

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE
COORDINATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS
TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 2017

Meeting Locations:

| Office | Address | City | Meeting Room |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| Department of Education | 9890 S. Maryland Pkwy | Las, Vegas | Board Room (2 nd Floor) |
| Department of Education | 700 E. Fifth St | Carson City | Board Room |

Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 10:16 AM.

Roll Call

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

- Brent Husson
- Lou DeSalvio
- Debbie Brockett
- Jeff Zander
- Kelee Dupuis

In Carson City

- Dr. Sandra Sheldon

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

- Jeff Zaul
- Chelli Smith
- Meredith Smith

In Carson City:

- Kirsten Gleissner

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

In Las Vegas

- Kelee Dupuis
- Raven Cole

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

There was no public comment in the north or south.

3. FEXIBLE AGENDA APPROVAL (*Discussion/Possible Action*)

Motion

- Member DeSalvio moved for a flexible agenda
- Member Husson seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:17 AM**

4. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES FOR MAY 24, 2017

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Jeff Zander, Chair

Motion

- Member DeSalvio moved to approve the May 24, 2017 RPDP Meeting Minutes
- Member Brockett seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:17 AM**

5. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION UPDATES (Information/Discussion)

Dena Durish, NDE Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement

- Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

The ESSA Plan was revised to include two deadlines for submission and states had the opportunity to choose which deadline. Nevada was one of seventeen states to submit in April and was the first of three to be reviewed by the U.S. Department of Education. As of August 9, 2017, Betsy DeVos, U.S. Secretary of Education, informed Governor Brian Sandoval that Nevada's ESSA Plan was the second to receive Federal approval. The full revised version will be posted to the website by the end of this week.. The bulk of the ESSA Plan is looped in AB-7, surrounding the School Accountability Framework (NSPF) and for the first time in three years, there will be new star ratings published September 15, 2017.

- 2017 Legislative Update

The national definitions of Professional Development (PD) and Tiers of Evidence have changed. In regards to Federal grants, the law now states that we must adhere to four levels of evidence-based, not just research-based, practice. Tier 1 Evidence is strong evidence. Title I and Title IV funds must be supported by at least one scientific randomized study in order for funds to be utilized for Title I and Title IV purposes. Moderate Evidence is supported by at least one quazi-experimental study. Promising Evidence is at least one correlational study with pre-tests as covariates. Tier 4 Evidence regards Title II and other Federal and State Grants and needs to be supported by programs with a rationale based on high quality research or a positive evaluation that are likely to improve student, or other relevant outcomes, and that are undergoing evaluation; in other words, strong theory. This year, when applications were sent in for NDE grant , administrators had to submit Tiers of Evidence within their application. The *Evidence for ESSA* website provides studies that satisfy the ESSA evidence requirements.

AB-124 requires the Department to put together a taskforce to look at The Model Code of Educator Ethics. Once that code of ethics is adopted, there will be training necessary for the RPDPs to provide. SB-497 is a school-leader study for the purpose of observing the full continuum of how we work with school administrators in our state. This includes how we prepare, license, provide PD, and evaluate administrators.

The two bills that impact this group the most are AB-77 and SB-544. AB-77 is related to the RPDP Council as the Council adopted PD standards for the RPDPs. The State Board is required to adopt regulations regarding statewide PD Standards, and the bill would affect the Council to the extent that the Board would override and/or add onto anything the RDPD Council has adopted for the RPDPs..

Another portion of AB-77 that states, "On or before December 1st of each year, in a format prescribed by the DOE, including recommendations from the taskforce, each district will then submit a full PD report." It is a solution to the concern with districts previously submitting only the RPDP training piece and not submitting a comprehensive report.

There is a focus on Title II-A funds at the federal level specifically about how PD money is being spent. There is not much concrete evidence from States or Districts on the return on investment with PD funds. Additionally, there is no consistent method of coding PD expenses: it could be Title I, Title II, Zoom, General Funds, etc. There needs to be a streamlined method of coding to effectively capture what Districts are spending on PD.

Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) had a hard time reconciling PD funds so, AB-77 requires that the Department come up with a form that assists districts in adopting a consistent coding procedure to be used moving forward.

SB-544 sections 27-30 is the RPDPs' funding bill. There were no cuts made to the budget; however, a Flat Budget approval still means cuts given salary and PERS increases.

The Department was asked by LCB how we are funding different grants during the legislative session, and LCB as well as the Governor's Finance Office, has asked that NDE move toward a reimbursement basis on all grants. The initial proposal was a 100% reimbursement-based process, but there was a lot of concern about the feasibility of doing that. It was concluded that the process would not move to 100% reimbursement for RPDPs, but they would move toward that with a first quarter distribution of these funds. The Department would like to have a meeting with RPDP directors and fiscal agent representatives to talk about what the process would look like. Questions were as follows: Member Husson asked what the rationale was for moving to a reimbursement system. Two reasons: 1) fiscal responsibility and, 2) revenue. A couple years ago, NDE was told that we were going to do 100% reimbursement. Our State goal is to be fiscally responsible to taxpayers, and it is not fiscally responsible to distribute money in advance, and then wait until the end of the year to monitor the funds.. The second reason is that State funds are wanted in an interest bearing account until they are properly spent.. Member Husson asked what the general pushback was from the organizations impacted on whether or not that would work for them operationally. Chair Zander said, , when it comes to RPDP money, the full amount of that appropriation goes to the districts every fall. The districts are the fiscal agents so it doesn't create a significant impact on those districts. It seems as that States are converting to a grants system – accounting for funds the way we account for grants. It just requires more time to track those expenditures. Member Sheldon commented that she hopes that the reimbursements will be done quickly because there are districts that are struggling with fund balances, and it could cause a cash flow issue for smaller districts. Dena said the Department has completely realigned its grants office, and there is an efficient process in place now that has been reviewed by an outside entity.

NRS 391A.130 Section 29 discusses the \$100,000 administrative fund.

Moving forward, RPDPs should be working with districts on how they are going to spend the \$100,000; then present the proposal to the Council for approval. Chair Zander explained to the Council that to educate all the local boards of how the process districts have to structure their PD in a manner that allows them to be evaluated by the RPDP Council. The Council needs input from the local governing boards on the initiatives they have in place and training they have in planned.

6. UPDATE ON STATEWIDE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP

Each RPDP Family Engagement Facilitator worked together to develop a course syllabus and a sample module of the program. The plan is with the approval of both the PIFE and RPDP Councils, the groups can continue with creating six more modules (one module for each PIFE Standard). All seven could be combined to complete enough time to receive a half credit. Pending the Council's approval, the facilitators could complete all seven modules by the twentieth of December. Each module would be in a PowerPoint format that would include facilitator guides or notes, master handouts, and a list of all materials necessary. Each presentation could be completed by administrators with their staff. Or in the future, the modules could possibly be converted to online options. The suite of modules could be housed on each RPDP website or on a State website. NDE Credit could be written by each RPDP and be monitored by the RPDP facilitators with administrative guidance to ensure that people who take those modules would be credited. The floor was opened for questions. Questions were as follows: The review module is an hour and a half and is completed now. Member Brockett encouraged the RPDP directors to place all the modules they can online because the more online options available, the greater potential for high participation rates amongst administrators.

7. REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RPDP) BUDGET PRESENTATIONS *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP

Chelli said that moving to a 100% reimbursement process is asking districts to front-load funds. The situation that has arisen in Clark County right now, they're talking about not even giving raises that because they're in a deficit. Her concern is that at any given time, the districts may not be able or willing to front this distribution. If nothing else, at least the funds for staffing should be paid out. She does not want to lose staff do to their concern that they might not get paid.

Chelli presented budgets for both the SNRPDP as well as the NWRPDP. SNRPDP was allocated \$3.983 million, and 1,383,750 of those dollars will be used for salaries. They have three classified employees including an office manager, budget director, and fiscal agent in Clark County. Chair Zander asked how the RPDP determines how much those employees will be paid. Chelli answered that there is a formula used, but it is always under \$500 a day which may seem high, however these employees have to pay their own travel expenses and benefits. \$27,500 was allocated to employee training and development which are things specific to RPDP employees. These things include: training, going to conferences, subscriptions to national entities, etc. \$4,400 has been set aside for facility rental and \$1,400 for communication (these funds are typically used for Wi-Fi access in rural). \$7,700 was allocated for the infrequent times a printing service is used for larger documents that would take hours in the office. Staff travel is allocated for \$75,000 (includes mileage, in-state travel, and out-of-state travel,. Member Husson asked for a breakdown of the figures has presented. The RPDPs have a database where they record all expenses with receipts. Sometimes the information is input after-the-fact, but approximated figures are \$45,000 in-state and \$30,000 out-of-state.

Member Husson said that he would appreciate if she could include those types of specifics in their budget, that way the Council can go back and compare those figures to what actually happened. She agreed to do so. \$125,900 was set aside for general training supplies (The formula for this was the number of participants multiplied by \$7 per training). \$60,000 was allocated for books and periodicals (one-credit course participants receive the text.) \$20,000 was allocated to Supplies/Equipment and the majority of that money goes toward Chrome Boxes. There are teachers at specific sites that have a difficult time getting to a physical class, and Chrome boxes allow them to attend a class without leaving their site, which addresses Member Brockett's concern. The total for the object code is \$205,900. In total, there was approximately 3.5 million spent on teacher salaries, and the other 400,000 is to be spent on supplies. Member Husson asked how much PD is being supplied in relation to how much is needed. She would guess that they are supplying PD to about 40% of the schools in Clark County. Member Husson thinks that this area has the potential to grant the biggest return on investment as there is still plenty of work to be done. Chair Zander asked how much the SNRPDP Budget was before cuts a five or six years ago. \$7.2 million – a forty-two percent decrease.

Chelli also presented the NNRPDPs budget on behalf of Sarah Negrete. The budget was appropriated a total of \$1,200,000 with \$702,710 going to salaries and 288,546 going to benefits. \$99,100 was set aside for purchased professional services and \$3,300 for facility rental. \$105,050 was allocated for general supplies, which includes training supplies and books and periodicals for one-credit courses. \$20,030 was set aside for dues and fees and includes other miscellaneous training that requires travel and reimbursements. These items make for a total of \$1,218,736.

Kirsten presented the NWRPDP Budget totaling \$2.2 million. The majority of that figure went to salaries as well at \$1,328,136 and benefits at \$515,837. \$126,817 was set aside for purchased professional services and \$21,793 for facility rental. \$124,615 was allocated for travel services and Kirsten will probably be back before the Council in September to potentially redistributing some of the money in this line item. \$112,928 was set aside for general supplies. Dues and fees for miscellaneous trainings were allocated \$3,730. These items made for a budget total of \$2,233,856.

Motion

- Member Sheldon moved to approve the budgets as presented
- Member Husson seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:07 PM**

8. LONG-RANGE PLANNING/COUNCIL WORK GROUP (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Looking at item 9 in tandem:

The next meeting for this council is September 28, 2017. The Council anticipates having a discussion regarding the \$100,000 administrative costs. The Council was prompted to think about what revisions they want to be made in the upcoming RPDP annual report. Member Dupuis asked Kirsten if the RPDPs could present an example or outline of t the to the Council.. Chair Zander would like to discuss quarterly distributions and what impact it might have on the districts. He would also like to address Kirsten and Chelli’s concerns with conversion to that funding system.

9. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS (*Information/Discussion*)

The next four meeting dates for this council are September 28, October 19, November 9, and December 13, 2017. All meetings are scheduled to begin at 10:00 AM.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Kirsten Gleissner in the north commented to support Chelli Smith’s concerns with moving to a 100% reimbursement-based funding system. She asked how can they plan for a conference and ensure they have funding to prepare for larger events such as that. Also, their fiscal agent prefers that their rurals pay the facilitators in the rurals, and then they are built for rural salaries.

There was no public comment in the south.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion

- Member Husson moved to adjourn the meeting
- Member Sheldon seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:17 PM**