



NEVADA LEGISLATURE JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] [218E.320](#))

DRAFT MINUTES

July 29, 2022

The eighth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education for the 2021-2022 Interim was held on Friday, July 29, 2022, at 9 a.m. in Room 4401, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3138, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Joint Interim Standing Committee's [meeting page](#). The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Vice Chair
Senator Carrie Buck
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblywoman Clara (Claire) Thomas

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy – excused
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller – excused

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Jen Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Alex Drozdoff, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Jennifer Ruedy, Deputy Research Director, Research Division
Erin Andersen, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Sarah Baker, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Asher A. Killian, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Adam Drost, Principal Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division

draft

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]*

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Denis:

[Chair Denis called the meeting to order. He welcomed members, presenters, and the public to the eighth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education.]

Ms. Baker, can you please call the roll? [Roll call is reflected in Committee Members Present.]

[Chair Denis reviewed virtual meeting and testimony guidelines.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Denis:

We will start with public comment.

[Chair Denis reviewed public comment testimony and submission procedures.]

I will begin with those wishing to make public comment here in Las Vegas. Is there anyone here in Las Vegas who would like to give public comment? Welcome to the Interim Committee on Education.

Keith Whitfield, President, University of Las Vegas (UNLV):

Hello and the topics that you are covering today, while there are other institutions that are connected with them, these are all things that are at the heart of UNLV; that includes workforce, minority-serving (MSIs) and Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs), as well as name, image, and likeness (NIL), which is an important topic that I will be very curious to see what you all come about to talk about what is appropriate for our state. It is a national issue, and I can tell you from my service with the Mountain West Athletic Conference that it is something that we understand that each state is going to be slightly different and so what we do here will be good for us but will also be a model that others will likely try to copy. I will be very interested to see your deliberations with that.

Also want to extend and say for some of you all I have not met you before. I am surprised because my person, Sabra Newby, introduces me to everyone. But if I have not had a chance to meet you, I look forward to meeting you in the future. Thank you.

Chair Denis:

Thank you, President Whitfield for being here with us. I think that is critical that all of our members have an opportunity to meet all the leaders in all of our different institutions and in K-12.

Francisco Aguilar, Founder, Blueprint Sports:

Good morning, Chair Denis, and members of the Committee. I am the founder of Nevada-based NIL sports marketing technology company, Blueprint Sports. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. Blueprint Sports has two models. First, Blueprint Sports

is a marketplace that allows student athletes of any sport to engage in marketing opportunities such as youth sports, coaching, public appearance, and the chance to engage with brands, local companies, supporters, and alumni for commercial opportunities. This model gives student athletes the ability to build their own brands. The second, and one of the ones that has become the most popular recently, is we power fan and alumni collectives around the communities and student athletes at universities. We have seen this growth and popularity across the country.

As you may know, my co-founder and partner, Rob Sine—of Blueprint Sports—presented these models to the NIL Committee on April 28. Since then, we have communicated with Chair Miller regarding the committee's findings, its legislative recommendations, and our ideas to further enhance the NIL marketplace. To ensure the best interest of Nevada student athletes and its universities remain top of mind.

We look forward to continuing this conversation with interested parties and decision makers to ensure clarifying language is included in this Committee's final bill draft request (BDR) for the 82nd Nevada Legislative Session. We believe Blueprint Sports and the State of Nevada has a unique opportunity to become the gold standard of NIL collectives and marketplaces throughout the United States. But we first must guarantee that industry leading standards comply with Nevada's Collegiate Athletic Association and other state regulations. It is our mission to create NIL opportunities that exclusively benefit student athletes, fans, and businesses of the university's community, especially here, home in Nevada.

Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association (CCEA):

This Committee is well aware of the educational inequities in our state education system, but I would like to orient the Committee's focus into research the CCEA has been conducting related to the recent academic outcomes of our state and propose a plan that can serve as a key piece of a wider solution to battling our state's education challenges. After analyzing standardized test scores and graduating grade point averages (GPAs) in the past few academic years, the CCEA has discovered that opportunity in our public high schools, specifically in the Clark County School District (CCSD) has been largely reserved for students of two ethnicity groups, White and Asian American/Pacific Islander (API) students. All other ethnicity groups on average, fall far below the average in English language arts (ELA) and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) proficiency levels of our schools, jeopardizing academic and career pathways for many of our racially diverse students and their communities.

It has become increasingly aware that opportunity in our public schools is largely segregated among racial and socioeconomic issues. Strategically expanding Nevada's dual credit program can increase the number of low-income, ethnically diverse students who attend college upon graduation, provide career and technical training pathways to high paying industry jobs, and provide a wealth of academic and career opportunities to Title I schools, resulting in a significant return on investment for all community stakeholders. In many ways and for many reasons, discriminatory allocations of success and opportunity in our public schools have mired the state of education in Nevada and each day we wait to act, inequity gaps in our schools grow wider and wider. Dual credit opportunities allow students to build upon their successes and envision the future. The CCEAs research has produced some solutions to address barriers that exist in Nevada's dual credit program. We would like to work with legislators prior to the legislative session and we will be reaching out to interested parties. As the 2023 Legislative Session approaches, CCEA urges our legislators to strategically and purposefully expand Nevada's dual credit program. The CCEA

appreciates the work and dedication of this Committee, and we stand ready to assist in every way possible to ensure that Nevada's workforce is ready for the future. Thank you.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Is there anyone else here in Las Vegas? I do not see anyone coming forward. Let us go to Carson City. Is there anybody in Carson City wishing to give public comment?

Hawah Ahmad, Representing CCEA:

The CCEA bargains for over 18,000 licensed educators in the CCSD and is the largest independent teacher's union in the state and the country. As we approach the 82nd Legislative Session, today's updates and recommendations will shape the future of education in Nevada. It is not a secret that CCEA is committed to aligning the K through 20 education delivery system with our current and future industry needs. As such, CCEA is in full support of the Work Force Incentive Grant Pilot program, especially the aspects of the program that will open the doors to teacher recruitment.

Today's presentation from the Commission on School Funding (CSF) will provide recommendations for changes to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP). However, as we discuss treatment of auxiliary services and transportation for charter schools and university schools for the profoundly gifted pupils, we must be cognizant of how much we have in our revenue budget to spend and where we can realistically look to find more revenue to strategically invest in education.

The CCEA believes that our top priority must be funding the base of the per-pupil ratio first to the national average then to optimal funding, fully funding our weights and ensuring that the services attached to those weights are provided. The CCEA also believes that at the CSFs next meeting, where the Nevada Cost of Education Index (NCEI) will be further discussed, is an important change that must be considered to align our salary and wages with available occupations per region. It must be noted that every change to the PCFP will come with a price tag. So, we must ensure that every investment is tied to substantive evidence-based increases in student proficiency.

Ultimately, the CSF will be making critical recommendations to the governor and to legislators on sources of funding for K-12 education. In CCEA's opinion, this will be the most important issue of the 2023 Legislative Session. Legislators who advocate for funding, particularly in an election year should believe and support the CSF and its recommendations. After all, they are only doing what they were charged to do from [Senate Bill 543](#) (2019). Of course, as always, the CCEA thanks this Committee and all the hard work you put in during the interim and during the legislative sessions. We stand ready to support you as we move forward to make sure that our students are prepared to bring our state forward. Thank you.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Anyone else in Carson City wishing to give public comment? Let us go online. Do we have anyone online wishing to give public comment?

BPS:

To participate in public comment please press *9 on your phone to take your place in the queue.

Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association (WEA):

I am the new president of the WEA representing over 4,000 certified professionals in Washoe County. I am calling in specifically to address the current metrics being used to determine the NCEI. Using the current model, it states that Washoe has the lowest cost of living in the state. None of us have to be economists or mathematicians to clearly understand that coming to that determination is false and the metric currently being used is extremely flawed. The biggest indicator in determining cost of living is housing prices. In Washoe, the current median housing price is approximately \$600,000—that is \$600,000 for a single family, three-bedroom, two-bathroom home. We can drive 30 minutes east and that same home is more than 30 percent less. You can drive another hour east and that same home is nearly half the price. Searching other factors across the state, such as food and fuel prices, nowhere in the state is Washoe the least expensive. Even your constituents who live in different districts across the state know that the cost of living is not the lowest in Washoe and that is why they commute into Washoe from neighboring counties for work. They do that because they cannot afford to live here.

Trust me, I wish the current NCEI was correct, and that Washoe was the cheapest place to live, because then it would not be so insanely expensive to own a home and live in the community, but it is not. How are we even considering using the current methodology that we are when determining the NCEI? It is clearly not accurate. And if we all put aside self-interest, we can agree that we need to use a different set of data when making this determination. The purpose of this index is to provide fair, objective, and equitable funding to school districts. But that is not what is happening. We understand that we are all fighting over the same small pie and ultimately, we have to address the drastic lack of educational funding across the state. But making sure that we have an equitable method of distributing these funds should also be a top priority to all of us because it is the right thing to do. Using the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) data to determine the NCEI is fair and objective. At the end of the day, which is what is most important. Regardless of where Washoe and other districts rank when using that data, at least we can all know that it is an accurate representation of the cost of living in those areas. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Let us go to the next caller.

BPS:

To participate in public comment, please press *9 on your phone to take your place in the queue. Chair, the line is open and working, but there are no more callers at this time.

Chair Denis:

We will close public comment.

AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETINGS ON MAY 3 AND MAY 18, 2022

Chair Denis:

We will go to our next item, approval of the minutes for the meetings on May 3rd and May 18th. Before we go to a motion, there was a couple of changes; mostly minor things but I want to make sure, to be totally clear and transparent, I am going to have staff talk about

those changes that were made. You have access to those. I am going to have Ms. Sturm address those.

Ms. Sturm:

Chair, there were three very minor changes that were made, and it is now reflected in the minutes that are posted online. The first was a name correction to Nikki Haag who presented during public comment. On page 47, we also updated a hyphen between Senator Dondero Loop's name; and lastly, there was an extra space on one of the pages (on page 88) that we updated.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Any questions on the minutes or any additional additions or corrections. If not, I will take a motion.

VICE CHAIR BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON MAY 3 AND MAY 18, 2022.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PRESENTATION ON THE ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INTERIM STUDY CONCERNING THE USE OF THE NAME, IMAGE, AND LIKENESS OF A STUDENT ATHLETE ([ASSEMBLY BILL 254](#) [2021])

Chair Denis:

I will now go to a presentation on the actions and recommendations of the Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning the Use of the NIL of a Student Athlete (Student Athlete Committee). Staff is going to do the presentation.

Ms. Drozdoff:

Good morning, Committee members. I am joined by my colleague, Jen Sturm in Las Vegas. As nonpartisan staff, we do not advocate for or against any measure. Also joining us on Zoom is Assemblyman Cameron C.H. Miller, Chair of the Student Athlete Committee. Staff will begin this presentation with the discussion of the work of the Student Athlete Committee. We will briefly detail information about the Committee, including its inception and background, members, and meetings. We will then discuss the Committee's final recommendations. Chair Miller will be available to help answer any questions you may have. Staff has submitted a draft report of the Student Athlete Committee's activities to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), under this agenda item. The draft report provides a summary of this presentation. (Agenda Item IV)

[Assembly Bill 254 \(2021\)](#) created the Student Athlete Committee that was tasked with studying and examining existing bylaws of state collegiate athletic associations and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and state and federal laws relating to compensating a student athlete for the use of the NIL of the student athletes. The Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education (COE) must submit a report of the results of the

study, including any recommendations for legislation to the director of the LCB for transmission to the 2023 Session of the Nevada Legislature.

As you will recall at its January 20th meeting, earlier this year, the COE appointed the members and designated the chair and vice chair of the Student Athlete Committee. The members consisted of representatives of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), several representatives of individual NSHE institutions, including student athletes and Assemblyman Miller who served as Chair and Senator Lange who served as the Vice Chair. The specific members are listed on the first page of the exhibit. During its four meetings this interim, the Student Athlete Committee heard from a variety of stakeholders, both local and national, about NIL issues. At its final meeting, the Committee discussed the results of the study, including recommendations to bring forward to the COE for its review.

At its first meeting in March, the Student Athlete Committee heard from two former students at the Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), who participated in the legislation-based competition during their first year of law school that ultimately resulted in the bill that created the Student Athlete Committee (AB 254 of the 2021 Session). The presentation focused on the exigence of the bill and the student athlete perspective. The National Conference of State Legislatures (NSCL) provided an overview of the national landscape related to the compensation in NIL of student athletes, including recent legislation and judicial action. Representatives of the NCAA and the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA), presented to the Committee concerning recent NIL policies and related oversight and compliance from their perspective.

At its April meeting, the Committee heard from UNLV representatives and their third-party NIL partner, NOCAP Sports, a representative from the NJCAA who discussed junior college actions, and a representative from Blueprint Sports who discussed marketing and business topics in NIL. These presenters helped to provide more local context in this NIL conversation and helped to describe the business aspects of NIL deals.

At its May meeting, the Committee heard from a labor and employment relations law professor who spoke to state NIL laws on a national scale. The members also heard from University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) representatives and their third-party NIL partner, INFLCR, along with several college athletes and coaches who have been or are involved with NIL deals. These presenters also helped to provide local institutional context in concert with UNLV's April presentation. Additionally, they helped to provide an overview of the legal policies and challenges in the NIL space and provide the perspectives of those actually involved in these deals.

At the Student Athlete Committee's final meeting in June, it held its work session. We will now discuss the recommendations that emerged from this work session, including recommendations that the Student Athlete Committee would like to put forth to the COE for its consideration. The Student Athlete Committee voted unanimously to approve five recommendations. Of those, three of the recommendations are contingent upon COE action and approval. You will note that beginning on page three of the draft report exhibit, additional context for these recommendations is provided. This context includes relevant information presented to the Student Athlete Committee.

First, there are two recommendations that the Committee voted to take its own action on. The first recommendation deals with supporting the development of a national NIL policy. Specifically, the Committee voted to send a letter to Nevada's congressional delegation on behalf of the Student Athlete Committee urging the development of a national uniform

policy for NIL. This letter encourages Nevada's Congressional Delegation to create and support a federal policy that outlines specific parameters for NIL deals and policies across all states, including the rural individual institutions play in monitoring and supporting NIL policies. Further, the letter will include that this national policy might also develop a plan for international students to participate in NIL by addressing visa complications, such as the work restrictions in place for F-1 visa status.

The Student Athlete Committee's second recommendation focused on publishing a list of best practices based on testimony provided by UNR and UNLV. Specifically, the Committee voted to include a list of best practices for NIL in the Committee's final report. This list includes: increased awareness and communication of state and federal NIL parameters for on-campus NIL practitioners, including student athletes, coaches, and institutional personnel; student athletes may not attend NIL engagements in lieu of academic or athletic activities; student athletes must wear and use institutionally issued gear and equipment during athletic activities; use of an institution's logos, marks, or facilities for NIL engagements must be approved in writing by an institution; NIL activities must be consistent with institutional and NSHE policies, the student athlete handbook, local, state, or federal law, and existing national NCAA regulations; and further develop NIL educational supports for student athletes in areas including, but not limited to, financial implications, tax education, and scholarship impacts.

I will turn things over to Jen Sturm in Las Vegas to discuss the remainder of the recommendations.

Ms. Sturm:

The final three recommendations that the Student Athlete Committee put forth are contingent upon the COE's action and approval. Again, the exhibit we posted on NELIS (Agenda Item IV) has additional context attached to each recommendation. The first recommendation, the Committee voted to recommend that the COE take action regarding junior college involvement in NIL. The Committee heard testimony about the specific challenges that junior colleges experience in navigating the NIL space, including transfer policies for athletes moving between two- and four-year colleges and universities.

Specifically, the Student Athlete Committee voted to include in its final report, the recommendation to the COE to send a letter to an entity deemed appropriate by the COE urging the entity to conduct a study concerning NIL policies and challenges specific to junior colleges. Specifically, this study would investigate NIL issues relating, but not limited to, resources and personnel at junior colleges and funding and opportunities for NIL deals for junior college student athletes. As testimony indicated that student athlete transfer policies, especially concerning NIL, can be contradictory and difficult between junior colleges and other institutions, the study would also investigate concerns and challenges with student athlete transfers between two- and four-year colleges and universities. If such a study is conducted, the entity conducting the study may submit a report of the results of the study, including any recommendations for legislation to the COE on or before June 30, 2024, so that would be the next interim.

Additionally, the Committee voted to recommend that the COE take action regarding Nevada's gaming industry and its potential involvement in NIL deals. Specifically, on page five of the exhibit, the Committee voted to include in the Student Athlete Committee's final report, the recommendation to the COE to send a letter to the Nevada Gaming Control Board and the Nevada Gaming Commission on behalf of the COE urging the board or commission to conduct a study concerning NIL implications for the gaming industry in

Nevada. Specifically, this study may investigate what, if any, possibilities exist for NIL deals between student athletes and the gaming industry. The study may also investigate the possibility of deals with student athletes as brand agents, among other deals, and the implications of such deals. If such a study is conducted, the board or commission may submit a report of the results of the study, including any recommendations for legislation, to the COE, on or before June 30, 2024. Again, that would be next interim.

The Committee's final recommendation involved NIL deal disclosures and NIL entity registrations. Specifically, the Committee voted to propose legislation to amend [NRS 398.330](#) regarding student athlete disclosures to instead require any entity which engages in NIL deals that provide compensation in any form to one or more student athletes with an aggregate value equal to or greater than \$10,000, or a different amount as determined by this committee, to be responsible for disclosing those deals to the student athlete's institutions. The COE would determine the appropriate method to gather information related to NIL deals into one centralized place. Additionally, the proposed legislation would clarify that NRS 398.330 does not require the NSHE to approve these deals. Further require any entity who facilitates NIL deals including, but not limited to, third-party agents such as collectives, boosters, and certain vendors, to register with the state through the Office of the Secretary of State. Collectives are required to disclose all participating parties as well as sources and recipients of the collective's funds. Testimony indicated that the new reporting obligations are unenforceable and there are no consequences for failure to report disclosures.

Chair that concludes our presentation and unless Chair Miller has any additional comments. We are happy to take questions at this time.

Chair Denis:

We have Chair Miller online. Chair do you have any additional comments or even a commentary on how the process went or any additional comments you might want to share?

Chair C. H. Miller:

I would like to thank the staff for doing a great job through the interim in helping me to chair my first time out the gate. I think things went smoothly and we were able to get some good information done, and as well as, I want to thank the Committee members that were able and available to commit their time to being a part of the Committee. At the end of the day, we are still so early in how this is going to develop, and we wanted to make sure that we were starting to put some framework into place, but also not being too restrictive as to not allow our institutions to be competitive. But there are still some areas that we need to further study and some of that is going to come out over the next couple of years as we see how these fall into place and how things play out. So outside of a great gratitude for the Committee members and the staff, that would conclude any remarks that I have, and I am available for questions.

One more thing, Blueprint Sports did reach out to me, and Mr. Cisco called into public comment, they did reach out to me regarding some new language. It was after we had our final Committee meeting and so that is why we were not able to discuss it as a Committee whether it should be a recommendation. There is some new legislation in Tennessee that we may want to focus on and consider if we do in fact move forward with a BDR in this area.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. A quick follow up on that. Would you envision that we would have a discussion about that additional language as a Committee as we were making recommendations for bills for next session?

Chair Miller:

Yes. If you have discussions on whether or not to move the bill that we suggested or a bill in this area forward, I would definitely suggest you consider having discussions on that language.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Any additional questions from the members? Assemblywoman Hansen, go ahead.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I have a couple of questions, more clarification. Thank you for the presentation and it is good to see you, Assemblyman Miller. I had a question on the recommendation that pertains more to the Nevada Legislature and that we would have a letter to the Gaming Commission. I do not have a problem with that, just wondering what scenarios, I know we are trying to ask the Gaming Commission if there would be any issues, but wondering. I did not see any connection, so I am very ignorant in these matters. I was curious what we are trying to avoid when we are dealing with NIL and maybe the Gaming Commission. And then I have one other question.

Chair Miller:

It is also good to see you Assemblywoman Hansen. The thought there is with collectives and boosters coming together a lot of times there is maybe several businesses within a community, and they may want to have student athletes come to certain events or participate in certain things, and so what we wanted to do is see how that intersects with the gaming community. A casino property may want to host an event with student athletes. We want to know if they had any thoughts on or if they had considered what that type of interaction would look like, considering we are a unique state in that we have the majority of gaming in the country. We want to be forward thinking on that.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for that and to follow up on the third recommendation regarding an amendment to NRS 398.330. Is the only difference that we are looking at is we are going to have an actual amount declared, like if it is under \$10,000, we were not necessarily concerned about disclosure from the athlete?

Chair Miller:

Yes, to some degree, what we are looking at in the testimony that we received from our student athletes, we discovered that a lot of these deals that are happening right now in Nevada are for products. They may be getting clothes or tennis shoes or something like that and the requirement to disclose each and every one of those deals falls on the students to be responsible for that and it is not happening. A couple of things we thought to do was every single deal that happens, we did not think was worthy of disclosure. So, we wanted to

raise the standard on what that would look like, as well as change the reporting requirement from the student athlete to the institution or to the third-party entity that is conducting the deal with the student athlete, and then putting in a dollar amount that is not requiring so many minor deals being reported.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for the clarifications and thank you for the work, I appreciate it.

Chair Denis:

We have a question from Assemblywoman Thomas.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you, Assemblyman Miller for your work on this and it is a great presentation, but I have to go back to recommendation number four. I am confused with the Nevada Gaming Commission being involved. I thought student athletes have to follow NCAA rules. Can you explain it to me a little bit?

Chair Miller:

Absolutely, thank you. I will explain it the best that I can. I am not an expert in NCAA rules. However, what we are doing is trying to be proactive if there is an intersection where student athletes can receive NIL deals from casino properties or from gaming institutions; we want to know what that could look like or if that is even possible. That is a sector that is completely excluded. To my understanding, NCAA has not given any guidance on NIL deals at this point since it has become available across the country. That is an area that we foresee being a problem. It was a recommendation to invite them or to suggest that they also look at it and be proactive in considering what that could look like from the gaming perspective.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you.

Chair Miller:

I will add too that we did reach out for a presentation on that, but it was still so early for them that they had not begun to gather information, or they were not prepared to present anything to our Committee.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you and follow up Chair. So, with that said, would it be advantageous for us to include NCAA because you do not want them to come back later and want to have a discussion after we have done this work.

Chair Miller:

This is simply a recommendation to send a letter urging them to do it. It may or may not be necessary by the time that happens. But so far, what our testimony from all the experts throughout the Committee have seen is that NCAA is not yet ready to move in bringing parameters or structure to what NIL deals look like on a national level. That is one of the

reasons why we have tried to be as broad as possible but also trying to provide some framework as well as gathering additional information that can be useful if and when we do need to come back. We also have the recommendation for a study to be conducted with the junior colleges because we discovered through the testimony that there may be some issues with transfers and NIL deals affect junior college athletes differently than at universities. So, there is still a lot of information to be gathered as we work through building the right policies to protect our students and our institutions in this area.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you, I appreciate the explanation.

Chair Denis:

As you can tell there are some recommendations that are going to come forward at our next meeting when we are going to talk about all of things that we can do.

Ms. Sturm:

Yes. Thank you, Chair. I think our legal counsel Mr. Killian can maybe help clarify if necessary.

Chair Denis:

Mr. Killian, would you like to chime in on that last question? Maybe offer some clarification.

Mr. Killian:

As a big picture clarification, while the NCAA may have rules relating to student athletes and involvement in gaming institutions, the issue is that under state law, specifically [NRS 398.300](#), institutions of higher education in this state are prohibited from enforcing NCAA rules that prevent a student athlete from being able to use their NIL and receive compensation for that. So even if there were an NCAA rule that prohibited a student athlete from entering into a branding deal with a gambling establishment, for example, state law would prevail over that NCAA rule and allow that kind of involvement to happen. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 398.300 allows an institution to adopt a policy that imposes reasonable restrictions on student athletes entering into those kinds of contracts. That is the core of this question and the origin of this recommendation from the NIL Committee to ask the Gaming Commission and Gaming Control Board to study this issue, is there is not a lot of understanding yet as to whether that would be a reasonable restriction or not. And there has not been movement by the NCAA to determine whether that would be something that would violate the rules.

But even if the NCAA did find that that violated their rules. State law would prevail in this instance and allow student athletes to still enter into those kinds of contracts regardless of the NCAA rules. If it was the will of this Committee or the Legislature to prohibit those kinds of deals, some sort of statutory amendment would be necessary to regulate student athletes entering into those kinds of contracts with gaming institutions.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Senator Dondero Loop go ahead.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Thank you, Chair Denis. My question is when it comes to gaming, are there any restrictions regarding age, since our gaming establishments are only open to 21 and over, would that make any difference with a student athlete who may be 18?

Mr. Killian:

There is no restriction regarding NIL contracts with gaming institutions or regarding NIL contracts in general based on age. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 398.300 would allow any student athlete enrolled in college or university regardless of their age to enter NIL deals. Of course, any other provisions of state law regarding age and entering gaming establishments would have to be complied with. So, it may be the case that the student athlete could not enter a casino to film an advertisement for the casino, but they would still be allowed to contract with the casino, and film an advertisement in some place that they are legally allowed to be.

Chair Denis:

Any other questions from any of the members? I am not hearing any or seeing any. Chair Miller thank you for all the work you guys have done there and it makes it much easier for us when we get ready to make some decisions that you have done the hard work. Thank you for all that work and thankful to staff as you mentioned they do an amazing job. Thank you.

We will go ahead and close this item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM V—SUMMARY OF TOPICS COVERED BY THE JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION DURING THE 2021–2022 INTERIM

Chair Denis:

We will move to our next item a summary of topics covered by the COE during the 2021–2022 Interim.

As a precursor to this I asked staff to put this together, because at our next meeting we are going to talk about any recommendations that this Committee might wish to make to the Legislature, or to even, as we saw now, send letters to other entities; and to give you a “heads up” so that you could be thinking about it so that when we talk about it at our next meeting—this is a refresher. We have talked about a lot of things during the last eight meetings, and I want to make sure that it is brought back, “top of mind” for you. I am going to ask, Ms. Drozdoff, in Carson City to start off.

Ms. Drozdoff:

Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Committee members. I am joined again by my colleague Jen Sturm in Las Vegas. During this interim, the COE has heard presentations on multiple items from various stakeholders. Chair Denis, as he mentioned, asked staff to present a review of the topics that the COE has covered thus far, in anticipation of the COEs final activities and work session. (Agenda Item V)

At the COE’s first meeting in January, it heard presentations from staff on the COE’s duties and responsibilities, reports relevant to the Committee and the status of the Committee’s recommendations from the previous interim. The Committee also heard presentations on

the state of education in Nevada from its institutions including Nevada's Department of Education (NDE), the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), and NSHE. Several representatives of Nevada school districts were also available for comments and questions at that time.

Similarly, the Committee heard a presentation from the Education Commission of the States (ECS) regarding the education landscape but from the national perspective. Furthermore, the Committee heard presentations on updates regarding the report on the transition to the PCFP and an overview on the actions of the CSF. And it heard from Chair Denis about upcoming work this interim related to the composition and selection of school boards. Finally, the COE appointed members to and assigned the chair and vice chair of the Student Athlete Committee, which was a required Committee activity.

During the second meeting in February, the Committee appointed the members of the Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory (TRRA) Task Force, which was required by statute. It also heard a presentation from the Clark County Black Caucus and Hazel Health Services on the mental and academic challenges facing Nevada students, including those in the Black community. And it heard a presentation on policy issues related to Hispanic K–12 students from The Lincy Institute. Representatives of the eight NSHE institutions presented on current and planned programs and challenges of their institutions. Additionally, the COE heard from Brookings Mountain West and The Lincy Institute on higher education and workforce development and considerations in strengthening innovation ecosystems.

Finally, the COE reviewed the state of early education in Nevada with a presentation from the Children's Advocacy Alliance and discussed the use and functions of educational management organizations and charter management organizations, with the presentation from the SPCSA. At the Committee's, third meeting in March, updates on the state of school districts and the impacts of the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic were presented by several school district superintendents, as well as the SPCSA. The superintendents and the NDE also presented on chronic absenteeism in schools. The NDE gave a presentation to the COE on the status of legislation from recent sessions relating to education and it presented with the Children's Cabinet to offer additional perspectives on the state of early learning and related programs in Nevada. Finally, the COE heard from Communities in Schools on the evidence-based model of integrated student supports in certain Title I and high-need schools. And it heard from the Public Education Foundation (PEF) on its programs in COVID-19 response efforts.

At the Committee's fourth meeting, in April, it heard presentations on apprenticeships, pre-apprenticeships, and other work-based learning opportunities regarding their programs and challenges from the Department of Business and Industry, NDE, and district superintendents. The superintendents and NDE also presented on magnet schools and career and technical education (CTE) programs in Nevada, including expansion efforts and the challenges they face. Those entities, along with the Nevada Immigrant Coalition, presented on English language learner (ELL) programs and challenges. Furthermore, Jobs for Nevada's graduates presented on its current programs, and NDE reviewed the process for approving and revising academic standards in Nevada, which included a discussion on [AB 19](#) of the 2021 Legislative Session. I will now turn things over to Jen Sturm in Las Vegas to discuss the remaining meetings of the COE.

Ms. Sturm:

The COE's May 3rd meeting focused primarily on topics relating to the composition and selection of school boards as required by [AB 495](#) from the 2021 Session. The COE heard a presentation first from staff regarding the history of school boards and recent legislation relating to school boards. Then the ECS provided a look at the national school board governance landscape, which detailed different appointment and governance structures across the states. The Committee also heard from the Nevada Association of School Boards regarding additional information on local school boards in the state and recommendations for Nevada's school boards. This meeting featured an open microphone setting, which allowed for extensive discussion of these topics by the COE members and members of the public.

At the May 18th meeting, this Committee heard presentations on pupil and school personnel health and well-being from several district superintendents, NDE, and the Nevada Association of School Psychologist's president. Additionally, a student attending a local high school presented to the Committee on mental health and students supports. The COE also heard presentations from the superintendents and the NDE on restorative justice and pupil discipline issues, educational staff recruitment and retention initiatives, and school and school district performance plans. The NDE provided a review of school safety requirements and initiatives and an overview of NDE's boards, commissions, and councils. Furthermore, the COE heard a presentation on the work of the Leadership Institute of Nevada from the PEF, and it heard from Nevada's Regional Professional Development Programs on various teacher and administrator professional development programs. Finally, UNLV representatives outlined the successes and challenges of the Nevada Institute on Teacher and Educator Preparation.

At the June meeting, the Committee heard presentations related to the statewide implementation of competency-based education from KnowledgeWorks representatives and from the Churchill County Superintendent Summer Stephens. It heard a presentation on evidence-based evaluation methods to improve student outcomes from NDE and Results for America, and it heard a presentation on early learning program, costs and equity updates from NDE and WestEd. The COE also heard a presentation on class sizes and teacher workforce both nationally and in Clark County from Data Insight Partners. Furthermore, as required by statute, the Nevada State TRRA Task Force Chair outlined the work and recommendations of the Task Force to the COE. Finally, the Nevada School Counselor Association presented on the current roles and challenges facing school counselors.

That brings us to today. In addition to the staff presentations, the Committee will hear from the CSF concerning funding updates and recommendations. It will also hear from the NSHE representatives in multiple presentations addressing NSHE's dual enrollment data dashboard, the Workforce Incentive Grant (WIG) Pilot program and information on HSIs and MSIs. And finally, the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) representatives will provide updates on [AB 319](#) from the 2021 Legislative Session and the pilot program at the college offering credit course opportunities for certain students.

Looking forward, the COE will have three additional meetings. The first will be on August 9th and will serve as a follow up to the May 3rd meeting on school board governance issues. The second will be on August 30th and will act as the COE's work session. Then the third meeting will take place likely in September in order to hear the report required by [AB 231](#) of the 2021 Session concerning the Holocaust and other genocides. With that Chair we stand for questions.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. I will note that on August 30th when we do our work session, we are going to be in Carson City with the Committee on that day. And, as a note for the public also, right now it is scheduled to be a noon start time because of the travel arrangements between here and Carson City and will probably go a little later than we normally do because of the later start time, but still be able to get back that evening.

Ms. Sturm:

If I may, and on that note too, the August 9th meeting will begin at 6 p.m.

Chair Denis:

Yes, in order to accommodate individuals that work during the day, we wanted to be able to get input on the school governance, and so that meeting is going to start at 6 p.m. in the evening.

Any questions on the report? I wanted you to have access to at least all the stuff that we have talked about, as you are thinking about that, so it will be “top of mind” for you.

I am not seeing any questions. We will now close that item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM VI—PRESENTATION CONCERNING SCHOOL FUNDING UPDATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chair Denis:

We will move to a presentation concerning school funding updates and recommendations. Welcome and when you are ready, go ahead.

Guy Hobbs, Chair, CSF:

Good morning. With your indulgence, there are two or three areas that I would like to cover with you this morning. The first one is some background on the CSF itself with some observations and recommendations, and then I intend to walk you through the recommendations made thus far by the CSF; I believe already forwarded to you. Then to wrap things up, go over with you to profile the funding issues that we have identified and then perhaps talk a little bit about where we are heading with regard to our requirement to recommend funding.

The CSF has been meeting monthly since October of 2019. We have several members of that CSF (one is with us today, former Senator Joyce Woodhouse sitting in the audience here) Punam Mathur, Dusty Casey, Nancy Brune, Dave Jensen, Paul Johnson, A.J. Fueling, Mark Mathers, Jim McIntosh, Jason Goudie, and we have past members, Karlene McCormick-Lee and Lisa Morris Hibbler that have all contributed to the work effort so far. A number of those names I mentioned to you, if you are not familiar with the individuals, are representatives of school districts around the state; many serving in the capacity of chief financial officer and, in a couple of cases, superintendent. It is a very diverse and experienced group with respect to the tasks that were laid out ahead of us. We appreciate the fact that during the course of our work we have been ably staffed by members of the staff of NDE, as well as having support from the Attorney General's Office to keep us in line.

The major tasks as you will recall from [SB 543](#) for this CSF over the past nearly three years has been, number one, the monitoring and implementation of the PCFP. Much of that work was done in the first two-year period of this CSF. Making recommendations for improvements to the PCFP is an ongoing endeavor. We did quite a bit of that work during the first couple of years and, of course, you have recommendations that have been forwarded to you that are a continuation of that particular charge to this Committee. Responding to other tasks as they may be assigned by the Legislature; there were a handful of questions that were forwarded to us as a part of a legislative memorandum where the Legislature asked for some clarification from the CSF, and we provided responses to those. I think probably the most difficult and important task that we were given in SB 543, as well as in AB 495, was to identify optimal funding for education in the state. And, as importantly to make recommendations regarding how to fund education over the next ten-year period and that is something that we are actively engaged with at the moment.

A couple of things about the CSF itself that I think are worth passing along to you. We are not allowed to meet after September of this year and the CSF would not resume meeting and taking up its additional tasks until July following the close of your next legislative session. So, there is a period of hiatus for this CSF where we are not authorized to meet. By September, we must have formulated all of our recommendations and then by the middle of November, forward a final report to you all with regard to the identification of optimal funding and recommendations for how to fund education on a going forward basis. All of that is work that is being done almost as we speak. We have meetings scheduled in August and September and will probably end up having a couple of meetings in September to finalize those recommendations. But that period of time where we are not allowed to meet is something that you may want to consider altering in the future, if in fact you deem the CSF something that you wish to continue. I would certainly recommend that because I think the maintenance of the PCFP model and the fact that the CSF and I suppose all of you, by extension, have identified a ten-year period to implement funding to improve education would seem to suggest very strongly that work on that funding plan will need to continue for the next several years.

I do believe also that the terms for each of the members of the CSF expire later this fall and that would obviously be something that you all would need to also attend to. One thing that we struggled with a little bit, particularly since your last legislative session, the CSF was given a number of very challenging tasks to do that are also very technical tasks. And the CSF was not afforded any support financially for doing that work, which again is rather complex and challenging. Fortunately, through NDE we did find a way to accommodate some of them. We were able to bring on some subject matter experts, but it was not without some challenge to get that part of it done. So again, the CSF has been doing this work for almost three years and it will culminate in a report that will come to you all in November. I think certainly the highlights of that report in November will be the identification of different funding levels, and I intend to go over some of that with you towards the latter part of my presentation, and methods of potentially funding those target funding amounts.

Chair, I do not know if there are any questions about the CSF itself or anything that I have said thus far. My intention would next be to, if it meets with your approval, go through some of the recommendations that have been delivered to you briefly with a bit of background on those.

Chair Denis:

Let me see if there are any immediate questions. I know Senator Dondero Loop had a question.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Thank you Chair and thank you Mr. Hobbs. I will probably want to ask the same question when you get done presenting, but in recognition of you do not have any more time to have meetings after September; you have no money to do the work; and you have some subject matter experts, but this is broader work than maybe was originally thought when they did the legislation. I do not know. And if you want to wait until you are done to answer this, but I would like to know what things need to be in place so that we can finish this important work, because I think the time restraints and the money restraints might have been unintended consequences. This is important that we get this right due to the fact that if we do not, we need to live with it for, we can say 10 years, but it could be 50 years. If you want to answer that now, that would be great, if you want to wait until the very end with some information, that is fine too.

Mr. Hobbs:

I wanted to put those issues on the record to make you aware of them. I think we will probably see in the coming months whether or not the CSF's inability to meet from September to July creates a vacuum that might otherwise be beneficial to you all as you are deliberating some of the items that will be before you. My guess is that it may well, and we would certainly prefer not to put off any of that work if we could do it sooner than later. With respect to the technical side of it, since we are now dealing with funding issues which are sensitive, technical, and complicated, I would imagine that we will be continuing to deal with those for the next couple of interims. Again, this is a ten-year funding period that we were asked to provide some guidance on. There is no expectation that all of it would be resolved in the 2023 Legislative Session, that it would be a multi-session effort to do that. And to the extent that the CSF needs to continue providing that level of support to you, providing some additional resources may be commensurate with what was provided for the first two years of the life of this CSF would probably be appropriate. Hopefully, that addresses your question, Senator.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Yes, it does. Maybe Mr. Asher is listening in. I do not know if there is any way to fix that "no meeting piece" in the interim or if it has to be during session.

Mr. Killian:

Chair and Committee, I was anticipating your call. That meeting date limitation is in NRS. In order to allow the CSF to meet outside of those dates, it would require a BDR with the statutory change to enable them to have meetings outside of those dates.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Perfect. I am pretty sure I have one in. Thank you.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. We have a question from Assemblywoman Hansen in Carson City.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you, Chair and thank you Mr. Hobbs for being here and thank you to the CSF for the hard work you have done. I am distressed that the CSF is not going to be able to meet after September as well. I would like to put you on the spot. I like the idea of an ongoing CSF. I know things cost money and I own a small business and know that sometimes I know how to "rob Peter to pay Paul." Maybe that is what we do here in the Legislature sometimes. Would your recommendation be an ongoing CSF? You mentioned the members' service will expire in the fall; and I have been impressed with the makeup of the CSF, it represents, it covers a lot of the state and the diverse issues that the different counties deal with, as well as Washoe and Clark. With those members and their service being vital, how would you see this moving forward if you had a magic wand and could make an ask? How would you like to see it move forward? And what periods of time would the members serve, two years, four years? And the CSF in perpetuity, or we revisit it every two years or four years as we are getting used to this new funding formula.

Mr. Hobbs:

I think to your question, and I appreciate you asking that I give you some "off-the-cuff" answers, but maybe what I should do is give it a bit of thought and put it in writing to you. It is hard to anticipate what all the tasks are going to be from year to year. The PCFP obviously is something that we expect to be ongoing. We feel that we need to continue to monitor that for any unintended consequences or any ways in which it might be improved with regard to responsiveness to the needs of the various districts around the state. That I would say is an absolute certainty. It is sometimes easier to have a commission like this than to try to charge staff of NDE, who already have very full workloads, with what they do. Unfortunately, you have a lot of expertise on this in the form of several chief financial officers and superintendents. There are a few of us that do not directly work for any school districts. Fortunately, or unfortunately, my background and the work that I normally do is generally in the area of public finance, taxation, budget issues, and those sorts of things so it has been a good fit. And the fact that we were able to bring on some help this past April on the technical side, I have been able to work with them rather closely, and I do believe we are still going to be able to meet all of the tasks that you asked us to fulfill.

Again, the funding issue is going to be a multiyear, multi-session issue. As you will see later in the presentation, there are very large numbers that we are dealing with and that does not come without some challenge. But if it meets with your approval, I would like to be able to put together perhaps a memorandum to you and summarize some of the tasks that I think would justify continuation of the CSF and provide some meaningful work that the CSF can assist you and the State of Nevada in doing.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Chair, if I could follow up. Thank you, Mr. Hobbs, for that and certainly I appreciate if you wanted to do that, that would be greatly appreciated. Putting you on the spot like that and I appreciate your thoughtfulness in wanting to give us the information we need. Yes, look forward to that, and hoping that we can find a way to resolve this unintended consequence and move forward. So again, thank you and the CSF for all your hard work.

Chair Denis:

Before we go on, I have one question for Mr. Killian. My question is, I want to make sure that I clarify, about the CSF itself (since I had an integral part in creating this along with former Senator Woodhouse at the time when we were doing this). Is there any kind of

provisions in the NRS when we put in the new PCFP, where we created the CSF, that sunsets the CSF? Because I know that there is a limitation on when they can meet, because I think that was more budgetary than anything else, and that is why to clarify for the record whether there is anything in the NRS that sunsets the CSF or it still continues but we have to fund it so that they can meet.

Mr. Killian:

Yes, I think the idea for the limitation on the dates that the CSF could meet, the intent of that idea was partially budgetary and partially that the CSF was intended to help in the interim with the implementation of the PCFP. Their meetings happened basically after a session ended and up until BDRs were submitted for the next session. So, they were only working during that period that the Legislature was not working; both for budgetary reasons and because their work was then intended to be integrated by the Legislature into the PCFP during session. So, it did not make sense for them to be meeting during session. I think the commentary that we are hearing is that it might be useful for them to be able to have those meetings during session as well and certainly that is a decision for the Legislature to make. The CSF does not have any sunset under existing law, it continues in existence indefinitely. That provision that they only meet between July 1 of an odd-numbered year and September 30 of an even-numbered year is solely a matter of statute so the Legislature would be free to change that.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. So that the record is clear, when we talked about creating this CSF, the intent was always that it would be ongoing, because we knew that the funding plan is always going to have a need to have changes. The way that we have done it in the past, is that any time we had a change to the old funding formula it would have to come to the Legislature (and we had 120 days to talk about it and make changes) and that is why it took so long to make changes in the past. And then, sometimes you could do some things in the interim, but you would have a special committee that would meet.

So, the intent, as I worked on this, was that like the Economic Forum that meets periodically and looks at the budget. We would have this CSF that could meet on an ongoing basis—not necessarily—I guess that the work demands might determine how much budget is needed, how many meetings, but that it would continue on, so that there is always somebody looking at that to see if there are changes that need to be made. I want to make sure that is clear; because as we get going in the future, sometimes people forget why we did certain things. But the intent was that this CSF would continue. The biggest issue right now is that it became a budget issue on how many meetings they were going to have. And so hopefully that can be looked at so that you can have the appropriate number of meetings to be able to do the work that has been asked of you.

Mr. Hobbs:

Thank you, Chair. With the support that we have received from your staff at the NDE, it has helped us stay on schedule; the ability to identify some additional funds for subject matter experts to assist with the workload over the last couple of months. As we formulate these final recommendations, I do think we will hit our mark there. But I do appreciate your sentiments about the CSF and obviously the PCFP and the funding of education, are ongoing, complex, difficult issues. We would certainly, I think I can speak on behalf of all the members of the CSF, I think all of us would be pleased to continue to try to provide you whatever support we possibly can.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. If you will go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Hobbs:

The next section I was asked to cover were the recommendations that were forwarded to you in a letter—I believe late last week. (Agenda Item VI A-2) These are recommendations that have been made by the CSF and if you like, I can summarize what those recommendations are.

Chair Denis:

For the Committee members, we do have in our material that letter, so if you want to reference that, it is under Agenda Item VI A-2.

Mr. Hobbs:

Yes, I will follow along with the same order in the letter. The first category of recommendations that we were asked to consider are under the category of auxiliary services. The first recommendation you can see before you, auxiliary service allocations, consisting of food service and transportation costs, should be based on a four-year average of actual expenditures. Additionally, a hold harmless adjustment, similar to that used for payments based on quarterly average daily enrollment data should be applied in the event expenditures decrease compared to the previous year.

I do realize as I go through these that the wording is not particularly poetic on some of these. Sometimes technical precision creates some difficulty in how these are worded. But this was recommended to avoid a situation where amounts for auxiliary services may otherwise have dropped and creates a hold harmless to preserve funding for transportation and food services. This essentially helps smooth out volatility and funding for these services over time. It is more of a practical way of dealing with those costs on a going forward basis. If you are taking four past years and averaging those, but you are looking ahead to the next year, you are always a little bit behind and there could always be decreases based on enrollment. This was intended to smooth that part of it out.

The next recommendation, charter schools and university schools for profoundly gifted pupils should be included in the auxiliary services calculation of the PCFP using the same funding methodology established for school districts. This recommendation was made to equalize funding between charter, university, and district schools in the category of profoundly gifted pupils and again deals with auxiliary services. The next recommendation, if charter schools or university schools for profoundly gifted pupils have not incurred expenditures for auxiliary services for a total of four years, the average should be based on the number of years for which expenditure data is available. The protocol for doing these calculations is based again on a four-year average. And if a school entity, charter school entity has only been providing the services for two years, mathematically it does not make sense to have two zeros plus two numbers and then take the average of that, that would be somewhat impractical this is what that is intended to address.

Next, an inflation adjustment factor for auxiliary services should be established that mirrors the inflationary factor for the PCFP. This recognizes that the cost of auxiliary services will rise each year and simply deferring to the four-year average can understate the true current cost. Adding this inflation factor, which would be the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all urban consumers in the western region addresses this issue. Next, allow charter schools

offering auxiliary services for the first time to develop a line-item budget based on projected needs that would be submitted with an application to the NDE. If you happen to be a charter school that had not been providing these services, you will not have any expenditure history, if you were looking forward, intending or hoping to provide those services in the future. This would enable a method for establishing a base on a going forward basis and that would be done by putting essentially a budget or proposal together that would be submitted to NDE that could then become the base, and thus not act as an impediment, to any of those charter schools who were looking to provide those services going forward.

The next one is somewhat of a lengthy one, a four-year average of transportation costs that would exclude capital costs. District capital costs would be initially funded on a per-pupil basis, which is based on the number of active buses in operation, assuming a 15-year average life per bus, a cost of \$150,000 per bus, and total enrollment. The funding of the district's bus replacements and acquisition costs would be contingent on an equivalent increase in the State Education Fund, which is an important point in this one, so the base funding is not negatively impacted. Charter schools without an existing fleet would indicate their desire to begin transportation operations to the NDE. Each charter school should receive the same amount of per-pupil funding as the district they are located within. Any unspent monies would be returned to the State Education Fund at the end of the year.

The CSF recommends segregating the operations and the capital costs for the transportation element to different things. Operations would be based on the four-year average that we talked about earlier, where the capital costs would be converted to a per pupil amount using criteria, the cost of a bus, the estimated useful life and so forth. This would apply only if there were sufficient funds by way of an increase in the State Education Fund so that base funding is not negatively impacted. That is again, a very important point in that this would only apply if revenues were sufficient to not negatively impact base funding. This also provides an avenue for charter schools desiring to commence transportation operations, which would require them to notify the NDE of this desire. The charter schools, if approved by NDE, would receive the same amount of per-pupil funding as the district within which they are located.

The next category of recommendations is under the heading of inflation. The CPI for all Urban Consumers Western Region, currently included in the NRS, should be replaced with a Nevada-Specific CPI, should a sufficient Nevada CPI become available. The CSF recognizes that there is currently no Nevada-Specific CPI, it does not exist today. However, should such an index become available in the future and of course, that index would need to be reliable and from a source like the Bureau of Labor Statistics, something bona fide and valid. It is recommended that we eventually migrate to that Nevada-Specific index. So, nothing would occur right away, and it is hard to say at what point in time there would be a Nevada-Specific index, it is more of a "thinking ahead" thing.

Under the title of "at-risk," the CSF affirmed its previous recommendation to utilize the alternative definition of at-risk defined by the State Board of Education to allocate weighted funding. The new definition of at-risk uses numbers from infinite campus versus the numbers relating to eligibility under the Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Program (FRPLP). Use of the infinite campus numbers results in a higher per-pupil value for at-risk and a lower number of students qualifying for at-risk. This is an important point there and we have been getting quite a bit of feedback about this recommendation. It must be emphasized that this does not reduce the dollars dedicated to at-risk.

Use of the infinite campus definition for at-risk provides for better and more up-to-date tracking of students who are truly at-risk. The CSF recognized that because of the way FRPLP was applied, the true designation of at-risk was being, perhaps arguably, over applied. An example would be that if I believe this to be the case, if over 40 percent of students at a particular school were classified as at-risk, the entire school is designated as at-risk. Some method of better identifying those that are truly at-risk—which would be a lower number than had previously been determined, it was felt that we should be moving in that direction—would result in a higher amount of funding for each one of the at-risk students. The overall funding dedicated to at-risk, again, would not be changed and would hopefully increase as additional funding becomes available and we meet the targets of each of the weights.

The NCEI, truly my favorite one on this list. At this point in time, the CSF apologizes that it is not quite ready to make a final recommendation. This is an item that has appeared on, I do not know how many of our agendas, but I would say at least a dozen over the last three years and to say that it is been challenging to work through this would be a tremendous understatement. We met a week or so ago and this was on our agenda. Let me give you some background on how we have migrated through this. We used subject matter expert APA Consulting (APA), if you are familiar with them, they have been doing quite a bit of education support work for the state for the past couple of decades according to the information that I have seen. They recommended the NCEI would be applied to each of the districts in the state.

Again, by way of additional background, the NCEI is intended to recognize that there are differences in purchasing power or costs between and among the 17 school districts in the state. Some things are more expensive in some counties than they are in others and that gets applied to the statewide base and that helps produce the adjusted base. Theoretically, it is an important statistic. However, arriving at a methodology to determine that statistic, which is embraced by all 17 of the school districts, has proven to be a bit elusive over the past many meetings.

At the last meeting, since we were looking at, by my reckoning, the fourth variation of methodology on computing the NCEI. I, as Chair, requested that the chief financial officers, who are members of the CSF, get together and have some discussion. Technically they are certainly in the best position to understand that issue and since they also represent two of our large school districts, a couple of our smaller school districts, and charter schools, they also have an investment in the outcome of this. I do not know what that final recommendation is going to be, but I hope to be able to forward that to you by our next meeting. It is possible that the recommendation may run the range of excluding the NCEI from cost adjustments in the formula—that is certainly a possibility and was discussed at our last meeting—to using one of either prior methodologies or a new methodology to make that computation. We will bring that to closure Chair, hopefully by the next meeting.

The next category is virtual schools. The CSF recommendation is to fund online district and charter schools at the statewide base per-pupil amount. Online district schools have been funded at the adjusted base, with charter schools being funded at the statewide base. They were being funded at different bases and this recommends that they both be funded at the statewide base on an equivalency basis.

Lastly, which I know is good news, the recommendation is under the category of dual enrollment to maintain funding at the adjusted base per-pupil amount for students taking dual enrollment courses. Based upon the deliberations of the CSF, it was felt that the

funding for students taking dual enrollment courses continue to be funded through the adjusted base so, no change recommended.

Chair, that is a summary of the recommendations that we forwarded to you in the letter that you have before you (Agenda Item VI A-2). We will have one to clean up with respect to the NCEI and then we will follow that with additional recommendations that have more to do with the final topic that I will discuss today and that is optimal funding and methods of achieving optimal funding.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Any questions on the recommendations?

I want to make a comment if we do not have any questions yet. It is amazing to be able to have a group of individuals that understand, because as you were talking about some of this, you have to be almost a "finance person" to truly understand school funding and what these recommendations mean. I appreciate the work that you have been able to put forward. This is what once again, this is one thing that I envisioned, that the Legislature would be able to get recommendations on how we "tweak" the funding plan and looking at whatever the situation was at the time. To have that I think is great.

Any questions that we have from any of the members? I am not seeing any. All right, so then we will go ahead and go on. What I will say is obviously all these things that we talk about, any recommendations, these will come to us at our work session so that we can figure out what we want to recommend as we move forward.

Let us go on with the next part of the presentation.

Mr. Hobbs:

Thank you, Chair. The objective of these next few slides (Agenda Item VI A-3) that look a little bit imposing, but I will try to make them less imposing as we go through it is to give you a sense of the first objective that we were given, which is to identify, per SB 543, optimal funding for education. I think a number of us on the CSF struggled with the term "optimal". One of the things I did is I went to the dictionary to look up optimal and find out what the synonyms would be because I know from my background, I view it only one way, mathematically. Optimal funding can be somewhat elusive because different people depending upon the viewpoint that they take may view the word optimal in a bit of a different context. One of the things that we chose to do was to identify a continuum of funding. We understand what the current funding is per-pupil as funded through the state budget and that would be, let us move to the first bar chart, which would be the top bar that you see and that was computed using 2020 data. So, right away I would tell you that information is a couple of years older.

Next you see, how does that compare to the national average? You can see the national average per the source National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is \$12,645 per student compared to Nevada's \$9,249 in 2020. Now does national average necessarily equate to optimal. Most of us would say that it does not, but it provides a rational benchmark for where we are, compared to where other peer states are. We turned our attention to a work product that was provided by APA, so it is subject matter expert recommended levels of funding on a per-pupil basis for Nevada. That recommendation would be to fund education at \$14,300 plus per year. You can essentially see the gaps between those three markers. If you go to the next slide, we have recently tried to update

these numbers but that does not change the relationship between the numbers—Nevada at over \$9,700 per student, the national average at \$13,500, and the recommended level by the subject matter expert at nearly \$15,000 per student. So those at least provide us the ability to gauge ourselves against those two markers.

Going forward, if we were to be funded, if we were to stay at the “status quo,” this is what we believe our per-pupil funding would look like. This would be the Nevada values updated for inflation and enrollment going forward, but no other funds necessarily committed to those. The next slide, the dark blue area, is where we would be if we did not add any additional funding for education. The lighter blue part of the bar is the amount of funding that would need to be added to reach the national average in each of the ten years that you see. That is essentially the comparison of where we are currently, to where we would need to be to reach the national average, the light blue representing the delta or the difference between the two. Now, if you put that in dollar terms, how much additional funding would be required each year to reach the national average, which is what these bars show you. As you can see, those are large numbers, and these are incremental. In other words, you would need this amount of funding in each of these years; it is not cumulative, which you will see on the next chart.

So, in aggregate, by the time you would get to the year 2032, the difference in funding between status quo—if nothing were done—and the amount needed to reach the national average would be an additional \$2.3 billion in funding required, as of year ten, which is obviously a very large amount of money that would need to be dedicated to reach that national average. One thing I need to maybe pause and say about these numbers is, we are still working on these as we speak. What you are seeing is a work in progress. So, we anticipate there will be a number of questions that might arise from you or your colleagues with regard to the amount spent per-pupil in Nevada, and the national average, and the subject matter recommended level of funding. Those are all very good questions. One of the things we are trying to do right now is ensure you that when we put these numbers in the report, they will be on a purely “apples-to-apples” basis. In other words, they exclude interest on debt service or include transportation or exclude transportation, but you will be looking at apples-to-apples values.

Between the presentation I am showing you today and that which may appear in the final report, there may be some variances, but that is because of the work that is being done to make sure those are all being shown on an equivalent basis. I do not expect it to change the orders of magnitude, however, that we are looking at. Essentially, what you see on a chart like this and the prior chart, those become funding targets, around which one would construct a funding plan to achieve that level of funding and that is the importance of charts like this.

The next couple of charts do the same thing but are compared to the subject matter expert’s level of funding that they believe is necessary to be more at an optimal level. Again, you have the status quo going to the next chart that should bring in the delta or the total amount that would be needed each year. The light blue area again would be the difference between where funding would be with no action taken, and where it is believed it needs to be to achieve that level of per-pupil funding. The next chart would also show the incremental amount needed each year. This is no surprise, since the APA recommended levels of funding are higher than the national average. These numbers are much larger than what you saw in the incremental shortfall to reach the national average.

Now, something I think is important about using the APA recommended level and the national average: it is easy to defer to the national average, but one might then ask

the question, "Well, is that truly optimal? There are obviously a number of peer states that are below that average and a number that are above. Does that necessarily cause you to believe that number is a representative of optimality?" Fair enough question and that is one of the reasons why the APA values have been included, because from a subject matter expert standpoint, that would suggest that even at the national average, it would be less than what is optimal for the State of Nevada. But again, national average becomes a simple metric to focus on.

Then you go to the aggregate shortfall. You can see where, in the tenth year, the amount of additional funding that was required for reaching the national average was at \$2.3 billion, now rises to \$3.2 billion. So effectively having those two together, the national average and APA gives you a range in which the targets would be constructed. From this point forward, again notwithstanding the fact that we may make some adjustments to these to make sure that current spending, national average, and APA are all on an equivalent apple-to-apple basis; those form the funding targets for each year and the ten-year period as a total. The "how to fund it" part has been the part that we have been working on since April. I do not have slides for you today because that is still very much a work in progress. But focus is being placed on the historic, traditional, and customary methods of funding education in the State of Nevada, which falls in line with the traditional funding sources such as property tax, state and local school support tax, sales tax, and other revenues that are traditional and customary.

When you are looking at numbers of this size, it is difficult to identify funding sources that produce this level of revenue that does not cause some impact on those that are having to pay those taxes, fees, or charges. It is simply an impossibility for that to happen. And that is one of the reasons why our focus has been on the traditional and customary methods of funding education, which, by the way, in Nevada are not necessarily unique to those being used in other states. Those are the staples of funding education in other states as well. So, Chair, by the time September rolls around and the CSF "turns into a pumpkin" for a while, we will be working between now and that time on finalizing the recommendations that the CSF will be making. A report will be coming to you, I believe by November 15th. That report is already under construction and in that report will be the recommendations for methods of funding that the Legislature can consider over the ensuing ten-year period to reach their goals.

Chair Denis:

Great, thank you. As a way to maybe start some questions, to see if there are any other questions. When we are looking at the APA level versus the national funding, and you are looking at—I do not know what, it does not have page numbers on here—but still, you have the incremental shortfall with both of those, and on the year 2032, when you are talking about the \$283 million as opposed to \$391 million. You are talking about that is how much additional funds would have to be put in, in that particular year, to be able to be at the level that we need to be at, for whatever one that is, the national average or the APA?

Mr. Hobbs:

That is absolutely correct. The numbers that you see on the slides that are entitled incremental would be the additional amount needed each year.

Chair Denis:

Then the subsequent one, where it has the aggregate, is that the total amount? That \$2.3 billion for the aggregate shortfall on the national average versus the APA, which is that \$3.2, what does that represent?

Mr. Hobbs:

It essentially takes the incremental amounts and adds them to each other, each year. If you were to add in the tenth year, each of those to the left of the tenth year together, each of those ten years in the far-right column, it would equal that number.

Chair Denis:

If we waited until year ten and did not do anything, that is the amount we would have to put in to make up for the ten years of not doing anything, right?

Mr. Hobbs:

That is absolutely correct. The more it gets deferred, the more challenging it becomes. Now, in fairness though, we have assumed here for purposes of simplicity, perhaps, that it would be funded at over a ten-year period on a linear basis, in other words, equally each year. So, you would take that sum that you see on the far-right side and divide it by ten, that would be the average amount needed, every year. Now you may choose to fund earlier, which would take some pressure off later; it does not necessarily have to be linear. But the more you defer into the future, the more expensive it becomes to reach that target level.

Chair Denis:

Other questions? Senator Dondero Loop.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I do not know that I have a question, but it is overwhelming, the work that you have done, in the amount of time you have had, and I want to thank the former commissioners, as well as current commissioners for all of their hard work. This illustrates the importance of continuing this work and making sure we get it right for our kids and for the future of Nevada; because every student that goes through the process of being educated becomes our workforce at the end. Thank you again for all your hard work, and we will see if we can get it right.

Chair Denis:

Other questions?

I do have one additional comment, that it is incredible that we can actually be able to have this discussion. In the past, we have talked about, yes, we need more money for education, but now we are talking about what that is. That is important because trying to make decisions, especially from the legislative side, trying to make decisions has always been based on how much money do we have so that we can increase. But this at least gives us that goal, that if we want to be at a certain place, we know what that cost is and that is something we have not had in the past. I appreciate all this work that has gone on. I think to be able to have frank discussions about education, when we talk about how we make

education better and what are the real needs, this is what we were looking for when we put in this new funding plan, to be able to have this discussion. Thank you for all that work.

Are there any other comments or questions? Thank you, great work you are doing. We will be talking about some of these recommendations at our next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM VII—PRESENTATION CONCERNING DUAL ENROLLMENT DATA IN THE NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION (NSHE) DATA DASHBOARD

Chair Denis:

We will now move to a presentation concerning dual enrollment in the NSHE Data Dashboard. We have Renée Davis here to make that presentation.

Renée Davis, Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs and Community Colleges, NSHE:

Thank you, Chair Denis, for having us here today. I am delighted to come and talk on this topic. (Agenda Item VII) What I wanted to say from the outset is in addition to being a priority for the Legislature and the NDE, dual enrollment is also a priority for NSHE, and it goes hand-in-hand with the strategic goals of the Board of Regents. Ranging from the access to postsecondary participation for all Nevada students, to increasing success, closing the achievement gap, and then going into building the workforce, as you know. It is a crucial part of what we all do in the state, and so I am delighted to give you some information on the tool that will help you dig deeper.

First, to set some definitions. What does it mean to be dual enrolled? So, that would be a high school student taking college courses. Then, of course, there is recognition in state law that this course also applies to their high school graduation requirement. And then in terms of, some terms that are normally used interchangeably but have a slight difference, concurrent enrollment would be when a course is taught by a high school instructor. It is still a college level course, it is done in cooperation with the campus, but it is taught by the high school instructor. And then dual enrollment is taught by the college instructor either at the high school or at the college campus.

The dashboard—we did not choose to do a live demo because that is always a little unpredictable; we did give you the link here at the bottom of the slide so you can go and explore the dashboard yourself, which I encourage you to do—basically, you will see when you go to the dashboard, we have three basic parts: dual enrolled high school students; information about the high school graduating class; and NSHE capture rates, in terms of students who had a dual enrollment or concurrent enrollment experience and those who did not. I think it will be very interesting to see what those numbers look like. And then, of course, the data is presented in various ways, and you can disaggregate it on the actual tool. And just know that the graduation data in the dashboard is as of a point in time. As we go to more recent years, there will not have been the full period for the expectation for students who have graduated from college. Once we get into that, I will explain a little more. Then the data we are going to be looking at is from 2012–2013 through 2019–2020. If you go to the dashboard, we started with Part I, which has some 2021 data, but, for the rest of the tabs, we are still working on that, and we should be up by November. It all depends on the timing of data and the Statewide Longitude Data System (SLDS).

I wanted to make a note to some data limitations. In this data, we were not able to differentiate between students who are in a formal dual enrollment program versus maybe a student who took courses in college independently while they are still enrolled in high school. We also cannot differentiate between that distinction between dual and concurrent enrollment. So, they are all together in basically one category. Then as I mentioned, there is a lag in the data and that has to do with the timing of data coming into the SLDS—or Empower—and when we can pull that. We will of course be keeping this up to date on a regular basis as that new data becomes available.

Part I, when you first look at that tab, you are going to see some general statewide data, and you can see that the total number of students, as well as the total number of courses taken, has increased quite dramatically over the last several years, 235 percent since 2014–2015. A big reason that increase has happened is due to the Legislature’s action with [SB 19](#) (2017), which basically requires that each school district and charter school enters into an agreement with an NSHE institution to offer the dual credit courses. That has had a tremendous impact.

Here is a different way to look at that data. You can definitely see that dramatic increase in the number of students. Then here is the average number of courses taken, and you can see that has gone down a little. I do not think that is too surprising because the opportunity is being branched out to many more students, so that seems like a natural progression, and I would not be surprised if it started to climb back up at some point.

In terms of disaggregating the data, we do so by NSHE institution of enrollment, race and ethnicity, and types of courses enrolled. At the top of the list, if you look at year 2019–2020, you will see things that you would expect to see. So, those general education requirements students need to do normally or traditionally, I would say in their freshman year, composition I and II, precalculus (which is what we refer to as a gateway math course), history, political science, those types of things that students all take regardless of their program of study, which is obviously a smart approach for students who may not know what they want to do yet when they go to college. They can still take these courses that they are going to need regardless. Then at the bottom of the list, there is enrollment here in more specialized courses. There is a large list, over 800 courses in 2019–2020, that students took.

We will move on to Part II. This is where we are looking at data specific to the high school graduating class. In this section we disaggregate by district, high school, and then there are the statewide figures. This is looking at students who had a dual enrollment during their 9th through 12th grades, at some point. When you start to delve into this data, you can look at the percentages of high schools with students that had a dual enrollment experience, again, specific to a year. You can see that for Clark, in this example, it was 100 percent of schools, and then statewide 96 percent. So, we are getting close to 100 and again, this latest data we have is for 2019–2020. It has been on a trajectory, and I am sure that we are going to make it to 100 percent due to all the hard work that is happening out there across the state.

As you delve a little further into the high school graduating year, you can see figures by district. Again, total high school graduates, total with dual enrolled credits, and then the percent of students who had a dual enrollment experience. As you can see, it does vary quite a bit by school district. From there, we can see that those figures—this is statewide—if you look at all districts, you can see the substantial increase since 2012–2013, when we started tabulating this data. This last slide is an example of if you delve down a little further and you look at a specific school district, then within the school district, you can see each of

the high schools. So, you can go from the overall statewide numbers to very finite numbers by high school, which is handy when you are trying to figure out the statewide picture.

Finally, we look at Part III, which has to do with the capture rate. When you are talking about capturing, you are talking about the number and percent of students who graduated from a Nevada high school and enrolled at an NSHE institution. We do have that time period of within one year of high school graduation, so they might not have started right away in the fall, but if they started by spring, it would count in this data set. We are comparing those who had a dual enrollment experience with those who did not. You can see the "dual enrollment experience," which is the green bar on the slide and then the "no dual enrollment experience" is the gray bar, and that is the capture rate. You can see that in general, students who have a dual enrollment experience are much more likely to make it to college. That goes back to what I said at the beginning; it is our goal to get more students in our state into postsecondary education. And so, the dual enrollment is having that impact, and that is important to examine in the overall picture.

Next is a look at the earliest time in the data set and then later in the data set, the distribution by race and ethnicity of the capture rate. These are students with prior dual enrollment experience, and you can see that the profile has shifted and more students who are non-White have been able to take advantage of the dual enrollment experience. That is good news and of course, more work to do there. That work will continue, and we all know that there was commentary during public comment about making dual enrollment more accessible to all students in Nevada. That data is also there on the website, so we can track it that way as well.

The last part is awards conferred. Again, by year, this also is broken down within the dashboards by race and ethnicity. But you can see, the degree completion rates are much better for those who had a dual enrollment experience and, in this case—in this data set, it could be one class. It is much like some of the other factors that we have seen in the last years that can influence students, and they can see themselves as college students. I cannot say enough about how important dual enrollment is in the current climate in getting students into college, but also getting them to complete.

Then, as you move down, you can see those years 2014–2015 through 2018–2019. You will not see the full strength of that number yet because the typical six years after high school graduation has not passed as of when this data was pulled. Those numbers will continue to grow in those later years. I am going to end it here and with your permission, Chair Denis, I will take any questions.

Chair Denis:

Are there any questions from Committee members?

Vice Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I was wondering, you said in the beginning that you were not able to tell the difference or pull out the data, if it was dual enrollment that was taught by a university professor or a college level course that was taught at the high school level. That is an important distinction. Can we drill down on that a little bit? I think that the majority of my colleagues, I believe, were interested in doing the dual enrollment because it is giving students the ability to take those college level courses with people typically who have master's or perhaps even doctorate degrees. I wanted to see if we could drill down on that a little bit more, and maybe I misunderstood what you said, but if you could clarify that.

Ms. Davis:

Unfortunately, that is difficult data to get. In our data warehouse, we do not have attributes of who taught the class. There may be some opportunity to do some parsing out at the institution level because they of course have that data. We do not have the data on who taught what class, accessible to us. But I certainly understand the need for some more information to figure out what is the best model for dual enrollment. There are some competing philosophies out there about, it is not necessarily the Ph.D. instructor who is going to have the best connection with the high school student. There are lots of questions out there; it is a very good question. We unfortunately do not have that data in our warehouse, but as we move forward and discuss this, we will certainly be talking with our campuses and figure out what they are tracking and how are they able to provide that information. I will see what we can do in the future, but right now, I do not have access to anything we could pull.

Chair Denis:

Are there any other questions?

Senator Buck:

I agree with my colleague that all dual enrollment courses are not made equally and even when you are in the high schools and you talk and see the differences, there is some discrepancies in expectations and academic expectations. So, if it would be possible to pull out the data and see the ones that are taught in a college setting and those that are taught in a high school. Even high school principals realize that there is a discrepancy between that and an Advanced Placement (AP) class or International Baccalaureate (IB) class and that IB and AP tend to be higher rigor than a regular dual enrollment course. I would be curious to see, if that is pulled out, how successful the students that are taking a class in a high school, if they are successful going on later to college, as opposed to the ones that are sitting in the college classroom, or in the AP or IB class.

Ms. Davis:

I appreciate the desire to have more finite data so we can figure out the models that work. One thing I did want to say is that right now, as I understand it, the largest majority of courses for concurrent and dual enrollment are not happening on the college campus; they are happening at the high schools. So that is the predominant model right now. We certainly can, again, we will continue to try to refine this data, but it is more common that a student would have had the experience at the high school versus on the college campus.

Senator Dondero Loop:

My question is, there is some confusion with parents and students alike about where and what constitutes dual enrollment. I have had parents say, "You can only go to certain schools to get dual enrollment, whether they are private, public, charter, it does not matter." And then I have heard, "Oh no, you can do it anywhere." I have heard everything in between, so there is confusion. Could you give us the cliff notes of the "lay of the land" to put it on the record where can you attend to get dual enrollment credit and possibly end up with an associate's (A.A.) degree when you graduate?

Ms. Davis:

I can speak, specifically, to the NSHE institutions. All of the NSHE institutions do offer mostly concurrent and dual enrollment, as well. However, the factor to keep in mind is that it depends upon the school district and what agreements are in place with the specific NSHE institutions. In some of the school districts, there might be one NSHE that is engaged in dual enrollment with the high schools in that district, but in other districts, there are multiple. Then the courses that are offered for dual enrollment—it is not necessarily the whole, I should say, for concurrent enrollment, it is not going to be the whole catalogue or schedule of courses that the institution offers; it is going to be specific courses. And, in many cases, those courses are those general education courses I mentioned earlier: math, English, history, those types of things. Then there are also some specialized programs, depending upon the campus, that are more specific and more specifically targeted at preparing students for a particular job in the workforce.

So, whether you are talking about something that is a technical type of program or whether you are talking about teachers, future teachers, there are some programs that are fairly small at this point but are targeting students. But, basically, to go back to the original question, the courses that are available to students at their high school for concurrent enrollment will depend upon what agreements are in place with the school district and the NSHE institution. Now, in terms of dual enrollment that is different because if the student is enrolling directly at the college, then they would have access to more of the courses. Hopefully, that answers your question.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Follow up, Chair? So, my understanding, if I am at, it does not matter what school, X, Y, or Z, that I could actually dual enroll? So, say I am at Chaparral High School, and I want to take a class at the community college, but what if I want to stay at my high school and I want to end up with that degree. Is that siloed into certain schools?

Ms. Davis:

I am sorry, I did miss that aspect of the question, which was about students who are graduating high school with an A.A. degree at the same time. That is going to be more likely to happen at one of the community colleges and in particular with Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) High School and CSN High School. I am not aware off the “top of my head” of any regular concurrent programs, where you get that much coursework (because it is 60 credits) done. But lots of them could get 30 in, if they start early enough (which is in the first year), so it does vary quite a bit by student. But you are right, the opportunity to get that whole A.A. degree completed is not necessarily as widely available as other models of concurrent or dual enrollment. We are moving a little bit at a time in that direction to open those opportunities for more students.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Thank you. That is the confusion because when people hear dual enrollment, parents think they can stay at their high school, and they can do this process. It is not as “siloed” as I said into every school and so that is where the confusion is. I do not know if that is because the programs, we say dual enrollment, and we do not have different names, for the different programs. It is a tad confusing, if you will, because I think people—dual enrollment to them means, I am enrolled in the university or community college and I am enrolled in high school. But at the end of the day, if we are going to talk about dual enrollment as meaning that all the way to getting my A.A. degree when I graduate. Maybe we need to

have different labeling, if you will, so that people understand it. I have had several people say to me, who should know, "Oh well, I thought you could just go to any high school and get dual enrollment." Well, they are talking about the A.A. degree, so it is a little confusing.

Chair Denis:

Any other questions? Yes, Assemblywoman Hansen.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you, Ms. Davis, for being here. It has been very enlightening, and I am a big fan of dual enrollment and concurrent. A few questions, do we have data, or have we done surveys to find out why some children or families opt not to do dual enrollment? And, let me make sure I understand even though I have some familiarity; I have a relative who did TMCC high school, which was a fabulous experience; I am a big supporter of that. But that dual enrollment is when they go to the college and take the courses and concurrent is they have somebody from the college come to the high school. Specifically for dual enrollment, is the barrier transportation? I am wondering what feedback is available, if we have any, on why some of these—as I look at the breakdown of the stats—why are some of these populations not as represented as I would like to see in the dual enrollment.

Ms. Davis:

In terms of the concurrent versus dual, the location is part of the factor, but it is also who is teaching the course. At least in Nevada, concurrent is considered the high school, there is a high school instructor who is working with the college and usually there is a faculty member on the college side who is working with that high school instructor, a teacher, to give that course. The dual enrollment could be on the high school location, but it is a college instructor or professor. In terms of the access to the different modalities of that and the number of credits that they have access to, and the reasons students and families may or may not opt into that model, I think it varies a lot across the state. We at NSHE do not have data on these students. I am not sure if the NDE or any of the school districts collect that data. I would imagine that the superintendents, for example, probably have a general feeling for what is going on in their districts and why certain students are not opting in, and there could be conversations going on between them where you have higher percentages in some districts than others. Unfortunately, that is a long way to say, I do not have that data, and NSHE does not have that data, but I believe that the schools would have a better idea.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for clarifying. I had confused concurrent and dual enrollment locations. Chair, if I could follow up. There is no cost for dual enrollment, correct? And I will throw in the second question—I know the answer is no, but I want to make sure—so that is not a barrier to students taking dual enrollment or concurrent. The second question is, in your captured data, is it counting the kids who graduated with an A.A. degree? If that makes sense? Thank you.

Ms. Davis:

In terms of cost, there was funding that was approved by the Legislature, and that funding was provided to the NDE for disbursement to the high schools. Those monies were used to cover courses, but my understanding is that it is gone, so there is potentially a cost and that might vary by school district. In some cases, there are monies from the district that are covering it. In some cases, our college campuses have found philanthropy to cover costs

that students or their families would otherwise incur; there definitely is a cost. Up until recently, there was some state funding, but that is no longer available.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

To clarify when I said no cost, no cost to the pupil or the family. There is a cost, but it is not borne by the parents or the student per se?

Ms. Davis:

It could potentially be borne by the family, if there is no philanthropy and if the districts are not able to cover it, unless some funding got approved again through the Legislature.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

If I could, Chair, to remind Ms. Davis. The other question, the capture rate, does that count the A.A. degree, if they do not have their bachelor's degree, but they got their A.A. degree? I am curious how you count that.

Ms. Davis:

Yes, that would include the A.A. degree. If you go to the tool itself, filter by degree types, if you select the year, you can see the various levels of degrees, I believe, but if I remember correctly, it goes from certificates all the way up.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Other questions? I am not hearing any or seeing any.

It is definitely an interesting subject when we talk about dual enrollment versus the other things. I do have one clarification before we finish. In your presentation, there was a chart where you talked about the number of, it was the percentage of high schools in Nevada that have dual enrollment programs. I think it listed Clark and then the state as a whole; it had Clark at 100 percent and the state as a whole at 90 something. Can you talk a little bit about that statistic and how that interacts with all the other discussion that we have been having.

Ms. Davis:

The percentages are taken from the percentage of high schools within a district who are participating in a concurrent or dual enrollment formal agreement. That was as of the latest, 2019–2020. I believe the percentages have moved up since then, but at that point, not quite all of the high schools in Nevada were on board yet.

Chair Denis:

Does that mean then they have an agreement to be able to offer dual enrollment classes?

Ms. Davis:

Yes.

Chair Denis:

In that snapshot, at whatever you said it was, 2020—that is what you said—Clark was at 100 percent. So, all other high schools have some type of dual enrollment agreement. Is that what that means?

Ms. Davis:

Yes, that means that all high schools in Clark have an agreement in place with at least one NSHE institution.

Chair Denis:

Then the second number on there—I am trying to see what the difference is here—you had Clark and Washoe; Washoe was at 95 percent, so they had 20 schools. So, the state as a whole was at 96.3, right?

Ms. Davis:

Yes, that is correct.

Chair Denis:

Senator Dondero Loop has a follow up question.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I do not want to “beat the dead horse” here; so, if 100 percent of those schools have an agreement and I am at Palo Verde High School, and I have CSN right next door, does that mean that I am getting that A.A. degree? Or does that mean I can take a class in Palo Verde High School that might meet English 101 in college? What does that mean?

Ms. Davis:

It is the latter. It means that the student at the high school where there is an agreement in place, can at least take a course or courses. The opportunities to get the full A.A. degree as part of a formal dual enrollment program, which is not happening, we are not quite there yet. You saw one of the slides in the presentation showed that the average of number of courses taken by a student who has a dual enrollment experience is between three and four courses; that is not enough to get the A.A. degree. Again, getting the whole A.A. degree by the time you graduate from high school, it is definitely possible, examples outside of—I did mention earlier TMCC High School, CSN High School—those have been around for a long time, and that has been happening there. Other programs where there is some history and they have been around, is the Jump Start Program at Western Nevada College (WNC), that program does have graduates with A.A. degrees by the time they are ready to graduate from high school.

Really, what those agreements mean is that there is a formal agreement in place for a student to be able to take high school courses. It could be a specific list of high school courses, and that definitely changes from year to year, which count for both. They count for credit in college, and they count for credit towards high school graduation requirements. That is what that agreement means, is that there is some opportunity to do that, it is not related to the number each agreement has, not that figure anyway.

Senator Dondero Loop:

So, we are back to semantics. Because on that particular slide, Part II high school graduating classes, where it lists the 100 percent, the key word to me is prevalence of dual enrollment. When I have people call me and say, "Why can I not do this?" It is like I said, maybe semantics, because people are thinking that dual enrollment is, "I am going to get out of here with an A.A. degree," and it is not that. It might be a class or two unless you are actually enrolled in one of those other institutions that have that very fine, narrow program, like at Nevada State High School, or the others that you mentioned: CSN High School.

Ms. Davis:

Yes, it certainly is not the majority of dual enrollment experiences that students could get an A.A. degree by the time they graduate from high school, which is true. The opportunities are not just at TMCC and CSN High Schools, those have been the longest in existence, but the Jump Start Program at WNC is another one I know of for sure. There may be others, but in terms of providing the dual enrollment experience to the highest number of students, I do not know how feasible it is to have that full two years done in high school. I know that the campuses are working in conjunction with the districts and with the high schools to make more opportunities available. But there are a lot of students, and as we branch out to our students, we have to branch in a way that is sustainable. While it is a wonderful opportunity, I cannot deny that it is optimum for many students to graduate high school with an A.A. degree; it is also a lot of work. And so that may not be the appropriate experience for all students.

Can you do the two-year A.A. degree in high school and be in high school sports? I do not know the answer to that question, but there are limited time hours in the day, and so I do not think, while it is an excellent opportunity and it is great if that can get done—you are 18 years old and you already have your first two years of college—that is a fantastic opportunity, but it may not be the right fit for all students. The wealth of opportunities and the variety is because we have many different students with many different aspirations and so, I guess I will end there—that it is going to depend upon the student whether that is the right experience for them. I cannot tell you for sure if there are other programs besides the two high schools and WNC where it is common to see the students graduate with the A.A. degree at the time they complete high school. I would imagine that those conversations are always happening to figure out how can we expand these opportunities for more students.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. We have a question from Senator Buck.

Senator Buck:

Thank you, Chair Denis. Is there, or did I miss, an actual number of students that graduated in Nevada this last year, the last couple of years, with their A.A. degree?

Ms. Davis:

I do not think that we have that on the tool. I would have to go back and double check, but I will make a note of that, and I can respond with that information.

Senator Buck:

That would be great information, and if we can see if it increases each year, because it is important that is an option.

Chair Denis:

Thank you, good suggestion. I think we have been talking about it. I think to know how many actually got their A.A. degree could help, especially if we are tracking it.

Any other questions? I am not hearing any.

I am going to go ahead and close out this item.

We have been going at it for quite a while; I am going to take an opportunity to take a break here. We are going to take a lunch break and we will be in recess.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—PRESENTATION CONCERNING THE WORKFORCE INCENTIVE GRANT (WIG) PILOT PROGRAM RELATED TO [AB 450](#) (2021)

Chair Denis:

We are back in order. We will continue with the next item on our agenda, which is a presentation concerning the WIG pilot program related to AB 450. Renée, who gave our last presentation is going to do this presentation.

Ms. Davis:

I have with me today our subject matter expert, José Quiroga, who has worked closely on this grant proposal and is the genius behind many of the things. We wanted to bring him to present on this proposal. For a little background, the WIG is a proposal that we discussed over a couple of meetings with the AB 450 Committee that concluded its work. The AB 450 Committee did write a letter of recommendation for our proposal that we will be taking to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) in August for approval for funding using American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds. I wanted to provide that background, and we will hand it over to José Quiroga.

José Quiroga, Research Analyst, Academic and Student Affairs and Community Colleges, NSHE:

Thank you. As Vice Chancellor Davis stated, I will be giving an overview of the WIG proposal. (Agenda Item VIII A-1) (Agenda Item VIII A-2) First, I will go over the impetus for the program, then an overview of the context of state-funded financial aid in Nevada. Finally, I will give a description of the proposed WIG pilot.

This proposal, the development of it, was kick-started by Governor Sisolak's commitment in March of this year to set aside funds toward exploring ways to make community college and other apprentice and training programs free for more Nevadans. That federal funding is being set aside to kick-start any initial recommendations of the AB 450 Committee. As Vice Chancellor Davis stated, the AB 450 Committee has now recommended the WIG pilot to be adopted and funded.

Now to go through a quick context of state-funded financial aid in Nevada. There are three major programs. The first, largest, and longest established is the Governor Guinn

Millennium Scholarship (GGMS). This program first awarded funds in School Year (SY) 2000–2001. It targets high achieving recent high school graduates. It is merit-based so it does require students to have a certain grade point average (GPA), that is currently a 3.25 GPA from high school and to have fulfilled certain requirements of the courses they took in high school. The eligibility window is only for six years after high school graduation, with some limited exceptions. And, importantly, it has a minimum level of enrollment required of students of nine credits per semester at a community college—that is what we would consider a three-quarter time enrolled student. There are more facts about the program in each slide; in the interest of time, I will move on, but I am happy to answer questions.

The Silver State Opportunity Grant (SSOG) was the second major state-funded financial aid program as opposed to the GGMS, which is merit-based. The SSOG is need-based, it goes to students with high financial need who are college ready in math and English. There is no eligibility window, as in, there is no timeline after graduation from high school that a student needs to have to be eligible for the SSOG, but the student does have to be enrolled in at least 12 credits, which is full-time enrollment at a community college or college. However, because there is a priority for students at 15 credits and above, and there is limited funding since establishment of the SSOG, only students in 15 credits and above have received funding, so that is above full-time enrollment.

Finally, the third most recent program is the Nevada Promise Scholarship (NPS). It is a little different from the other two programs in that it is neither considered to be merit-nor need-based. It is considered a last dollar program, where high school graduates who do not have other federal aid, like the Pell Grant or certain other types of state aid, will have their registration fees and other mandatory fees covered by the NPS. So that it is in effect free of registration charges and mandatory charges at the community colleges. The eligibility window is limited to three years after high school graduation or until a student has earned their A.A. degree. It requires 12 credits minimum enrollment, which is full-time enrollment at the community college.

The NPS also requires certain steps for a student to take in their senior year in high school, including applying to the program, community service hours, meeting with mentors, and other steps to make sure that they are eligible for the program. As we look at the state-funded financial aid programs and where students who receive those funds go to, we can split it out into four-year institutions and two-year institutions. This highlights one of the current unmet needs in the state, and that is more funding for state-funded financial aid programs at two-year institutions. As you can see in this slide, most of the funding, nearly 80 percent of it is going to students at four-year institutions, and that is driven from the GGMS. It is the largest program. It does not have a funding cap like the other two, and students who receive it are more likely to be enrolled at the four-year institutions. The two-year institutions only receive about 21 percent of state financial aid dollars; however, they enrolled nearly one-half of all undergraduate degree seeking students in the state. So again, it is one important reason to focus a new state financial aid program on students at NSHE community colleges.

As we look at the unmet need that the WIG pilot will fulfill, the first is that of student need-based support for more Nevadans. Out of the three programs that I spoke of, only the SSOG is need-based, so the WIG pilot would also have a financial need component. It would also give aid to returning adult students who are underserved by the other programs. For part-time students, I will go over the eligibility criteria a little more later on, but it does serve students at six credits or above, which are not being served by the other state-funded programs. And then statewide, there is a need for a financial aid program that targets

students to enroll into critical workforce programs, including nursing, teaching, and other in-demand occupations. As we developed this program, we brought it to the AB 450 Committee, and at their last meeting on June 7th, the committee recommended the adoption of the WIG pilot contingent upon funding. They also wrote and submitted a letter of support for the program to the IFC recommending funding.

To the WIG program itself, to be eligible, students must be enrolled in a program of study leading to a degree or certificate in an eligible in-demand occupation at an NSHE community college. I will talk a little bit more about what that means later on. A student must also be enrolled in six credit hours per semester that apply to the student's chosen program of study. They must be classified as an in-state resident for tuition purposes. They must meet satisfactory academic progress requirements. That is a measure of making progress towards that degree program that is used for federal aid and many other types of financial aid programs. The student must not have previously earned a bachelor's degree, and they must be Pell Grant eligible. That last point is important as it is our measure of high financial need. Students who are eligible for the Pell Grant by filling out the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and having demonstrated high financial need would be eligible for the WIG program granted that they meet all the requirements. We will also have, for students that are not eligible to fill out the FAFSA, another measure of low income based on household income so that they can be eligible for the WIG program.

Now, as we look at targeted occupations, this slide talks about how we came up with them. The list of programs per institution is listed in the materials for the item broken out by institution. There are ten occupations listed at each community college. The way that these were developed was to map the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) Regional Analyses of the occupations that are in most demand across the state. We mapped them to the degrees and certificates offered at NSHE community colleges. With that, we came up with a list that you will see at each institution, which includes many similar programs. For example, nursing and teaching, as I said before—in high demand statewide. However, there are needs that are specific to certain regions of the state. For example, transportation, there are transportation degrees offered at TMCC and industrial machinery at Great Basin College (GBC) that are unique to those institutions or unique to those areas being in high demand.

Another important part to know is that many of these degrees listed are stackable among each other so that a student, for example, at CSN, may take a certificate or may enroll into a certificate program in licensed practical nursing (LPN), then go on and do an A.A. degree in nursing, and then go on to a bachelor's degree in nursing. All of those degrees would be eligible for the WIG pilot; they would stack into each other and would lead to an occupation in registered nursing (RN) in the state. Another important point to note though, especially with nursing and those types of programs, is that some of these are capacity-limited already. For example, nursing has very resource-intensive practices in order to teach it—laboratories, and those kinds of things. The NSHE will be submitting a request to fund a Workforce and Economic Development Investment Fund to build capacity in these types of programs, which will be subject obviously to the Governor's Office and legislative approval. And that would work in concert with the WIG pilot to increase capacity and enrollment into these programs in the state.

The development of that fund was also recommended by the AB 450 Committee. The pilot award amounts will be based on enrollment level, so that a student at 6 to 8.5 credits, a part-time student, would receive \$1,000 per semester—\$2,000 for the year (that is fall and spring together). A three-quarter time student would receive \$1,500 per semester, and a full-time student would receive \$2,000 per semester, \$4,000 for fall and spring. These

amounts were developed to cover registration fees and, in most cases, all other mandatory fees in those programs, as well as in, depending on the program, leaving a little bit left over for other costs of the student's education—books, supplies, and living costs. However, it is important to note that the WIG program is intended to be part of the student's full financial aid package. Since these students will be Pell eligible, they would also be receiving funds from that and potentially other types of aid to help go towards the living expenses and other ancillary costs.

Regarding reporting and accountability of the pilot program, NSHE's Department of Academic and Student Affairs will submit quarterly and annual required reporting of ARP funds and the use of funds. We will also publish an additional preliminary report at the end of the first semester of funding, and a more full final report at the end of the pilot, with key metrics of the WIG program, including how the funds were used; which students received it (always disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and income levels); so that we can study how the program was carried out, the number of students, persistence rates, and other student success metrics.

Finally, for a timeline of the program, as I said before, March was the initial impetus for developing the program—the governor's commitment of ARP funds. In June, the AB 450 Committee endorsed the WIG pilot program and issued a letter of support. (Agenda Item VIII A-2) In August, it will be going to IFC, with the funding request for the program. If approved, the pilot will take place in a quick turnaround starting in spring of 2023, going to the full next academic year: fall 2023–spring 2024; and if funds are available, fall 2024 would be the final semester of the pilot program. At that point, we would issue our final report to the Legislature. Thank you to the Chair and the Committee for its time. Vice Chancellor Davis and I will be available for any questions.

Chair Denis:

Questions? Assemblywoman Thomas.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you for the presentation. I have one question. I was looking at your spreadsheet for CSN and I did not get a chance to go through northern Nevada and the central area. My question is with the nursing program, it is almost like one area was missed. I saw nursing assistant, then something else, an RN, and then the physician's assistant. It is like we skipped a beat here. What about LPNs because that would give students an opportunity to be in their field that they would like to practice in and would be one step closer to gaining registered nursing.

Mr. Quiroga:

The Committee member is referring to Attachment A of the NSHE WIG proposal that does list the degrees eligible for funding for the WIG pilot. In the CSN nursing degrees list, it does begin with practical nursing, which would be that LPN. What it does not have is certified nursing assistants (CNAs). Part of that, and we acknowledge that CNAs are highly needed throughout the state, we were basing these programs on the GOED analyses. They did not have the CNAs programs as "highly needed." Part of what they put in those lists of regional analysis of in-demand careers is having a well-paid area of occupation. Unfortunately, CNAs did not quite fit into their analyses, as well as not stacking into the next program of nursing. The LPNs were included in the programs that CSN has, although

those programs are not at every community college, which is why schools that did not have an LPN program were not included.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I was making sure that you were not associating CNAs and LPNs, because they are different.

Mr. Quiroga:

I completely agree, they are two separate areas. If I may take your attention to again Attachment A. We do list the LPN programs, which are part of the practical nursing programs that are part of CSN's offerings, including 1E Practical Nursing for Military Medical Corpsman to LPN, and the Practical Nursing Certificate of Achievement. Those are the programs we were able to identify leading towards a practical nursing credential in the state that are being included in the WIG proposal. Now another part of that, if I may add, would be that we are in discussions with, and these lists were developed in discussions with the presidents at each community college. So, if a new LPN program came online the following year, that would lead to an LPN credential at CSN or any other college that could then be added to this list. It is not a static list—it is meant to grow and change as the needs of the state change.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. I appreciate it. Other questions?

For clarification, you went over this, but I think it is important because you mentioned all the different scholarships and grants that we have available, but whether it is the GGMS, the NPS, or the SSOG, the WIG is available to folks that are not out of high school. Right? It could be anybody?

Mr. Quiroga:

That is correct. The WIG pilot would be available to any student as long as they meet the eligibility criteria outlined, regardless of age or how long ago they graduated high school.

Chair Denis:

Great, thank you. As we have talked about grants and things in the past, that has always been the one piece that we never quite get to because we always tend to focus on the kids who just graduated from high school and trying to get them in. But if somebody got out of high school and then went to work and then decided to go back to school, that kind of a grant can help them to be able to go back to school.

Any other questions? I am not hearing any. Thank you. That was a great presentation, excited that we have that opportunity to be able to get more folks in school. We will close this agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM IX—PRESENTATION CONCERNING HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS AND MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS INCLUDING INSTITUTIONAL UPDATES AND IMPACTS ON STUDENTS

Chair Denis:

Let us go to a presentation concerning HSIs and MSIs, including institutional updates and impacts on students. We have Ms. Cota from CSN here to make that presentation.

Clarissa M. Cota, J.D., Vice President, President's Office, North Las Vegas Campus, CSN:

Good afternoon, Chair Denis, Committee members, colleagues, and guests. It is my pleasure to be with you this morning in my capacity as the NSHE HSI Task Force Chair. This presentation will cover the important work being done by our NSHE institutions to better serve our students of color and lead them to student success. Our Nevada universities and colleges provide the gateway for these students to pursue higher education credentials and degrees in high-demand, high-wage workforce sectors. I will provide a brief overview of the MSI-HSI designation, go into NSHE institutional work and student success data, and end with the HSI Task Force goals for the 2022–2023 Academic Year. (Agenda Item IX)

Minority-Serving Institutions emerged in response to a history of inequity and lack of minority people's access to higher education institutions. They are now an integral part of American higher education, serving the needs of low-income, underrepresented students of color, explicitly recognized within the Fostering Success in Higher Education Act of 2022. Because MSIs enroll a substantial share of minority students, many of whom may not have otherwise attended college, the continuous development and the success of these institutions is critical for achieving a state's higher education and workforce goals. Students at an MSI are more likely to have a lower level of academic preparedness, come from high stress, high poverty communities, and one-half of all MSI students are first in their families to attend college, compared to 35 percent of students attending predominantly White colleges.

Of the eight distinct categories of MSIs, the NSHE institutions are either Asian American, Native American, Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions otherwise referred to as AANAPISI and/or they are HSIs. Once designated by the U.S. Department of Education as an eligible MSI, the higher education institution can then compete for federal funds on behalf of their students and communities. To be considered an AANAPISI, in Nevada, we have three NSHE institutions which are designated as such—CSN, NSC, and UNLV. These institutions serve low-income students and have a combined 10 percent or more undergraduate enrollment of students who identify either as Asian American, Native American, or Pacific Islander.

Five of our seven institutions are HSIs—CSN, NSC, UNLV, TMCC, and WNC. These institutions serve low-income students and have at least a 25 percent or higher undergraduate enrollment of students who identify as Hispanic. Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the nation are the fastest growing. Each year it becomes more competitive for HSIs to compete for federal funding. Nationally, there are 559 HSIs and collectively they represent only 18 percent of all higher education institutions; yet they are home to 66 percent of the 3.2 million Hispanic undergraduate students. They also serve one-third of all Pell Grant recipients in the nation. It is worth noting that for the first time in 30 years, this past year there has been a slight decrease in the total number of HSIs, which is representing the national effect COVID-19 has had on Hispanic enrollment at our higher education institutions.

The HSIs tend to enroll the highest number of all minority students as well. The HSIs serve 66 percent of all Hispanic students, 41 percent of all Asian American students, 35 percent of Native American/Pacific Islander, and 24 percent of all Black undergraduate students. Therefore, when federal funds are received by HSIs, they will increase the capacity of these institutions to serve all of their students.

What should we expect when our institutions reach an MSI designation? There should be a focus on hiring diverse faculty and staff. We should be creating environments with an intentional focus on student learning. We need to be intentional addressing the potential deficiencies resulting from poor college readiness. As we grow in our number of MSIs and HSIs in the state, the success of them is critical to reaching higher education and workforce goals.

The NSHE has taken a proactive approach to address the needs of our minority students. In 2014, eight years ago, Nevada ranked fifth in the country for having the highest percentage of Hispanics, at 28 percent. So, under the direction of the chancellor, the NSHE HSI Task force was formed in 2014 and supported by the Board of Regents to help their institutions ready themselves to become HSIs. The CSN became the first HSI in Nevada in 2015, followed by NSC, then UNLV, TMC, and WNC, and each were following every subsequent year. This is a rapid growth if you can see how the demographics of the state has changed and how our institutions are matching that change. The UNR and GBC are emerging HSIs with now over 20 percent Hispanic student enrollments. Our institutions have made great strides, and each has now created its own HSI task force to focus on initiatives meant to better serve our students.

The HSI Task Force represents all eight including Desert Research Institute (DRI) of the NSHE institutions, where we enable a systemwide approach in supporting the work we are all doing regarding HIS and MSI initiatives, and ultimately creating campus environments that are welcoming, and policy climate and academic programming to the students we serve.

There are distinct benefits from having a statewide coalition. First and foremost, we are recognized as the only state in the country that has a unified task force that includes R1s, state colleges, and community colleges all coming together around this very particular focused effort. This has drawn the attention of national institutions and national organizations and brought opportunity to our state and to our institutions, their administrators, our faculty and our students, by bringing these best practices to Nevada and allowing it to take place here without having to send our faculty and staff out of state.

We have also been leveraging statewide partnerships at our monthly meetings. We can share information, share board membership, and share opportunities that benefit our students. We have often spoken about collaborative grant writing. We are currently engaged right now, as the two Title Vs (NSC and CSN), in collaborative work of professional development where we know that regionally we are serving the same students. So, system-wide recommendations to the Board of Regents and other elected officials equals better service to our Nevada students.

As we look at how NSHE institutions are performing, it is important to take a look at our pipeline and consider that looking into the future. Currently, we have 37.7 percent of our Nevada high school graduates, in 2020, enrolling at NSHE institutions. It is of note, for all of us, that this is down from 42.4 percent in 2019. We also know that there is a growing pipeline continuing to grow in our K through 12 student populations, which has now reached 43.4 percent Hispanic enrollment.

When we look at how our NSHE institutions are faring in terms of our headcount and enrollment, it is no secret that students pursuing higher education in Nevada have suffered an enrollment drop over these last two years, significantly impacted by COVID-19. Our institutions across the state, with the exception of NSC, have experienced these enrollment drops. If you look at this chart and take a look at our community colleges, which have experienced the largest drop in enrollment, this can reflect the student population served by community colleges, the students with the highest socioeconomic needs, and those who were the most impacted by COVID-19 factors.

When we look at the numbers of our students across the board receiving awards, the numbers of awards conferred by students have continued to increase in the same time period, across all institutions, with the exception of CSN. But overall, there has been an increase in awards conferred across the system by 5.3 percent. When we start to look by race and ethnicity of who are receiving these awards you can start to see that the interventions at our campuses to promote student success are resulting in a positive impact for our students of color. When you take a look at the increases that have been occurring across the different ethnicities it continues to increase in the last three years. As our MSIs and HSIs continue to conduct their intentional work, the number of awards continue to increase, except for Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders and our White students. This indicates work has to continue as we want all our students to continue improving their achievement.

Community colleges confer the majority of the skills certificates. So, when we look at the workforce awards conferred, skills certificates can usually be completed within at most a one-year period of time. The certificate of achievements are 30 credit programs which can take someone maybe one year or extended over into a year and one-half. Then the A.A. degree is considered a two-year degree, although we track completion within a three-year time period. When we look at these workforce awards that have been conferred, you will see that there has been a drop in skill certificates, which is of concern, and resources and focus are being placed at the community colleges to turn this around. But this also is indicative of the fact that the community colleges have been the institutions who have experienced the largest drop in enrollment during the same period of time.

As we look across the NSHE institutions, the largest minority student population is our Hispanic students; one third of all the NSHE students are Hispanic. Once again, the performance and achievement of our Hispanic students continues to improve. If you look at the graduation rates, you will see the institutions, their overall graduation rates, and then the Hispanic graduation rates. We want to see those gaps closing as we are slowly seeing—with the exception of GBC, where their Hispanic graduation rates exceed their overall graduation rates—equitable achievement by all students, particularly as we are tracking Hispanic students.

I am going to give a highlight and information for each of our institutions who are doing way beyond what I can say in this short presentation, but they have been very intentional in their work. The CSN is proudly a majority MSI institution, we have a 36 percent Hispanic enrollment, and we proudly received the Title V Federal Grant based on our HSI designation for \$2.8 million to help guide students through gateway math. We also are trying to create welcoming environments with cultural programs and have started a mariachi program that is now first in the country.

Great Basin College is an emerging HSI. They are at 23 percent Hispanic enrollment out of their 3,800 students. They are actively engaged not only in the HSI task force at the NSHE level, but on their campuses as well and have formed their own HSI task force at their campus. The NSC also has received two Title V Grants, federal monies coming to

their institution and serving their students to increase the teacher education pipeline. They are now at 41 percent of their 4,500 students overall Hispanic enrollment, they are both an HSI and an AANAPISI institution. Truckee Meadows is at 34 percent Hispanic enrollment as of fall 2021 and they are making great strides in their Hispanic student achievement throughout. They are very active in their multicultural centers, as well as their task force that they have formed for their institution.

The UNLV also is an HSI and AANAPISI. They have probably held the designation of the Title III, or MSI designation, the longest in the state. They are 30 percent Hispanic, but you can see their distribution among their other ethnicities for their student enrollment. They have also earned several Title III MSI grants that have helped to bring federal money to their institution. And UNR is considered an emerging HSI; they are at 23.5 percent Hispanic enrollment and growing every year, as you can see in the chart. They are preparing themselves to become fully ready to be an HSI and compete for those federal funds, and they have intentionally incorporated this goal in their strategic planning. Finally, WNC is an HSI, 26 percent Hispanic, and they have been able to create a program in the state that is a standard of excellence with their Latino Leadership Academy yielding student success metrics exceeding the institution's average.

All of this information is shared with the task force. We learn from each other, and we can take those best practices back to our own institutions. But as our institutions' work is focused on these initiatives, and we are laser-focused on student services and student success, there continues to be much more that needs to be done. This list of recommendations from our students is part of a collaborative work that began between NSC and CSN and funded by the Title V Grants that we mutually hold. We held student focus groups and we learned from our Latinx students. And what we learned is that their experience is still resulting in their reflection that access to higher education is still a challenge. We need to do better to retain students of color once they are in our higher education institutions. They would need to see clearer pathways to completion. There is need for retention, resources, and support. They often sometimes even report almost a hostile college environment or experience, and the need for mentorship. This presents the challenge and the opportunity for our institutions to do better by our students, and that is the work we engage in on a daily basis.

When reflecting within our group and our task force meetings, we have identified goals for the 2022 Academic Year to plan for the HSI/MSI Symposium. And on a grand scale for the state, we held such a symposium in 2019 prior to the pandemic. We are looking forward to offering this in this spring semester, where we can bring best practices and national speakers to one of our institutions and invite the state institutions and their students to participate. We want to move and improve student success partnerships and initiatives and continue growing those so that it is meaningful to our students we serve. We are looking at various national standards for a data accountability framework such as Excelencia in Education. This allows our institutions to compare each other with our HSI work with very distinct metrics so that we can better compare the work and how we are meeting our goals, not only as a whole for NSHE, but also for the state. We also want to increase and see our NSHE students participating in national leadership development and internship opportunities.

Our MSI/HSI NSHE institutions are providing the gateway to higher education for students with the highest need. It is essential and critical that their work continues to be supported and developed so that as a state we may continue to reach our higher education and workforce schools with an intentional focus on equity in student success and eventual

prosperity for our students as they pursue the high-demand workforce programs. At this point, Chair Denis, I turn it over to you if there are any questions.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Questions?

You obviously went over all those HSI schools that have that now. Do we have any of our schools that do not currently have HSI designation?

Ms. Cota:

Yes. We have UNR and GBC that are considered emerging HSIs because they are somewhere between 20 and 25 percent Hispanic enrollment. We are anticipating that they are going to be able to apply for designation in the next few years when they reach that. But those are the only two. We only have three of our institutions that are considered an AANAPISI, and they are in the southern Nevada—UNLV, CSN, and NSC. Those are the AANAPISIs, and they are the ones who are eligible to apply for Title III funding.

Chair Denis:

Great. Thank you. Well, it seems that we have come a long way; because it seemed like yesterday, we did not have any that were HSIs. Now we do, and we have these opportunities.

Ms. Cota:

Yes. The work continues and that is what creates this opportunity. I appreciate the acknowledgment of how far our institutions have come in a very short period of time.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Assemblywoman Hansen in Carson City, do you have some questions?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you, Ms. Cota for the presentation. It was very insightful and if I could, I have a question on slide 12. I was distressed to see the percentage of the drop in enrollment. If I am reading things correctly, down 42.4 percent in 2020 from 2019, due to the COVID-19 ramifications. If I understood that right, 37.7 percent of Nevada high school graduates in 2020 enrolled at NSHE institutions within a year of graduation and that was down almost 43 percent. Is that right?

Ms. Cota:

It is down from 42 percent in 2019, meaning that it dropped approximately, not quite 4 percent from the prior year. It was a 4 percent drop from the prior year of students who are enrolling in higher education institutions within Nevada.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for that. Thankfully, that is not what I interpreted. Then on slide 13, NSC shows, in the table there, they looked like they had an increase all through COVID-19, if I am

looking at that correctly, where the other institutions had a decrease. I was curious why they had the increase, if that was due to COVID-19, but the others had the decrease?

Ms. Cota:

I believe, President DeRionne Pollard, if she were here, would have a wonderful answer. Yes, this is something that we are going to be asking and sharing the information of what NSC was doing throughout the COVID-19 period to continue to experience an increase in headcount. I do not have, myself, any specific answer to why and I was starting to say that President Pollard, if she were here, I am sure would point to several practices that they were engaging in there. I would be happy to get that reflection back to the Committee to see specifically, was there something that they were intentionally doing, and we also want to learn from them at the task force level.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you. We will look forward to that because it would be interesting to note how they were able to do that growth during that timeframe. Thank you for the presentation.

Chair Denis:

Thank you for that question and it is not a little bit of a gain; it is quite a bit.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you for the presentation. That was enlightening for me. Anyway, I do have a question now with the aspect of getting free community college to our students in Nevada. Do you see an uptick, or have you talked about bringing these numbers up with enrollment across the board, not only for Hispanic, but also Black, Indigenous, throughout our culture?

Ms. Cota:

That is an excellent question that we are constantly pondering on because it is not one single factor, it might be the NPS that we have in place. We are tracking those numbers. It may be the participation of our students with the FAFSA or financial aid application. We are seeing those. And unfortunately, what we are noting over these last couple of years is a lowered student engagement, whether it is applying for the NPS, whether it is our Pell Grant recipient rates, or the number of students filling out the FAFSA.

I could point to other factors that we are seeing. So, what we are working with, very intentionally, is our early college outreach to our students because we know that there is some level of disengagement that has happened and occurring, coming up through the high school period of time, especially these last couple of years, which is reflective in the drop of the pursuit of higher education from high school graduates. We absolutely are looking at enhancing that, bringing back our ability to reach these students, but reach them earlier on, which is tied to the conversation that you are having regarding dual enrollment. Because that early intervention, that early outreach, that early ability to have our students be not just college ready, but college proven can assist in their readiness to then go through the necessary steps to get them to our higher education institutions once they graduate.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you.

Chair Denis:

Any other questions? Not hearing any. Thank you for that presentation. We will close this agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM X—UPDATE ON [AB 319](#) (2021) AND DISCUSSION OF THE PILOT PROGRAM AT THE COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA OFFERING DUAL CREDIT COURSE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS

Chair Denis:

This agenda item is an update on AB 319 from the 2021 Session and discussion of the pilot program at CSN offering dual credit course opportunities for certain students. Dan Corsi is going to offer the presentation. Whenever you are ready, make sure you push the button and turn on the microphone.

Dan J. Corsi, Ed.D., Associate Vice President, Office of Academic Affairs, CSN:

Good afternoon, Committee members and guests. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today on behalf of the CSN to present to you a status update on AB 319. Some history, AB 319 was adopted last year, and I wanted to give credit to those individuals who sponsored the bill as well as those entities there that are in support of it. (Agenda Item X)

The intent of the AB 319 was to establish a dual credit pilot program as a collaboration between CSN and the CCSD here in southern Nevada. I want to make a distinction here, as I am learning, I am fairly new here, I have been in Nevada for a year; and I have had experience in higher education across several different states here in the last ten years or so in my career. The definitions in the way that schools and systems define dual enrollment early college are a little different.

The purpose of AB 319 specifically was to put a college instructor in the high school setting and the idea was to use an instructor in high school who is a credentialed faculty member with those credentials from the college perspective. To set the stage there for what this pilot program was designed to do: identifying and serving underserved populations; identifying low-income populations and placing these programs in those high need schools; giving students college readiness, particularly adding the math and English component, which puts them on track for future postsecondary education; and getting students who are interested in pursuing a career in high-demand industries. I will show you what those were identified as.

The five pathways that were identified when AB 319 was first adopted was automotive technologies, which was offered in the first year of this pilot; culinary; hospitality and tourism, which was offered in the first year of the pilot; mechanical technology, also known as advanced manufacturing; as well as graphic design. You will note that of those five programs, two of them were offered in the first year. At this point, I share a few of the challenges that came through during this pilot and now largely based on the credential ability of the high school instructor. In order to provide college level credit in that setting, that instructor has to be credential-able. They go through the same process that any part-time or full-time faculty member would go through, and they are held to that same standard.

So particularly in the areas of automotive technology and hospitality and tourism, we were able to locate those individuals, we have been in the process of and working with our local

high schools to identify teachers, in the high school, currently working, who are teaching in these CTE areas, who have the experience, the education, the training, and skills to be credential-able. We are looking to add to that list in terms of what is being offered in this upcoming year.

I did want to provide some basic demographic information. This is for the entire high school to “set the stage” for why these schools were selected, which is part of it and there is another component as well. First is Spring Valley High School, obviously a majority Hispanic-serving high school, as well as other minority populations. The Northwest Career and Technical Academy, you can see the breakdown, a majority Hispanic-serving school, and this is a career and technical academy focused on those CTE areas here in Clark County, and Desert Pines High School—75 percent Hispanic student population overall.

This is a breakdown by high school comparing the three across the board. This is specific to the pilot program. This is the number of students and the breakdown of the students who were engaged in this AB 319 pilot program among those two different CTE paths. You can see the breakdown. In both the fall and the spring semesters, 57 percent of the students were Hispanic, and 12 to 13 percent White between the two semesters and you can see the rest.

I want to call your attention to the success data that we generated there at the bottom of the first two boxes, and that is the pass/fail rate. So, “Ds” and above were considered passing, and then we pulled out the “Fs” for failure, and “withdrawal” for a withdrawal from the program. A couple of notes here: you can see that a 90/87 percent success rate is very high when you would compare these classes to other programs, other classes comparably. The withdrawal rate, meaning the students who did not persist from one term to another, or they dropped out of those particular courses, is small. This was over a 90 percent retention rate from the fall to the spring, which for someone who has been at high rates for some time, which is a very high rate. I understand it is a very small population, but again, to maintain that high level of retention I think speaks to the success of the program itself.

The bottom box brings some attention to the financial part of this initiative. You can see the breakdown between the fall and the spring terms as far as tuition waivers. Those amounts were covered by a philanthropic gift, as well as the books. The textbooks and the tuition costs that would have been received by the institution were provided from a philanthropic gift and that donor was an anonymous donor, but very generous, by the way. The last column is cost of instruction, and that was to pay the instructors a stipend for the number of sections taught by each instructor.

A couple of highlights to note—94 percent student retention rate. As I said, that is a very high level of success, when you look at retention from fall to spring. There is a projection to triple the number of students participating in this pilot for this Academic Year 2022, going into spring 2023. We have five additional CCSD high schools slated to also participate. That is where that tripling of the students is going to come into play and they will be enrolled in the fall. We are about to that point where enrollment will hit here in early mid-August. We do not have the exact figures yet until students come back on campus, but that is our projection at this point. I noted it earlier, but the student success rates were very high in terms of pass-fail rate for those courses when compared to their peers. That is the status update.

Chair Denis:

Do we have any questions? Yes, Senator Dondero Loop.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Thank you for the presentation. Do you know which of the five high schools are going to be added or have those not been determined?

Mr. Corsi:

At this point, we do not know exactly which five. We have some idea, but we have not publicly come out with that information. There is a lot of discussion between my office and the CCSD representatives. Actually, the other young lady who was supposed to be here, Ms. Leticia Wells, became ill this week and was not able to co-present. She may have had a little bit more to offer there; she is our director of Early College Programming. But we are still in talks with those schools.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Thank you. I was just curious. And thank you for "taking one for the team."

Chair Denis:

Other questions? I am not hearing that we have any other questions. Thank you for being with us this afternoon. We will close out this agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM XI—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Denis:

We are now going to go to our second to last item on the agenda, public comment. We will start here in Las Vegas. We do not have anybody coming forward to give public comment. We will go to Carson City. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to give public comment?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

It does not appear so.

Chair Denis:

Is there anyone online to participate in public comment?

BPS:

To participate in public comment, please press *9 on your phone to take place in the queue.

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA):

The NSEA has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years. The NSEA has consistently sounded the alarm about the dire educator shortage facing Nevada school districts heading into next school year. As reported this morning, in the *Nevada Independent*, with back to school over a week away for most Nevada students, we still have an unprecedented shortage of educators to teach our kids and make our schools

run. This past year, we witnessed a spike in educator departures from the state or the profession with low worker morale. Meanwhile, hiring into these vacant positions has proven slow and difficult.

The NSEA has been tracking vacant positions across Nevada school districts that total over 3,000. Most alarming, CCSD alone lists over 2,100 vacant positions, nearly as many as they listed a month ago. When kids go back to school a week from Monday, will there be a bus driver to pick them up or a teacher in their classroom?

We know this issue is not limited to Clark County. Washoe County currently lists nearly 500 vacancies, and there are nearly 300 vacancies across Douglas, Nye, and Elko. Nevada needs bold action to address this crisis. It is time to adequately fund public education in Nevada. It is time to respect and retain our experienced educators. It is "Time for 20."

Time for 20 means a 20 percent increase in educator pay and at least \$20 an hour for the workers who make our schools run. Time for 20 means reaching an average class size of 20 students. This is the right-sized response to our educator shortage and would get educators the pay they need to make ends meet. One-time retention bonuses are a nice gesture, but as prices are climbing faster than any point in the last 40 years with the CPI approaching 9 percent, Nevada needs to get serious about raises for educators that keep up with the long-term cost of living. Remember, even when inflation comes down, prices and the cost of living, almost always continue to go up.

As we all heard from the Economic Forum last month, state revenue is outperforming projections by 25 percent or close to \$800 million. This news comes as our education system is hemorrhaging staff. Educators and our students need bold action, and Nevada has the resources to make a big impact right now. It is Time for 20. (Agenda Item XI)

Chair Denis:

Thank you; BPS, can we go to the next caller.

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen:

First, I want to say thank you, Chair, and this outstanding Committee, for listening to the people who testified. I want to thank all of you, because of [AB 235](#) (2021) (I think it was introduced by the awesome Assemblywoman Brittney Miller) and AB 260; my children were eligible for those. Because of AB 260, my son was in the National Guard, he got his tuition paid for especially by the GGMS. The dual program that they were talking about, when he was a junior—because now, he is going to UNR for engineering—he got into calculus, and they helped with the transportation. I want to thank you and everyone on this Committee and all the people that presented; it does take a village.

As a blind mom who lost her job in the 2020 pandemic. I was in dire need of help, and the school, bless their hearts, all the academic advisors stepped up and they gave me a modem for my son to finish his school, and he finished in the top 10 percent in his class. "It takes a village." I want to say thank you and I appreciate all of you. A big shoutout to Coral Academy School in Reno, Nevada, because of their tutelage—all my kids went there—and they got successful educations. I do agree with the person who spoke before me. We have to take care of our teachers because they take care of our children, our future, when we are at home or work for the six or seven hours.

Also, some of the visually impaired students, they are left out of this presentation to which I was listening. Yes, we have all the diversity, ethnicity, but I did not hear anything about students with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), some students with visual impairment. The only thing that is missing is with the blind; everything else works. They need a teacher who knows about accessible technology that will teach the blind students how to use the Internet with their talking screen readers so when they go to college, they know how to navigate the system, whether that is Canvas—or the other thing that I cannot think of it right now. But they need help, and I hope there is some money set aside for assistive technology teachers for visually impaired students.

Thank you, and happy Friday. Take care.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. Let us go to the next caller.

BPS:

The line is open and working, but there are no callers at this time.

Chair Denis:

Thank you. I want to thank everybody for being here today and all our presenters. I think we might have one or two presentations at the next one, but as far as all the presentations we have received, we have finished those up. The next time we meet, we will have some quick presentations at the beginning and then we are going to spend the rest of time doing a work session, having discussions about what kind of legislation we want to support.

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for August 9th at 6 p.m., where we are going to talk about school governance. And then our last regular meeting is scheduled for August 30th in Carson City. It is currently scheduled to begin at 12 p.m. to give you time to be able to fly up that morning, and the flights are late enough that we should be able to fly back that evening.

Thank you everyone for being here. Thank you for your time. We are adjourned.

AGENDA ITEM XII—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Baker
Research Policy Assistant

Jennifer Ruedy
Deputy Research Director

Jen Sturm
Principal Policy Analyst

Alex Drozdoff
Senior Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item IV	Jen Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Alex Drozdoff, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item V	Jen Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB Alex Drozdoff, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VI A-1	Guy Hobbs, Chair, Commission on School Funding (CSF)	Recommendations-Commission on School Funding
Agenda Item VI A-2	Guy Hobbs, Chair, CSF	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VI A-3	Guy Hobbs, Chair, CSF	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VII	Renée Davis, Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs and Community Colleges, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE)	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VIII A-1	José Quiroga, Research Analyst, Academic and Student Affairs and Community Colleges, NSHE	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VIII A-2	José Quiroga, Research Analyst, Academic and Student Affairs and Community Colleges, NSHE	Letter of Support-WIG Pilot Program
Agenda Item IX	Clarissa M. Cota, J.D., Vice President, President's Office, North Las Vegas Campus, College of Southern Nevada (CSN)	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item X	Dan J. Corsi, Ed.D., Associate Vice President, Office of Academic Affairs, CSN	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item XI	Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association	Written Testimony

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.