risk from FRL, uh, to the Grad Score, uh, once we shifted to a student centered uh funding model and to hopefully set some expectations for presentations, uh, in future meetings. Uh, before I start, I, I -- we just want to acknowledge that, uh, at-risk may be a problematic descriptor or that better alternatives likely exist. Uh, NDE and the Commission continues to use the term at-risk, because that's how it's defined in law and we don't want to cause any confusion there. So as the SB 543 in 2019 set up the Pupil-Centered -- stood up the, uh, Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, the definition for at-risk pupil, uh, in statute at the time was, pupil who is eligible for free or reduced--price lunches pursuant to Chapter 42 of the United States Code or an alternative measure prescribed by the State Board.

Uh, there were some issues especially with FRL, especially with the, the, the community eligibility -- eligibility provision, which provides that all pupils in a school with 40% or more FRL prop -- population leads to the whole school being identified FRL. Uh, I would like to point out that in effective October 26, 2023, the identified student population dropped from 40% to 25%. So now any school that has more than 25% FRL will be considered fully FRL and there's also some additional provisions, uh, schools can actually group together. Some schools are below 25% to get it up. Um, that would result in a much larger FRL number.

We do have two, uh, two districts that are wholly FRL, uh, at this point, uh, including Clark. So the number

would have been extremely large, if FRL -- if remain with FRL. In 2021, there was 271,618 pupils, over the half of the entire student population, were labeled as at-risk, and that, that would go up with the changes in the community eligibility provision. Whereas 2020 recommendations, the Commission first moved to recommend the Campus Analytics Model by identifying the at-risk category pupils for the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

Chair Hobbs: Hey Beau, I, I don't mean to interrupt you, but I guess I am. Could you go back to the prior slide for a second? To just make sure I understand something here. When you refer to the community eligibility provision, what is that and who imposes that?

Beau Bennett: Thank you. Beau Bennett, for the record. So that is through the Federal, uh, Reduced Lunch Program, and it's the identifier for, uh, who receives the free and reduced lunch, and so if a school population is 40 more percent in a school are identified as FRL, then the whole school becomes FRL, uh, and again that is --

Chair Hobbs: And that's, that's -- that' Federal and that's mandated.

Beau Bennett: That is correct.

Chair Hobbs: Right?

Beau Bennett: That is under the --

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Beau Bennett: That is under the Chapter 42 United States Code. Well, it's mandated by the Federal portion. It's allowed. Sorry, excuse me. It's allowed and it recurs. Okay. So after the Commission moved to made their recommendation --

Punam Mathur: Beau, sorry. I, I thought I was with you until you last said. Is it, is it mandated or is it allowed?

Beau Bennett: It is, it is allowed and widely used.

Jason Goudie: So, so, so they don't mandate what you have to do, but because they allow it, CCSD applies it all and, and as they mentioned, especially when you went down to the 25%, we are now 100% free and reduced lunch, so every student in Clark County, um, gets funding now. We unlike some of the smaller districts get, we get all, we, we don't get any money from the State anymore for, for food. We get 100% of funding, um, through the Federal Programs and it's on a reimbursement basis based on how many lunches we serve, etc., or meals we serve, um, and so I think that and he can explain more, but that's the point, that it's, they don't mandate that you have to do this, they have the guidelines and then you're able to essentially implement the program that then becomes for our purposes reimbursable through the Federal Program itself.

Punam Mathur: So really this is about establishing a reimbursement relationship with the Federal Government for food you provide to your kids.

Jason Goudie: That's what, that's what we use for [Interposing].

Paul Johnson: Yes, so every school district, they, they go through the applications that we receive from families that identify a measure of poverty and based on that measure of poverty, if you have a certain population over that threshold, it used to be 40%, now it's 25%. If 25% your population exceeds that, then that school, all of the students of that school now can get their meals for free and the school district gets different

reimbursements from the Federal Government, they'll offset the cost of that program.

Punam Mathur: So districts can making a decision to convert to SCP --

Paul Johnson: Yeah, now it is, yes.

Punam Mathur: [Indiscernible] if it makes sense now in terms of the reimbursement?

Paul Johnson: And it's almost like an if, then statement. If this, then we as a school district do that, because if we don't do that, I think there would be a lot of criticism at the school district, so although it's not mandated, I would tell you that probably every school district does.

Jim McIntosh: [Indiscernible] subsidized for the student with free and reduced lunch rates. It's better, what, instead of having a large part, everyone is free.

[Interposing]

Punam Mathur: You're not the one, we all are.

Chair Hobbs: Sorry Beau, you were on a good roll. Um, let's keep it going.

Beau Bennett: Thank you. Beau Bennett, for the record. Uh, returning to the slide, after the Commission made their recommendation in November of 2020, the State Board adopted a new deposition -- definition wherein a pupil is at-risk, if the pupil has an economic or academic disadvantage such that they require additional services and assistance to enable them to graduate with their cohorts. And I would like to point out that although the, the definition for at-risk was changed on the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, all these kids still receive, uh, the financial, the economic assistance under the Federal Reduced--Lunch program. So those funds were not taken from the students who need the FRL program.

Chair Hobbs: And Beau going back to something you said earlier, the term at-risk, that's a, that's a federal term at large?

Beau Bennett: No. Uh, at-risk, is a, is a, in Nevada Statute 387.1211 defines it, for the Pupil-Center Funding Plan as an at-risk pupil.

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Beau Bennett: So, so we don't want to change from that term, because it might confuse people that, uh, in regards to us fall, falling statute.

Chair Hobbs: Well, I understand that part of it, but I'm just, I'm, I'm curious as to how accurate that term is? That's all.

Beau Bennett: Yeah, there's some sensitivity around it. Uh, you know, a student's unique experiences and perspect -- perspectives, uh, should be normalized and not marginalized and to, to tag somebody at-risk for, uh, factors that affect all of us, uh, is probably not -- may not be the right descriptor of this of what the students are facing.

Chair Hobbs: And that's the reason I raised that, because I, I, -- it does have a certain stigma by using that term, and if there were another term, if it's just a matter of changing the terminology in statute, that might be

something to think about. I don't know.

Punam Mathur: It's deficit based moniker.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, [Indiscernible].

Punam Mathur: Deficit--based.

Chair Hobbs: But, I think, I, I think it's something else that also fuels part of the reaction to the changes that have been made.

Beau Bennett: Okay. Beau Bennett, for the record. Uh, so after the State Board recommendation, uh, in this last session Senate Bill 503 section 15, uh, create -- created a new definition for at-risk pupil, and at-risk pupil now means a pupil who is within the quintile of pupils determined to be most in need of additional services and assistance to graduate based on one or more measures prescribed by the State Board, which may include without limitation consideration of whether the pupil is economically disadvantaged, is at risk of dropping out of high school or fails to meet the minimum standards of academic proficiency.

Uh, as we moved to the new definition, we used the camping -- Campus Analytics Grad Score and that is a comprehensive way to determine at-risk students. It uses cumulative data model based on 10 years of data from all Campus customers, yet remains contextual to each student's environments. It has a early warning system built into the student information system, which, uh, would warn when a student, uh, progress is, is going in the wrong direction. It assigns each student a Grad Score and it divides students into three categories; low risk, moderate risk, and high risk. The Analytics model uses 75 points of, of data in their calculations, uh, they group them under Academics, Attendance, Behavior, and Stability and the, uh, instead of using one factor whose correlation to risk has made even more tenuous when it's affected by the application of laws and regulations.

The aim was to look at a more of the whole person and the outside influences that influence risk, uh, in addition when risk factors are more clearly identified, it puts Educators and staffs in a better position to strategic -- strategically confront the issues that impede student learning. The parameters established are -- were 0 --5% high risk, 6--20% moderate risk, and 21--100% low risk. Uh, the idea was to identify the most at need and to prov -- allocate as much financial assistance to each student as possible. So in at-risk comparison, uh, in 2022, you can see there was 247,000 students identified plus, uh, they received a pupil rate of \$243 and there was a little bit more than 60 million. In 2024, 63,325 students were identified at-risk, the per pupil rate -- rate went to \$3,137 and the at-risk allocation, I would like to emphasize is, was now \$198,666,203 being allocated to those identified as at-risk.

So, for, for future topic considerations, these are potential, uh, topics, to, is to review in the future. Uh, is there a better way to identify at-risk students? Is the 20% cutoff rate and per pupil amount proper in Nevada? Uh, realizing that if you increase the cutoff rate, the per pupil amount goes down, so this really, ultimately ties back into ultimate funding, which the Commission is continuously working on. Uh, we can also do a review of allocation of the weight. Uh, and we're going to have presentations, uh, from the Infinite Campus staff, three of them were kind enough to enjoy and join us here today and will be available for questions. Uh, just realize that they will be coming back and making presentations, uh, next month. Uh, and I also want to highlight that we, we, we really do appreciate the community involvement, uh, on this topic, as it's going to take all of us, uh, together, uh, to, to, to identify these students and make sure all their needs are met and to get this right. So Infinite Campus staff can join us.

Nancy Bruner: Can I, can I ask a question?

Beau Bennett: And then your -- yeah, we're going to turn it over to questions and then any, any topics in the future you might want to see, so I'm just bringing them up in case, uh, the, uh, questions are better suited for them.

Nancy Brunes: I just have a clarifying question if you can go back to your previous slide, Beau. So one, I guess, concern I've heard from the community is that under the new system, right, the money doesn't follow the student. It's just sort of, because you can't identify which student is, um, at-risk, and then I guess in the previous model, the money followed the students you were able to identify, so, so that's, that's -- okay. So that's what, that's what I've heard and so I just wanted to clear.

Jason Goudie: I'll, I'll answer at least from Clark County School District. Right?

Nancy Brunes: Okay.

Jason Goudie: So under FRL, there was no way to follow the student, because by Federal law, we cannot disclose to principals who actually is FRL, so that was an impossibility. So basically you got funded and you got out there and now granted principals are pretty smart, teachers are pretty smart. They, they know which students were, were probably part of that populace, they didn't know everyone, right, but you can kind of get a general sense. Under the new component, um, the, at least we as a district have and we have not yet, uh, rolled it out to principals to where they have it.

We have access to the Grad Score data for every student. Our team, our, our research team is working on creating that data that then can be, be seen and utilized by the actual, uh, principals and which then they would have access to Grad Scores as well as the weights in there as to show, you know, why they, they are on the lowest quintile, and maybe it's because, homelessness is, is one of the key factors of the, this group and so that will enable us to actually provide more granular data to actually have follow the students and be able to add -- address the specific needs of students. We're not quite there all the way yet, we are as a district, but we haven't been able to push that out to, um, schools yet, but we can.

Nancy Brunes: Can I have a follow up? Um, -- about, um, students who were identified, um, as at-risk or FRL, because they turned in the lunch form, like, um, do you remember the lunch form, so wouldn't the school and the district know then this [Indiscernible].

Jason Goudie: No. The school does not know. The, the -- our Food Department is the one group that these pieces and it's kept confidential, because that's federally protected information, and so they would retain it, they would send out numbers, but they could not send out names. Principals have asked many times to get this, so they could use it. We cannot send out the names of the pupil on that list. You know, obviously there's some people, I don't have access to it, but the people that receive it from the Fed, um, process, they receive it, they house it, so we know schools then would be notified that's how they calculate which schools, um, but that information could not be disseminated.

Nancy Brunes: Okay. Alright. [Indiscernible].

Jason Goudie: Yeah.

Nancy Brunes: [Indiscernible] incorrect understanding of how that system worked.

Jason Goudie: Yeah.

Nancy Brunas: Thank you. Very helpful.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So Beau, I think it's back to you. Do the folks from Infinite Campus have anything to present at this time or are they just there to field questions?

Beau Bennett: They, they are going to return next month for presentations. Uh, we couldn't get it noticed in time to comply with the, uh, Open Meeting Law, so they will return next month, uh, but they are here now in person, uh, should anyone have any, any questions, uh, that they might want to direct to them. At this point, knowing that they will be back, so there will be another opportunity.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Let's, uh, let's go up north first.

Mark Mathers: Thanks, Chair Hobbs. Mark Mathers, for the record. Um, I guess, I would just say, I mean, I, I think there's separate out issues. One issue is the what I would consider the arbitrary capping of at-risk students to be 20%, and I know that's a real concern to some of us. Um, maybe coupled with that is the fact that we don't stack weighted funding, but that's kind of a funding issue, not, not so much a, a definitional issue, but then the other set of issues that I'm hearing loud and clear from people making public comment who are in a position to know are real, are data questions and so I hope that in a subsequent meeting, you can answer some of those data questions.

Uh, a couple months ago, just to give you another flavor of those data questions, one of our Superintendents looked at, um, kind of the reverse, who's the -- who are the high -- who has the highest Grad Scores and what that Superintendent saw was that all of the highest GRAD Scores were in middle school, which struck this Superintendent as a extremely odd that a 11th grader or 12th grader who has got straight A's and AP classes and all that wouldn't have the highest GRAD Score that a middle school student, right, who has another three to four years left of schooling would have the highest Grad Score.

So there's just another data point or data question that I would throw out to you as to how that could possibly be, but there are many data questions like that that just don't match kind of a common sensical view of who is more at risk than not. So I hope my question made sense, but I wanted to get that question on the record as to why that would be right, um, so that's about all I had, but, I just, to me there are a couple different sets of questions, but for you, I assume, our questions are going to be around data, you know, and why is this this way, and why is it that way. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Mark, I think that's a, a great example and to the extent that there are more questions that we would like them to come back, uh, and include as a part of their presentation, this would be a great time to identify those. Anybody else up north first.

David Jensen: This is Member Jensen. Thank you. Uh, I think one of the issues that I'm hearing representing Nevada Association to School Superintendents is are significant concerned that we're under identifying students, and so when we look at the current 63,325 versus the prior 247,000, that is a massive difference between those identified subpopulations. I just did a real quick look at with that updated allocation of 198 million, if we went back to the 247 that ups the per pupil to \$803 per pupil, um, we're talking the same amount of money, but we're greatly expanding the number of students that we're identifying and, and as a, a Superintendent, if I had \$803 for each of my what used to be FRL students, we could do a significant impact. So we are under identifying and I think that's one of the biggest challenges that I want to bring to the table, and then a question, um, that whether we address it today or we address it in the future is under the GRAD, I'm confused why ethnicity and gender are included in that calculation. Uh, to me that just, um, to me I see that as being problematic. So I don't know whether you're in a position to answer that question, why we include those in that GRAD Score, or if we can be prepared to address the legalities around that next time. Thank you.

Matthew Shaw: (Ph) Matthew Shaw from Infinite Campus. Just for my own clarification. Was the -- do you want us to answer questions at this point or do you want to go through the Commission and kind of gather those questions and then, and then, uh, have us provide feedback? What's your preferred method for how we do this?

David Jensen: And I'll defer to Chairman Hobbs on whether you would like them to start to address or just collect data for next month's presentation.

Chair Hobbs: If the rest of the Commission concurs, uh, I would collect these questions that are brought up today and be prepared to address all of them directly at the next meeting. Everyone agree with that?

Group: Yes.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So let's, let's continue on. Uh, Dusty.

Dusty Casey: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. Member Casey, for the record. Um, I think part of what we've heard and something I guess I've never really understood is when does the GRAD Score start? So if it doesn't, if that data doesn't start until, you know, middle school or, or whatever grade it is, um, does that mean that a senior can never have, to Mark's point, uh, a senior can never have as high a score as that middle schooler, because they have more data, and so that the score is never really as high and then along with that, if that's the case, then I, the part I never understood, and, um, this is where I would like some information on is, if that's the case, then the money gets funneled basically to high schools and there are no resources for elementary schools and that part of the model, I've never really grasped until I started, um, talking to more folks, and I don't know that that's exactly how it works, but I would like clarity on how those scores start, if they build as the student goes along and then how that money follows the student? So that would be, uh, what I would like to hear on next time as well.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you for that. Uh, we'll move down here for additional questions and data points that we would like to have, have them address at the next meeting. Jason.

Jason Goudie: Member Jason Goudie, for the record. Um, so a couple of pieces, um, with -- especially with what, um, Dusty just mentioned, um, our team RC, who, who, who is our research team, they have data, uh, going back to elementary. So I think, I would like to get clarification on that as well, because that wasn't my understanding, but again I'm not the expert on that piece. Um, I, I think that one of the things that we should consider and, and get input on is, um, the data that we have shows that elementary schools have the lowest GRAD Scores, high schools have the highest. Um, I'm aware of the Superintendent that, um, we, we talked about, um, because they have some different data and that's not what our data shows, um, and, and our team is, our team has looked at a type of GRAD Score for, for a number of years and, and so they, they've -- they've come to the conclusion that it's worked for us and as how they started to identify programs, etc., but that concerns me.

The, the other piece that we need to consider, I believe, is because of the way that, um, it, it skews towards elementary schools. In, in our district, we would only find elementary schools, which we know that's not where all of them are. I think that comes to the fact is, is the 20% the right and the stacking, I think, that the reason why it goes down so much, one is FRL was completely the wrong way to do it. I'll use my kids, my kids are FRL, they do not need at-risk funding, it's, it's a waste of funding, um, but thinking about how we can um recommend and analyze, you know, stratifying the at-risk population, if we're going to use 20% of whatever it is, use it for an elementary school population, use it for a middle school population, use it for a high school population, so then at least you can, you can more address the fact that there's that at-risk everywhere.

Um then the other piece that that we found is, is as a challenge is, is money following the kid. That's the intention. It's not a possibility. The data we get on FRL that the State used to fund us for at-risk students is well over a year old, using GRAD Scores even, right, so they do that, they then identify 50,000 students for us or whatever that're on this list, a number of those GRAD Scores might have changed, they might have left the district, you know, they, they might have done a bunch of different things. Right? We can run a GRAD Score data on a daily basis, it changes daily, and so our intent would be to run it on count day and fund for, for the actual numbers and the schools that actually have those students in the lowest 20 percentile, which doesn't necessarily align with the, the exact students that the State gave us, but it's a better reflection. So I think that's another piece I would like to just get input on from the group as well as from Infinite Campus on how to better utilize that.

I think, um, my concern is, is not with what I call the transparency of the data, because sometimes you don't need to understand algorithms. I think we need to understand a little bit more, if there's some discrepancies and some of the common sense pieces, but understanding that, that computer systems can generate things for us, artificial intelligence that that help us make these decisions, so I'm not as uncomfortable with that piece, but I think the consideration of is 20% the right number, I don't think that anybody really believes that that's perfect, right, so that's certainly consideration and the bigger issue is the funding, which means that by the time, you know, the only weight below at-risk is GATE, and GATE is a very small group, and so you know, the assumption in our model is that the at-risk students that are EL Learners are getting enough money in EL that they're covering their at-risk components as well, and I think, that's -- maybe it's a flaw or not, but it's, it's a challenge for us. So those are my comments that I would like to see when the group next time as well as the Infinite Campus address.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. We'll take additional comments. And I think a lot of what you were talking about Jason was after we get a lot of this addressed, we'll take, we'll take on for discussion, you know, the 20% and, you know, some, some other elements of this, you know, because we need to bring this to some form of conclusion. I think one of the dangers that we have and it's always bothered me when we look at the, you know, what it was in '22 and what it is now, you know, I can't remember the exact numbers, 247 down to 63,000, I don't know that there was any validity to the, the first number at all, but people, people make all of those comparisons all the time, and I think, you know, personally I think that's absurd, because I think there is more of a problem with the former number than there is the number that we have today, uh, particularly with the funding going up, you know, there, there may be a better way of applying it, but making that comparison is just flat wrong. Paul

Paul Johnson: Well, I, I think, I'm going to disagree with that, because, um, I, I think it, it -- I agree that FRL has been skewed and that data should no longer be used. Absolutely. I, I agree with that completely. However, there is a consistent measure of poverty that every school district uses consistently down to the school level, which is the direct certification that you have for families of poverty and poverty I think is the thing that needs to be connected to at-risk, not academic performance in my opinion. There, and this is 2023 data from the Department of Administration, there were 209,000 students in the data that qualified for direct certification and these are families that qualify for Medicare, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF.

These are the most impoverished families that we have in our school. They have needs that are both academic and nonacademic and we provide services and incur costs that are both academic and nonacademic. You cannot draw an academic line and say this student no longer needs those other nonacademic support services. So I think that that GRAD Score, I, I've personally and I've never agreed with it, should be pitched, because it's based on academic performance, and those supports that may be made that person perform at an acceptable academic performance level, you don't yank them away all of a sudden when they're -- receive this [Indiscernible]. You continue to provide those services to make certain that they maintain that level, because we want to treat the whole child, not just the academic portion.

They still have to be able to, um, work with other folks, they have to be socially, emotionally adapted and all those types of things. Those systems we provide and those students of poverty are the ones that are most adversely affected or the ones that we have to help the most with many of these types of things. So I think we need to take a look at that at-risk, at-risk of what, I'll be comfortable with whatever that definition is, um, and to, if you take a look at the population of the direct certification, that measure of poverty, which is 207 and before the FRL was 247,000, so it's, it is off, but there's still a baseline that I think should be used and then build from there up. Um, if you take a look at the total at-risk population, which was 63,000, EL was around 52,000, GATE was 7,400, specially education was 62,000, there's a total there of 186,268, which is 23,000 less than the total direct certification population. So, we're missing 5% just on that measure. So I think we're under qualified, I, I don't think that we -- I don't think we have the right definition in my opinion to reflect the costs that we incur as school districts to help a population that needs more than just academic.

Nancy Brunes: Paul, is that direct certification, is that children 0 to 18 or because --

Paul Johnson: That's K-12.

Nancy Brunes: It's K-12. Okay.

Paul Johnson: Yeah.

Chair Hobbs: So focusing on any other questions that we want Infinite Campus to address. I know that they have to leave in a couple of minutes or sometime soon, so let's focus on that. Punam.

Punam Mathur: Thank you. For the record, Member Mathur. Thank you Infinite Campus for being here and thank you for coming back. I'm learning a lot more about what I thought I knew, um, as, as we go. Um, I would very much like to hear from you next month your experience of applying the GRAD Score for comparable decision making and or funding decisions in other States. Um, I remember originally or I recall originally that, that was part of, for me, the attractiveness of this GRAD Score was that, it wasn't that you were building it and using it and piloting it just for us, it was something that was in place in all other communities and small districts, large districts, States, um, around the country.

So I would love to know the fidelity of the algorithm, um, and even some specific examples of how it's been applied in allocation of funding, because for my neighbor, all my neighbor wants to know is, is it doing, what we think, what I'm investing in it to do, and so it does trouble me a lot that right now, we don't know -- the money is supposed to follow the kid. So if right now, we can't identify the kid, for the principal, for whom the money is coming, that seems like a problem for my neighbor, um, and so we need to get that solved pretty quickly. It sounds like maybe we can. Um, the other thing that my neighbor is going to want to know is, great, if other states did it based on GRAD Score, how are their babies doing three years after being funded or five years after being funded or were, were that the, the third grader who was in the bottom 20%, are they now able on track to graduate from high school, um, and so we don't have anything that's going to give us that longitudinal data in this State.

I am hoping that the wisdom and expertise that Infinite Campus has in States around the country that you can help us with some of that and simultaneously help build some confidence in us that you've got experience in other places that we can use as a basis to feel more confident about implementing it, um, because I do worry that we also don't want to be zigging and zagging and changing and too quickly, right, that's part of what happens in education, if we're like did it, didn't work, that was Monday, today is Wednesday, we got to change it again, um, and I think we just sort of [Indiscernible] we all kind of shock and whiplash for educators and families and my neighbor frankly. So Infinite Campus, it really would be to, to the extent that you can share

your experience in application of this algorithm in other places.

Chair Hobbs: So, uh, Nancy, Jim, Joyce, do you have anything else to add?

Joyce Woodhouse: Nothing else to add.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So you have some questions to address at the next meeting and we appreciate again you being here today and we'll look very forward, forward to your, um, presentation and answers to those questions at the next meeting.

Matthew Shaw: Okay.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah.

Paul Johnson: Would we be incorporating the questions from the public comment that we received as well as issues that should be --

Chair Hobbs: I hope you can certainly ask one relative to that.

Paul Johnson: Okay. So, I as a Commission Member.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. You probably can do that.

Paul Johnson: Thank you.

Matthew Shaw: Okay.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks very much. Thank you, Beau. Thank you folks from Infinite Campus. Brings us to agenda item number 10, presentation and the discussion regarding the effects on school districts using the Statewide Base per pupil funding amount for online schools while receiving the FY 2020 Baseline Funding amount. So we'll receive a presentation from James Kirkpatrick. James. Well, James is getting ready. Just to remind everybody, uh, the prior item, this item and the next item are things that are on our checklist of items to bring closure to, um, not necessarily today, but as soon as the Commission as a whole feels comfortable. James.

James Kirkpatrick: Good morning. James Kirkpatrick, for the record. Today, I'm going to be reviewing the analysis that I performed related to the effect of, um, districts that are receiving the 2020 Baseline Funding through the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan and the impact of them receiving the Statewide Base for their online students or schools. I want to bring us back to the exact request from the legislature in their letter of intent dated August 18, 2023, that was provided to the Department. They requested a review of the effect and development of recommendations on providing school districts receiving 2020 Baseline Funding with the Statewide Base per pupil funding amount for their online schools. Fortunately, um, most of our districts have moved from the 2020 baseline.

We do have three districts still funded at that level and this request impacts only one district. So the analysis here on this slide, um, I've identified, um, the, um, current, um, baseline -- 2020 baseline per pupil amount that is applied to every student within the district and that allocation is \$2.8 million. Now through my analysis, uh, of the model, when I examined the impact to the same district and breaking out the number of students that are identified as being a part of that online school education process, 15.26% of the 77.32 students would receive a reduced per pupil amount of 8,981 which is the Statewide Base in fiscal year '24. The total allocation, if that district were receiving the Statewide Base in 2024, would be 2.4 million.

The net effect of that and the most significant impact would be to that one district and they would lose about \$428,000 in that for fiscal year 2024. The ancillary effects or impacts to the model, because of that reduction in funding to that district with, within the model, when we make the adjustment for every district to fund the hold harmless provision or the 2020 baseline amount, we would see a reduction of the adjustment from 0.1680%, that's a negative, so it would be a reduction adjust to a 0.1602% and that is the analysis. So I would be happy to take any questions you have.

Chair Hobbs: Questions from any member of the Commission?

Punam Mathur: [Indiscernible].

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, that was actually going to be my call.

Punam Mathur: Okay.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, you know, so to be able to check the box on this one, given, I think, what was on your first slide. What is it that the Commission is being asked to do? So let's read.

Jason Goudie: James, can you, can you remind us, so -- I remember discussing this way back when and, and ultimately the recommendation was to move to the Baseline Funding. Um, what was it prior to that, was it based off just the district funding?

James Kirkpatrick: James Kirkpatrick, for the record. Um, could you please repeat that?

Jason Goudie: Yeah, I'm just trying to remember, when, when we made this decision, so it looks like we recommended to move to the, the baseline funding using the Statewide Base for their online schools. What was the prior methodology for funding them? Was it purely just they got online students the same as they got for in-school students, so they got their district per pupil amount?

James Kirkpatrick: James Kirkpatrick, for the record. So currently, um, for school districts, um, the last recommendation of or -- currently in the model for school districts, districts with online students receive the full adjusted base for those students. [Interposing] So --

Chair Hobbs: James, I think I think the question was what, was that changed from?

James Kirkpatrick: So the Commission at one point recommended to fund district online schools at the Statewide Base, but that recommendation was never implemented by the Governor -- within the Governor's recommended budget and or the legislatively approved budget.

Nancy Brunes: Okay.

Jason Goudie: So, then can I -- okay, so that, that -- thanks James. That helps. So essentially we recommended moving away from the what's done now, which is still done is that if a school has an online, they still get funded based off of their district per pupil and, and there's no difference for online. Is that, is that right? That's what we're doing now?

James Kirkpatrick: That -- James Kirkpatrick, for the record. That is correct.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So I guess the question is, do we want to remake the same recommendation that we

previously made?

Nancy Brunes: Yeah.

Jason Goudie: That we move it to this -- I guess --

Chair Hobbs: Yes, Statewide Base.

Jason Goudie: -- my, my challenge is that, I, I do not think that we have done enough analysis of the actual cost differential between an online school and a bricks and mortar, you know, we, we have, we have one that's large and you know, Nevada Learning Academy, right, that and, and they are able to, depending on the class, certain classes, handle class sizes of gargantuan size effectively online, and other classes in English Lit class online is, is really not that much different than any class, but there's some that can be done. So I, I, I remember having the discussion, I think I had the same kind of challenge in my head is that, we've done it and we, we take our online school and we run it through our Pupil-Centered Funding Model that we fund everything else and it doesn't work. It doesn't work.

Jim McIntosh: [Indiscernible] per pupil, an actual per pupil?

Jason Goudie: Yeah, yeah, but I mean, because, but -- but like it is a high school elementary, because we have different levels for elementary school per pupil. So we, we try and make it fit and ultimately it doesn't and we have to kind of go through and make adjustments. And so I'm just, I'm not sure if the Statewide Base average is the right amount to apply to every online student yet, is where I am. I'm just, I don't know what the answer is, but I, I just, I'm not comfortable that that's the right answer, because I know that ours does not work in our current model, so.

Jim McIntosh: But you have a per pupil expenditure actual number ought to be bigger at the end of the day for the cost of that school.

Jason Goudie: Yes, I mean we can figure out, yes, the actual cost. Challenge is that they have, they have, they have different, um, curriculum needs, because they're developing curriculum on, on a -- so there's, there's, it's very hard to do, because they're still developing a lot of curriculum, so we're still kind of what I'll call even in the development phase versus a pure operation, where they have a curriculum that is no longer purely being developed as opposed to being maintained, which is a different cost structure. So that's some of our challenges as well, right, is that we're still truly developing a comprehensive online curriculum that can be applied in every, in every area. So I just, I just don't know. That's, that's, that's my problem. I don't know.

Chair Hobbs: Are, are there -- is the enrollment in online school is something that's noticeably changing year to year?

Jason Goudie: Jason Goudie, for the record. For, for Clark, it did. We had a huge influx during COVID.

Chair Hobbs: Right.

Nancy Brunes: Yeah.

Jason Goudie: You know, we, we went from having what I'll call virtually none as you compared to our, our, our, and maybe was less than a thousand full--time students, we got up to close to 10,000 full--time students and now it's back down, I don't know the exact numbers, but I'm guessing half that 2,000 to 4,000, on, on, on what I call fulltime, now they still service all the other schools, who, who, um, may, may be missing an algebra

teacher, and so they utilize as they have. A huge number of what I'll call part--time, um, and that fluctuates each year, but, but that's a bigger number, um, but our full--time went up and it rent back down, um, and it's probably more normalizing now.

Chair Hobbs: Well, yeah, I mean, COVID was obviously extreme. So you think it's kind of trending back down to --

Jason Goudie: I, I think we're a couple to 4,000, I can't remember the exact numbers.

Chair Hobbs: What about in the rurals, Paul?

Paul Johnson: Well, I can only speak for us, we don't, we really haven't had a great, um, need for distance delivery. Um, even during COVID, we were only out of face--to--face school for, you know, a month. And we were able to go back to face--to--face or masK-to--mask. Um, so you know, it's, it's not a huge issue with respect to us, our, the online competition that we have were mostly Charter School, but I can tell you that when, when we had our online education system before this was, you know, we were the first, uh, virtual school in the State of Nevada many months ago.

Um, we were looking, trying to exploit that as a means to finance the rest of the school district, because we figured that we would only have to operate at about a third of the revenue that we were coming in and the rest of the money we would actually use to help support the rest of the school district, so it has been our experience at the cost of operating those schools is by far less than what a traditional school would, would be.

Now I don't know if there should be equity allocation adjustments for online schools that would raise it above the base that we have for all, for all schools. Um, they certainly don't have transportation and, and food services and all those other adjustments, so for me the question would be, why, why can't we just make the recommendation still be the Base, because I, I, I don't see why we would need an equity allocation adjustment for education, because the online fees for, for Educational Services, well, I guess it would be for compensation those types of [Interposing]. I don't know how, yeah, so anyway, maybe it needs to be studied further, but it's hard for me to grasp how their, their demand would exceed our Statewide Base, unadjusted base, but it's certainly something we can study.

Chair Hobbs: Well, let me go, let me go up north to see if Mark or Dave or anyone else has any comments from their observations.

Dusty Casey: Member Casey for the record. I have a couple of clarifying questions. Um, if I'm not mistaken, online Charters get the Statewide Base though. Right? Okay.

James Kirkpatrick: James Kirkpatrick, for the record. That is correct.

Dusty Casey: Okay. Um, and they can get students enrolled from all around State. What about district online schools, can they take students from anywhere in the State or only inside their district?

David Jensen: This is Member Jensen. I'll weigh in. I don't think there's anything that stops it, other than some agreement between districts that we would not try to coup kids from other school districts. So in Humboldt County, our online program serves only students within Humboldt County.

Dusty Casey: So Member Casey has a follow up -- oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Casey, this is Member Johnson. I actually can kind of help, um, explain this, because

we went through this very little sticky situation. We actually offered a, a, a online through K-12 Service Provider, where we were, um, trying to, uh, leverage the financial resources of that school to recruit students from other school districts, and one of the, one of our biggest recruit grounds was the Park County School District. They were really happy with us taking revenue from them in the form of student enrollment. So we actually shut that down, because we did not want to adversely affect another County School District by directly competing against them. So, uh, it seemed like -- it seemed good at the time and then once, once we started exchanging students and, and realizing the impact that we're having on other school districts, we stopped doing it.

Jason Goudie: And, and -- Jason Goudie, for the record, to clarify, NDE was the first to do, because what, what they had was they were, they were trying to understand whether or not we had agreements and whether or not you should be receiving revenue, we should be receiving the revenue, or whatever, because of where it was, and so, you know, we didn't have a huge issue. We, we were through it just fine, but I know NDE stepped in, because it was a funding issue as to who should be getting the funds and should there be an inter--local agreement between the two to transmit and at which rate and, and things of that nature.

And, so, so, yeah, I mean, we, certainly it was done and it wasn't illegal, it was just a matter of figuring out how, the NDE was asking okay, so they're, they're at White -- they're, they're, they're up, in, in White Pine, the CCSD students, and if we're going to fund these students, should we funding -- should we be sending the lower amount per pupil to them or should they use the higher amount and so that was part of the challenge.

Chair Hobbs: You were probably just doing it to try to recruit for the basketball team. Right?

Paul Johnson: Well, that point, you know, we didn't -- we couldn't do sports.

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Dusty Casey: Member Casey. I have a couple of follow ups if I may.

Chair Hobbs: Please.

Dusty Casey: So another question I have, in those districts like, like Humboldt to have multiple attendance zones with different funding rates, do they get funded at the lowest, um, rate in your district depending does it matter where the students from. So if you have an online student from, um, McDermitt and an online student that resides in Winnemucca, do they get funded differently or all your online students funded at your lowest attendance zone rate?

Unidentified Speaker: My understanding is we're all funded at the same rate.

Dusty Casey: At the same rate?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record. Yes, currently for those online schools, it is all the same rate. For the purposes of today's question and context, um, as you're aware the legislature provided us a letter of intent and so for those districts who are on the fiscal year 2020 Baseline Funding or, or the hold harmless, um, the question is what is the impact if we were to require those online schools to be paid out the Statewide Base per pupil amount in alignment with all of the other online schools in the State as compared to they are currently getting whatever the, the hold harmless per pupil amount ends up being, and so for the case of Esmeralda, for example, they previously before the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan had such great local, um, revenues from the mining industry.

Their per pupil amount exceeds what is currently available and so the result from the comparison and the analysis that James has provided is that if we were to pay for the online schools at Statewide rate, it is a lower per pupil amount, because it's no longer at the hold harmless amount, and so therefore the effect for Esmeralda in this case would be a loss of funding of approximately over a little over \$400,000.

So ultimately the question from the letter of intent is, what is the impact in this specific situation and what are the recommendations from the Commission? Should, um, we make a recommendation to pay those online schools regardless of whether they're in the baseline funding methodology or not, the same across the State or because they're in a district that is in the fiscal year '20 methodology, do we pay them the flat per pupil amount that's established through that method.

And then secondarily, we can, um, explore the conversation of the online school conversation in general, but, um, Mr. Goudie, and, and Dr. Jensen were correct in that. Um, there is no provision in terms of which students can attend an online school regardless of the district, it's just that there is an agreement that needs to be put in place between the two districts to ensure that the -- they're accounting for the students and making sure that proper payments are occurring.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you for the clarification, Megan. Uh, given that clarification, is there any direction from this Commission? Anybody want to make a motion?

Jason Goudie: I don't know if I want to make a motion, but, I, I guess intuitively have a challenge with a change that is going to take \$400,000 out of a very small district. That seems wrong to me. Um, I was just trying to look up Esmeralda how much they get, but my guess is 400,000 is.

Jim McIntosh: How many are still on hold harmless?

[Interposing]

Punam Mathur: May I just clarify this. There are three in hold harmless, this change affects only one of the three, that's Esmeralda, and that's why that we got laid out in front of us.

Group: Yeah.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record. [Interposing] Esmeralda is currently the only district in the fiscal year 2020 Baseline Methodology Structure, and so, um, I'm sorry -- there are three districts in that methodology and Esmeralda is the only one that has online schools, so as a result of that, they're the only district affected by the decision.

Paul Johnson: They, they get \$2.1 million.

Punam Mathur: This is, is more than the money [Indiscernible].

[Interposing]

Chair Hobbs: So with that in mind, we want to make a recommendation.

Jason Goudie: Well, with that in mind, I, I would make a motion to with, withdraw our recommendation to move to the Statewide Base, um, until, and I don't think we need to kill it, because I think as funding increases, it may be the right decision in the future, but I think, at this point, I think it's so detrimental to a district that I, I would motion that we do not move forward the recommendation.

Chair Hobbs: Is there a second?

Todd Weiss: Hold on, Chair. Deputy Attorney General Todd Weiss. This isn't a action item on the agenda I don't [Interposing].

Chair Hobbs: No.

Paul Johnson: And we don't have to take a motion.

Nancy Brunes: It's just discussion only.

Punam Mathur: It says possible action.

Chair Hobbs: It does, on my copy, it does say discussion and possible action. So clarification.

Todd Weiss: Well, yeah, let say for possible action. Well I would say nothing, if you want to take a vote, go ahead and do that.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So we, we have a motion and we have a second. Additional discussion, I guess my only question, Jason, is, you -- is there a point in time at which we would migrate over to the Statewide Base?

Jason Goudie: My, my recommendation would be that once all districts are out of hold harmless, we reevaluate. I don't want to say that we ought to, but move to it, I want to say at that point we reevaluate, because again you look at the impact on this in, in all districts, and if this doesn't affect anybody else hardly at all, and it takes 20% of funding out of one, that doesn't seem like we're doing what we're supposed to do. So I think that we, we can re--evaluate it once all groups are out of hold harmless, because I think that changes how the funding model work.

Chair Hobbs: So the re--evaluation once they're all out of hold harmless would be also part of your motion?

Jason Goudie: Yes, it would.

Chair Hobbs: Okay.

Punam Mathur: Good motion.

Paul Johnson: And I'll amend that second or second that amendment.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. [Interposing] second a second time.

Paul Johnson: You know what I'm talking about?

Chair Hobbs: I do. Any additional discussion, questions? Uh, if not --

Dusty Casey: I have additional comment, if I may.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah.

Dusty Casey: This is Member Casey. Um, the only thing I don't understand is, some of these districts, you

know, like Esmeralda may not come out a hold harmless for, I, I mean, I don't, I don't know how long right, um, and so I guess, I don't really understand what the difference is, um, in looking at this, because even if we look at it in the future, we're talking about big differences especially when you talk about the rurals, right, I mean, the rural districts get substantially more than the Statewide Base, so even -- at some point in time, it's going to be a big, uh, a big deficit, if those online schools go back to the Statewide Base, even if you're talking about going from \$112,000 a student to, to, you know, 9,000 or whatever it is, it's still going to be a big deficit, so I guess I don't know, I'm a little confused on what we're deciding, because they're already being paid at the, the District Base. Right? So is that district just being used as an example, because everybody is already being paid at their per pupil rate for online schools.

James Kirkpatrick: James Kirkpatrick, for the record. So all districts currently receive the Adjusted Base amount, which is Statewide Base plus the attendance area, plus the NCEI. So currently everybody receives that. This question addressed districts receiving the fiscal year 2020 baseline amount, which includes three districts, but of those three districts, only one has online, an online school in which they have online students. Does that answer your question?

Megan Peterson: Um, Megan Peterson, for the record, to clarify a little more. So the, the standing question is, is that when a district qualifies for the fiscal year 2020 hold harmless base amount, because, um, of the hold harmless component, there are funds that are taken, because we only have the single pot of money for everyone that are then moved to that district to bring it back to that original funding level and so their per pupil amount that is distributed to these online schools is higher than the adjusted base, because of the Hold Harmless component, and so if the recommendation were to be, to fund all online schools at the Statewide Base, then it would not take into consideration the hold harmless funding for those online schools and so therefore the districts with online schools in hold harmless, which today is only Esmeralda County, they would lose funding, because the Statewide Base per pupil amount is lower than their hold harmless per pupil amount.

Dusty Casey: So then can our recommendation be to protect the districts that are only in hold harmless for their online funding?

Megan Peterson: That is essentially the essence of this question, is, what is the recommendation, um, if any, for the districts who have online schools in hold harmless, should they be funded at the Statewide per pupil amount or is there some alternative that the Commission would like to propose.

Dusty Casey: So I guess my question would be, Member Casey again for the record, is we've already made a recommendation that all online schools, um, should be funded at the Statewide Base, why would we change that other than just protecting schools that are in hold harmless, which is essentially the same as funding at the as our conversation for adjusted per pupil funding anyway, that's what the hold harmless is for.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson. One more point of clarification too. That was the recommendation of the Commission previously to fund at the Statewide Base; however, the Governor and the Legislature did not adopt that, so they're currently be being funded at Adjusted Base. So the question has been brought forward is not full circle again, because now the question is focusing specifically on the online schools that are in districts who are in hold harmless. So it's a little bit nuanced and a little bit more narrow.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Dusty, with, with that clarification, doesn't the motion address this or do we -- does it need to be reframed?

Jason Goudie: I can reframe, I guess the, the, and, and maybe I was going around with drawing the previous recommendation. So why don't we just change the motion. I make a motion to, um, continue to utilize the, um, current methodology of funding online schools and to re--evaluate the potential for moving to a Statewide Base

funding amount at a date when all schools are out of hold harmless.

Paul Johnson: I think that works.

Jason Goudie: Trying to make it more positive versus counterintuitive.

Paul Johnson: We have a motion and a second. Any other questions or discussion?

Joyce Woodhouse: So I have a question on point of -- point of order or something. Um, the previous motion that Jason made, did, did you withdraw that one, so we could do this?

Jason Goudie: Yeah, sorry. I withdrew that and move the second. I don't know all of this stuff.

Joyce Woodhouse: That's okay.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, so your first motion and second have been, have been withdrawn by the maker of the motion and the person that seconded the motion. We have a new motion that has been made and seconded. Are we good procedurally? Okay.

Todd Weiss: Perfect.

Chair Hobbs: All, all of those in favor of the motion, the most recent one, please signify by saying, aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Anybody opposed? Abstain? Okay.

Paul Johnson: We've to slug through that one Jason.

Jason Goudie: Yeah, I was trying to figure, because I was trying to read this back, what am I supposed to.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. That completes agenda item number 10. Agenda item 11 and we only, this is the last discussion item that we have. This is information and discussion, no action. Discussion regarding the use of English Language Learner Weighted Funding to provide a Dual Language Program, we'll receive, um, introduction on allowable uses of English Learner Funds and whether those funds can be used to provide Dual Language Programs. Beau, you're back up.

Beau Bennett: Thank you very much. Beau Bennett, for the record. Okay. This was, this was a task assigned to the Commission, uh, via the Nevada Legislative Letter of Intent, uh, and it, it instructed the Commission to review, to make a review of the English Learner Weighted Funding to determine if it would be an allowable use of these funds by school districts and charter schools to establish and operate Dual Language Programs or determine the legislative changes necessary -- necessary to do so.

Uh, and, uh, sub to that is a determination of the recommended weight that would be required, if a new Dual Language Program weight was to be established for the plan, but for purposes of this presentation, we're focusing on the, the review of allowable use of funds. And, I, I want to thank, uh, uh, David Gardner for all his assistance on that, reaching out, and, and he provided a lot of useful feedback, uh, so I just wanted to thank him. So NRS 387.12445(8) says in relevant part, a public school that receives funding for one or more pupils who are English Learners must use that weighted funding only to provide Zoom Services.

Zoom Services defined under the statute, under, uh, Nevada Revised Statute means any one or more the following: a pre-- prekindergartener -- prekindergarten program provided free of charge, a reading skills center, a professional development for teacher and other licensed education -- educational personnel regarding the effective instructional practices and strategies for pupils who are English Learners, incentives for hiring and retaining teachers and other licensed educational personnel who provide Zoom Services, engagement and involvement with parents and families of pupils who are English Learners including increasing effective, culturally appropriate communications with and outreach to parents and families to support the academic achievement of pupils, a summer academy, uh, for those who do not operate a traditional school, uh, calendar or an intersession academy provided free of charge, an extended school day, or where this one, uh, may fit in, any other services or program that has a demonstrated record of success for similarly situated pupils in comparable school districts and has been reviewed and approved as a Zoom Service by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

So moving forward to the topics for future consideration, uh, and we're going to bring this back this, this first part next month, do Dual Language Learners have the record -- programs have the requisite record of success for English Learners. Uh, other potential topics, how much money does a Dual Language Program cost and does the English Learner Weight, uh, as is support that entire program, uh, what does the makeup of an effective Dual Language Program look like, how to budget when only the English Learners side of, of the class would be tracked, and are any other States funding a Dual Language Program with a weight, but I do want to mention that, some of that is outside of the scope of what was given to the Commission via the Nevada Legislature of Intent, which is determining if this is an allowable use of funds and we will bring that back, uh, for, for future considerations. And any other information you would need, uh, any other information on this topic, we can bring forward in future meetings, uh, please provide that. Thank you.

Nancy Brunes: I have a question, Beau. When you say Dual Language, are you also including, uh, immersion programs without being allowable use within the Dual Language Program category? Immersion, immersion programs.

Beau Bennett: We will have to get clarification on that. Uh, I know we are having some staff members more familiar with that coming back next month, uh, and we will highlight that topic for them.

Nancy Brunes: Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Um, Mark, I see you have a question.

Mark Mathers: Yeah just -- thank you. Just piggybacking off of Ms. Brunes' question. I feel like we need a definition of Dual Language Programs, because Washoe County School District operates dual language in two of our schools, but I really don't know if that's similar to other districts, and just like Ms. Brunes asked, you know, it's two--way immersion programs considered dual language, yes or no, and I don't -- I'm not sure anyone has that Statewide view, so I do think that's a really good question that we first need to understand and ask ourselves, but I guess my next question once we define that, isn't, isn't this just a legal -- is, is this a legal question, because we're being asked is this an allowable use of EL funding and that feels to me like a legal question. Once we can define what dual language means, I don't -- I'm not sure we're really in a position at the Commission to answer that. Once it's answered, then there's questions we could answer, or try to address, but I'm a little leery of just making what feels to me like a legal determination.

Beau Bennett: Thank you. Beau Bennett, for the record. Uh, that is why we did reach out to David Gardner and got his take that it would be allowable only under number eight, so now we have to move forward to see if number eight, uh, moving forward if that is a sufficient program.

Mark Mathers: Okay. I, I missed that. I'm, I'm sorry. Who is, who is David Gardner?

Beau Bennett: The Deputy Attorney General.

Mark Mathers: Okay. Is there -- okay. So we have a written legal opinion?

Beau Bennett: I have emails that say this is what he believes. Yes.

Mark Mathers: Okay.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson to clarify. The language that was presented as was in the legislative letter of intent to our typical DAG who is staffing our member, our Commission Members has indicated that he believes it is an allowable use under item number eight, which is any other services or programs that have demonstrated a record of success.

Jim McIntosh: [Indiscernible].

Punam Mathur: [Indiscernible]. On our to--do list, because the legislature asks us to consider creating an additional weight for --

Megan Peterson: Yeah, Megan Peterson. Yes, I was just going to clarify that next step. So the first question was that, is it allowable? Yes. If it is, [Interposing] yeah, today it has no action.

Punam Mathur: Okay.

Mark Mathers: This is, this is Mark again. I, I guess, I'm not, I'm not an attorney, but, I, you know, the way I read Section 8 is, if you're an English Learner and any other program that benefits or serves you is allowable. To me, the question is, are, uh, students in a two--way immersion dual language program whose first language is English, is -- do they qualify to get EL funding. Right? I mean, that, that, that to me is the inherent question here and number eight just is a catchall category to say among, you know, the first seven items are ways you could serve EL students, number eight is if you can come up with a different way to serve EL students, then you go to the State Department of Education and you get approval to do that. I think really the question is, are all students in a dual language program qualify for EL funding, and I, but -- so I just, I just want clarification on that.

Beau Bennett: So, the, the original question was to, if it would be an allowable use of the -- of English language funds by a school district in order to establish and operate dual language. So this would be off, does this program benefit the Zoom students that would be in, into that class -- into those classes? They would, it wouldn't be an additional weight that would be given to the non-EL Learners unless that's the recommendation on that you're going to change the weight and offer it to more to, uh, students outside of the English Language, the question is, is a Dual Language Program, does it have a demonstrated record of success for similarly situated pupils, which be -- would be your English Language Learners, uh, and has it been approved, and that's the question we're going to bring back and move forward with. Uh, it does have the demonstrated record of success and what's that process look like.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So that's coming back on the next agenda. Correct? Okay.

Beau Bennett: That is correct.

Chair Hobbs: Any other points of clarification for that agenda item?

Punam Mathur: Sorry, I'm still not quite getting it. I'm sorry. Um, so the question is, can the ELL weight be spent on Dual Language Program? The DAG has confirmed, yeah, process to get clarity on that would be to ask the Superintendents, and the Superintendent and the Department determines that that Dual Language Program is a Zoom Service, then they can spend the weight on it. What is the role that we would have though? I don't see that there's any role for us neither.

Jason Goudie: Determining if there is a, if we should add an additional weight.

Punam Mathur: [Interposing] that's the only thing is --

Chair Hobbs: That was part of the specific request, yes.

Punam Mathur: So that seems like lots more has to be dealt with before it even comes to us.

Chair Hobbs: So back --

Punam Mathur: Right now, we don't even know if it's allowed.

Jim McIntosh: [Indiscernible] is the Superintendent of Public Instruction like determining that Zoom student these are eligible for, so they get the weight as long as they determine it's effective, right, it doesn't matter what the program is, dual language or anything [Interposing].

Jason Goudie: We need better in helping EL students is, is law, is approved by the Superintendent, then it becomes eligible number eight. So they've determined that it should be eligible number eight, if it meets these other requirements, and then the State Sup has to sign off on. Then, then we, then we determine as a group, should we add a separate weight for dual language. I think we all know the answer to that already.

Punam Mathur: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: I think that will be helpful in framing out the, uh, the item for the next agenda. Okay.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record. Um, Mr. Goudie nailed it on the head in the order of operations and then so that is what the intent is for the next meeting is that we will bring Department Staff back who do work very closely on the programmatic side with this to clarify what it is that they look at and evaluate and what is within that scope and then it will be for the Commission to look at that information and decide if it's warranted to add an additional way that is specific to dual language if we don't feel that it's sufficiently addressed through item number eight.

Chair Hobbs: And I believe --

Megan Peterson: Well, I'm sorry, I've to --

Chair Hobbs: -- [Indiscernible] able to understand, I believe the Commission will be able to make that determination at the next meeting. That's a sense I get.

Megan Peterson: We are hoping so.

Chair Hobbs: Yes. Well, we wish we could. Um, so --

Jim McIntosh: In terms of Zoom students and that is equivalent to an EL student.

Jason Goudie: It uses Zoom Services, so [Indiscernible] says that EL students must spend EL money on the Zoom Services [Interposing].

Jim McIntosh: The Zoom, Zoom Services are only for EL students -- it's no difference.

Punam Mathur: That's right.

Jason Goudie: Well, I mean, it's, it's hard, you have programs that help classes and there, there could certainly be students that are may not be ELs in, in certain cases, so these are programs are designed to help EL students, other students can fairly benefit [Interposing].

Jim McIntosh: It's not weighting on those students.

Jason Goudie: No, you're not weighting on those students. [Interposing] you then pay for what the funds and has to be serving those students, but it could serve ancillary students as well.

Jim McIntosh: We still use the term Zoom?

Jason Goudie: We do not use the term Zoom anymore.

Jim McIntosh: Okay.

Jason Goudie: The only thing we said the Zoom Services [Interposing] that's but we, we still don't talk about Zoom students.

[Interposing].

Chair Hobbs: Okay. That brings us to item number 12, future agenda items. We, uh, I think, I have, I know we're going to have community presentations at the next meeting. We'll have the flexible agenda at the next meeting. We'll have working group, uh, reports at the next meeting and discussion thereof. We're bringing back Infinite Campus and we're bringing back agenda item number 11 for final disposition. Any other items that are specific to the legislative memorandum that this Commission can address and bring closure to that would be largely our next agenda. Anybody else want to add anything?

Punam Mathur: Just for someday, a someday agenda, not next agenda, this whole notion of stacking weights and whether we want to have some recommendation because we think about making now, that even says over time as we're moving to optimal funding. Here is also the [Indiscernible] funding gets this, we then stack.

Chair Hobbs: A statement of an ideal objective --

Punam Mathur: Yeah, yeah, something that is a recommendation on the record around stack.

Jason Goudie: I, I, I think that we would want to bring [Indiscernible] back --

Punam Mathur: Back.

Jason Goudie: -- because they're there, because I don't recall and I was in, I was in the study groups, which was odd since I was brand new to a school district so, but I was there right and then I was obviously there for all

the [Indiscernible] meetings and stuff, and, and there were some reasons as to why to stack and why not stack, because when you, when you stack, there is a different weight that should be applied than if you don't stack and you have them independently, and I don't remember all those pieces, so I agree we should revisit that, but I think they certainly need to come back and help walk through how that works and, you know, because if, if you're going to stack, then it may not be 0.35 for at-risk anymore, it might be 0.-- I don't know, but I would agree and [Indiscernible] part of that discussion.

Chair Hobbs: So Todd doesn't go nuts, because we're now talking about an item that isn't on even this agenda. Uh, note that, we would have that discussion with the appropriate subject matter experts for a future agenda.

Todd Weiss: Yeah, these conversations are fine, because we're talking about what's going to go on a future agenda. So, um, you know, freely, freely discuss.

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Alright. I was trying, I was just trying to catch Jason, that's all.

Paul Johnson: Well, maybe we could follow up on a previous commission meeting, um, from 2021 where we agreed to reevaluate all of this stuff and perform an updated study on stuff, so maybe that could be.

Jason Goudie: Are you talking about an updated [Indiscernible]?

Paul Johnson: Yes, yes.

Jason Goudie: Well, the State commissioned that last time, but I mean, it was, did they do in '18, but it was still based off of one, one year data.

Paul Johnson: It's still bruited in 2006 and all the staffing allocations and everything else were based at that point in time, they updated the values for inflation, but they didn't update the staffing allocations and all that other stuff.

Chair Hobbs: It's more of a, is that more of a question to NDE about whether or not they have the intention of doing an update?

Paul Johnson: Well, we could, we could still recommend our prior recommendation where we in the interest of continually studying this, I think we need to have a refresh everything that was done before just to make sure we're still on track and everything still makes sense.

Jason Goudie: I, I would completely agree, because I would almost guarantee there are, the, the teacher ratios probably haven't varied much, but my guess is the social emotional other services, we already know we were way short there, I bet you were farther away from where we should be now with what they recommend. So I think that I, I would love to see it.

Chair Hobbs: So what would that agenda actually be?

Paul Johnson: Um, -- review another, well, this one was being in the -- the prior study was an adequate, adequacy study, maybe this would be an optimal study where they can identify that or an update of --

Chair Hobbs: Is it more, is it a discussion of an update of prior work?

Jason Goudie: Uh, it might be more than update. I think if we continue to say update, I'm afraid that there's -- I think we need phrase that that we need to evaluate the, um, utilizing [Indiscernible] or another entity, right,

because I know they did it, but I know there's probably RFP to analyze the, the, the value of creating or recreating, I, I just don't want to use --

Jim McIntosh: Reevaluate framework, right, that we use to determine optimal funding, because --

Jason Goudie: Yes.

Jim McIntosh: Because that we were using that stuff for [Indiscernible].

Jason Goudie: That's a good way to put it.

Paul Johnson: Yeah, we use it for, that's one of our benchmarks for adequacy, so maybe we can [Indiscernible].

Chair Hobbs: This item unresolved in a recommendation from the Commission. Right?

Jason Goudie: Yes, recommend to, to somebody to fund a piece, I remember last time it was you know 700 Grand.

Chair Hobbs: To do this work?

Paul Johnson: Yeah, to do and whatever that's [Interposing] we'll find at a later time.

Chair Hobbs: [Indiscernible]. Okay. That that covers that. That takes us to public comment period number two. We'll now have our second public comment period on any matter within the Commission's jurisdiction.

[Audio ends abruptly]