

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
AND
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
SUBCOMMITTEES ON K-12/HIGHER EDUCATION/CIP**

**Eightieth Session
March 29, 2019**

The joint meeting of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 8:11 a.m. on Friday, March 29, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Chris Brooks
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Joyce Woodhouse

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Assemblyman John Hambrick



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst
Jaimarie Ortega, Program Analyst
Carmen M. Neveau, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After roll was called, Chair Carlton reminded Subcommittee members of subcommittee rules, and she opened the hearing for the first presentation.

EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NDE - OTHER STATE EDUCATION PROGRAMS (101-2699)

BUDGET PAGE K-12 EDUCATION-22

Jonathan P. Moore, Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education (NDE), introduced the Department's PowerPoint presentation titled "Department of Education" dated March 29, 2019, [Exhibit C](#), for budget account (BA) 2699, Other State Education Programs. Page 2 and page 3 of [Exhibit C](#) highlighted the vision, mission, and goal for NDE.

Mr. Moore stated that the first program was the Read by Grade 3 (RBG3) program with base funding of \$20.5 million per year from State General Fund. In accordance with statutory requirements, subgrants were awarded based on competitive applications to provide supports for early literacy in grades K-3. Local education agencies used subgrants to provide learning strategists, professional development, and evidence-based reading interventions to students who needed support to meet grade level expectations. Budget Account (BA) 2699 included increased funding of \$10 million annually to fund learning strategists in every elementary school and \$1.2 million per year to enhance professional development. Approval of this funding required consideration of a change in the funding process from competitive grants to a formula-based distribution of RBG3 funds. Since the start of the RBG3 program, reading scores for Nevada students had improved, according to the 2017 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); however, Nevada fourth graders, shown as the blue line on page 15 of [Exhibit C](#), still scored below the national average in every subgroup. Continued and expanded funding for the RBG3 program, he suggested, would ensure more Nevada students were able to read.

All Nevada elementary schools were required to include RBG3 requirements. The map on page 16 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Moore continued, highlighted the local education agencies that received RBG3 competitive grants during the 2017-2018 academic year. Data was collected from the most recent RBG3 cohort, presently in Phase III. Competitive literacy

grantees and promising results were found on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) grade 3 English Language Arts (ELA) assessment. Three school districts, Clark, Douglas, and Washoe, outperformed the state average in almost all subgroups, including students with disabilities, English learners, and students eligible for free and reduced-price lunches. He noted that 45 percent of all districts that were awarded RBG3 Phase III funds, or 9 out of 20 districts, reported a score higher than the state average. Under RBG3 retention sections of Nevada statute, schools were required to consider good cause exemptions when considering whether a student demonstrated the expected level of proficiency on grade 3 SBAC ELA assessments and whether that exemption should be considered for promotion or retention. Acceptable good-cause exemptions were listed on page 17 of [Exhibit C](#).

Page 18 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Moore noted, presented an external evaluation conducted by ACS Ventures, LLC, that recommended continuation of the RBG3. The evaluation stated that the program demonstrated a positive effect on student achievement, specifically identifying struggling students, providing interventions, and improving literacy.

The next program included under BA 2699 and presented by Mr. Moore was the Turnaround Schools program. The turnaround grant was funded by State General Fund in the amount of \$2.5 million per year. Subgrants awarded in Nevada supported a school leadership network for the development of leadership capacity in all school leaders who worked in "turnaround" schools, downward-trending schools, and any school recently released from the star-rating star list. Turnaround funding allowed NDE to partner and collaborate with districts and schools to resolve specific needs.

Page 22 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Moore stated, presented an external evaluation conducted by ACS Ventures, LLC, and recommended continued funding for "turnaround" schools.

Andrea Osborne, Director of Fiscal Support, Business and Support Services, Department of Education (NDE), said that the Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG) program was a state-based, nationally accredited program that supported at-risk students likely to drop out of high school. The program provided student support, including workplace readiness skills, career pathway guidance, and academic and career mentoring, that enabled students to graduate from high school and be college- or career-ready. She said that decision unit Enhancement (E) 277 recommended an additional \$1.1 million for fiscal year (FY) 2020 and an additional \$1.2 million in FY 2021 to increase funding for Nevada's Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG Nevada) program so more schools and students would be served by the program. Page 25 of [Exhibit C](#) indicated the number of students, programs, and school districts served by JAG Nevada in FY 2018. With approval of E-277, the number of students served would increase from 2,814 to 3,640, and the number of programs provided would increase from 45 to 56 over the 2019-2021 biennium. Page 26 of [Exhibit C](#), she noted, represented the JAG Nevada program outcomes in FY 2018 by regions served.

Mr. Moore said that the College and Career Readiness Grant program, as specified on page 28 of [Exhibit C](#), was funded with State General Fund and was available to all middle and high school students. The program supported four programs, including advanced placement; dual enrollment; science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM); and work-based learning. The focus was to increase participation by low-income students and rural students in those programs. The recommended funding was \$5 million per year for dual enrollment, STEM, and worked-based learning, and \$662,750 per year for advanced placement over the 2019-2021 biennium.

Mr. Moore presented the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program, established during the 2015 Legislative Session. Funds for this program were allocated on a per-pupil basis as statutorily required, and GATE funding was used for educational programming for identified pupils through state approved assessments.

From page 33 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Moore explained, current funding included in S.B. 544 of the 79th Session (2017) for the Early Childhood Education program was roughly \$3.3 million in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium. Nevada's prekindergarten program was first offered in 2001. Half-day seats were available for three- and four-year-olds regardless of income eligibility requirements. With the addition of a United States Department of Education federal Preschool Development Grant (PDG), 3,023 four-year-old children had received prekindergarten services. This number included 1,942 half-day seats that were expanded to full-day seats and 1,081 new full-day seats. As the PDG neared expiration, NDE recommended funding for a single state prekindergarten program by moving funding from BA 2699 to BA 2709. Upon approval, state funding for prekindergarten services would follow requirements in Senate Bill (S.B.) 84. He added that requirements were established as part of the PDG and included four-year-old children with families at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty guidelines, a full-day seat that equated to 25 hours per week, maximum class size of 20 students, or a 10:1 student to teacher ratio, teacher qualifications that required a minimum of a bachelor's degree, inclusive classrooms, and a family engagement plan.

Mr. Moore stated that page 35 of [Exhibit C](#) included two graphs. The first graph was titled "Number of Pre-K Seats by Funding Source," and indicated the number of half-day seats were colored in dark blue, the number of half-day seats that were expanded to full-day seats with PDG funding were colored in light blue, and new full-day seats that were added with PDG funding were colored in green. The second graph was titled "Funding Totals by Source," with state prekindergarten funding in blue and the PDG funding in green. He noted that those charts began with the 2011-2012 academic year.

Ms. Osborne presented the National Board Certification program to Subcommittee members. The program reimbursed teachers who wanted to be certified. This assessment, if passed, allowed teachers to be recognized for highly accomplished teaching practices. Similarly, school nurses were important members of school communities who supported the health and wellbeing of students. In recognition of the school nurses' role and contributions, decision

unit E-225 recommended funding for National Board Certification, the highest standard of professional certification for school nurses. National certification advanced the quality of school health services and school nurse practices in the same manner as national certification for teachers recognized excellence in teaching. For school nurses to receive the National Board Certification, the only cost was the cost of the exam, and no coursework was required. The cost of the exam was \$375 with a \$75 fee for an optional practice test. School nurses could recertify every five years by retaking the exam or by showing proof of 75 continuing education units that pertained to school nursing. The NDE did not currently reimburse teacher recertification nor did the recommended funding include teacher recertification.

Mr. Moore continued with his presentation on page 39 of [Exhibit C](#) and stated that the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program served as a foundation for high-skill, high-wage, and in-demand career pathways that supported Nevada's workforce and promoted Nevada's economic development. Nevada's CTE program had demonstrated positive outcomes for students, and CTE students had graduated from high school college- and career-ready. Authority for CTE grant funding was found in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.330 through 388.370. Policies for CTE programs were found in *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 389.800. Nevada's funding for CTE had increased from \$3 million in FY 2015 to \$10.5 million in FY 2016, and then was sustained at \$12.5 million per fiscal year since 2017. Decision unit E-275 recommended an additional \$1 million per fiscal year to increase state CTE funding to local education agencies for the development of new CTE programs or for the expansion or improvement of existing CTE programs. The CTE performance measures of CTE students demonstrated on the CTE workforce readiness skills assessment continued to improve, and CTE students consistently outperformed non-CTE students in graduation rates by approximately 10 percent each year.

Page 41 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Moore said, demonstrated secondary enrollment by gender across the state in all CTE programs, and in high-skill, high-demand CTE programs of study. Data analyzed by NDE was depicted on page 42 of [Exhibit C](#) to identify program gaps, inequities, and/or opportunities. The NDE planned to continue the analysis through FY 2019, and with the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V), would work to increase equity and access for all students in CTE programs. Page 43 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Moore continued, compared current and potential CTE funding per student, if decision unit E-275 was approved.

Mr. Moore explained that the Adult Education program on page 45 of [Exhibit C](#) supported school districts with subgrants that were awarded to promote adult high school diplomas. Approximately 68 percent of program funding was allocated to school districts to support adult students, and 32 percent of program funding was allocated to correctional institutions, through school districts, to support incarcerated adults pursuing high school diplomas, high school equivalency certificates, or career training to become self-sufficient upon release. Adult high school diploma funding was reduced from \$22.2 million in

FY 2011 to \$18.3 million in FY 2012, with level funding since FY 2012. Mr. Moore stated that decision unit E-276 recommended an additional \$1 million in funding for each year of the 2019-2021 biennium. This increased funding would be provided to local education agencies in response to the 19 percent increased enrollment over the past five years. Adults served by the Adult Education program in FY 2018 were represented on page 46 of [Exhibit C](#).

Page 47 of [Exhibit C](#), according to Mr. Moore, illustrated the longitudinal enrollments over a five-year period for the two types of adults served by the Adult Education program. The purple columns indicated total enrollment. He stated that if decision unit E-276 was approved, page 48 of [Exhibit C](#) represented the projected data and outcomes.

Ms. Osborne said that BA 2699 also included the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation (NITEP) program, nicknamed Top Gun for Teachers, which was highlighted on pages 50 through 52 of [Exhibit C](#). Established in 2017, the NITEP program paired student teachers with master teachers, a research-based practice that ensured successful transition to a classroom setting. A proposed amendment expanded the NITEP program to serve more teachers and included a cohort of new principals to be paired with master principals to aid in the transition to school leadership.

Chair Carlton noted the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program's recommended funding increase of \$1 million in each fiscal year and asked about the development of any new CTE programs. She also asked the Department to discuss the CTE programs available at middle school/junior high schools.

Kristine Nelson, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options, Department of Education (NDE), replied that because of an alignment with high-skilled, high-wage, in-demand programs of study, she anticipated that there would be additional programs developed to feed the educational workforce pipeline, and she expected the removal of programs that were not aligned. The NDE had hired a consultant, WestEd, to produce a report by the end of March 2019. That report would provide an analysis of existing CTE programs statewide, regionally, and school-specific to identify aligned and nonaligned programs. Regarding middle school programs, she noted that [Assembly Bill \(A.B.\) 482 of the 79th Session \(2017\)](#) offered the possibility of using State General Funds for middle school career exploration programs. The State Board of Education and the NDE-approved middle school standards for CTE programs. Those middle school programs were also eligible under Perkins V, and promotion of middle school programs would continue.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any particular CTE programs under consideration, and Ms. Nelson said that the WestEd report would help to identify needed programs.

Chair Carlton noted that the CTE program's graduation rate of 91 percent was better than the state graduation rate, and she acknowledged the results from the program. Regarding special populations, she wondered whether there would be increased enrollments. Ms. Nelson said that recruitment for special populations was a requirement under Perkins V, so increased enrollment was expected. To meet the requirement for designated funding for recruitment of special populations, the NDE had worked with the Lyon County School District over the past five years to provide support through a federal grant for special populations.

Chair Carlton stated that for the CTE special population, specifically for students with individualized education programs (IEPs) and students with disabilities, the graduation rate was 83.5 percent compared to a statewide graduation rate of 66 percent. She also noted that English language learners in CTE programs had a graduation rate of 89.3 percent compared to a statewide graduation rate of 76 percent.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson recalled that during the interim, the Legislative Committee on Education talked about CTE programs, and she remembered that in the fall of 2018, there were unspent CTE dollars and discussions about areas in the state that did not have any CTE programs. She questioned which high schools, school districts, and charter schools had CTE programs. Ms. Nelson said that there were 79 CTE programs in 14 of the 17 school districts. Because CTE programs had been successful, there was an intent to introduce CTE programs to all rural and urban schools. She had provided the details to Fiscal Analysis Division staff, but would provide the details again, if needed.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson wondered if once the WestEd report was received, the funding allocation would first be applied to existing programs, or whether schools without CTE programs would be funded first. Ms. Nelson said that by statute, approximately 30 percent of the state appropriation went toward competitive funding that would target schools without CTE programs. The remaining 70 percent of the appropriation was for existing programs based on previous year enrollments.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked Ms. Nelson to verify whether 30 percent of the \$1 million increase would go to schools without CTE programs or whether 30 percent of the total appropriation would be used for schools without CTE programs. Ms. Nelson said that the \$1 million, if approved, would go to BA 2699, increasing the funding to \$13.5 million. Thirty percent of \$13.5 million would then be used for competitive grants for schools that did not have CTE programs.

Senator Woodhouse referred to page 41 of [Exhibit C](#) and noted the lagging number of girls enrolled in CTE programs. She asked whether there were plans to increase the number of girls enrolled in CTE programs and if there was data to demonstrate the ethnicity breakdown of students enrolled in CTE programs. She wanted to ensure that disparities in those two areas were addressed. Ms. Nelson said that there was specific funding in the Perkins V grant that was used for nontraditional programs. Data was deceiving, she noted, because the

Perkins V nontraditional performance indicator had been met. She stated that improvements could be made for both males and females in nontraditional occupations. Regarding the breakdown of CTE data based on ethnicity, she said that she could provide a report with this breakdown included. Senator Woodhouse asked for a copy of that report.

Hearing no other questions on the CTE program, Chair Carlton asked the Subcommittee members for questions on the Adult Education program.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked how the adult high school diploma program could increase school districts' four-, five-, and six-year cohort graduation rates. Tracy Moore, Education Programs Professional; Adult, Alternative and Distance Education; Office of Career Readiness; Adult Learning and Education Options; NDE, said that the NDE tracked graduation rates because many students who entered the Adult Education program were recent dropouts. Each program reported to school districts, and local programs reported to the K-12 Administration about those students who had completed a high school diploma in two years of the date the student's cohort would have graduated.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked how the allocation percentage between the regular and correctional programs was determined. Mr. Moore said that directors of adult education worked with the NDE to determine an equitable way to divide the adult education funds, which included correctional facility education. The split of 32 percent for corrections and 68 percent for adult education in the school districts was established in fiscal year (FY) 2013 and has remained at those levels. The allocation funding was broken down further so that 30 percent of the 32 percent funded a program for outcomes, and 70 percent of the 32 percent funded the program based on enrollment. Enrollment was tracked for each school district to determine a three-year rolling average. This average eliminated spikes in a single year that could have potentially underfunded a program.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked whether, given the growth of the corrections enrollment, the percentage splits would be reviewed and adjusted if necessary. Mr. Moore said that there were plans to revisit the split calculations this year. The percentage of total student enrollment had reached the 32 percent mark, and he anticipated that the rate would remain the same while studies were conducted to determine the increase for subsequent years.

Assemblywoman Spiegel noted that the Adult Education program reverted unexpended funding to the State General Fund at the end of the previous two biennia, and she asked why there was a \$1 million increase in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium. Mr. Moore had worked with staff from the Fiscal Analysis Division to attempt to determine the reverted amounts. A change in leadership in one district that did not have the ability to track funding sufficiently was one reason for the reversion. He anticipated that less than 5 percent would be reverted after the 2019-2021 biennium because of better tracking capabilities.

Hearing no other questions on Adult Education, Chair Carlton asked Subcommittee members for questions on the Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG) program. Both Assemblyman Thompson and Senator Kieckhefer served on the JAG Board of Directors and stated that they would refrain from participating.

Senator Woodhouse asked for the criteria that would be used to prioritize between high schools that wanted to expand an existing JAG program by adding new programs and high schools that wanted to offer a JAG program but did not operate any existing JAG programs.

Rene Cantu, Jr., Executive Director, JAG Nevada, said that JAG Nevada had programs in 13 counties, including Esmeralda County through Tonopah High School. A top priority for adding programs in the future was to help serve Eureka, Storey, Lander, and Pershing Counties if those counties wanted JAG programs. He noted that JAG Nevada was a statewide program with a waiting list of schools that had expressed interest in a JAG program. Decisions about whether to add new schools or to add programs to schools with an existing program were made based on advice from superintendents who identified schools with the highest needs.

Senator Woodhouse knew that there was interest in JAG programs and asked whether JAG programs would be expanded into middle schools that fed into high schools. Mr. Cantu replied that consideration had been given to expanding programs to middle schools, but with limited funding, NDE had chosen to focus on doing one thing right. The national JAG program had an effective middle school program that could be used as a model. He requested guidance from Subcommittee members on the direction JAG Nevada should take in the future to best serve Nevada.

Chair Carlton had previously expressed her concerns to Mr. Cantu about what happened when JAG programs left a school, and she asked him to describe a decision to leave a school and the process that would take place after the decision was made. Mr. Cantu recalled that he and Frank Woodbeck, Chair, JAG Nevada Board of Directors, had spoken with Chair Carlton before the decision was made to remove a JAG program from a high school in Chair Carlton's district after only one year. He noted that an accreditation requirement of JAG and JAG Nevada was to deliver the program with fidelity. Delivering a program with fidelity required full cooperation and assistance from the school for selecting students and involving counselors. Without that support, program delivery was compromised. Also, without disclosing personnel matters, an onsite JAG staff member was given a difficult time at the school. Mr. Cantu indicated that he had worked closely with this high school for many years and had written two Upward Bound grants for the high school that were still in effect. He hoped that the JAG program would return to that high school in the future.

Senator Denis recognized that JAG Nevada received State General Fund and grants. He wondered about the \$725,000 in grants that were scheduled to expire. Mr. Cantu said that JAG engaged in fundraising through corporations and foundations to expand its ability to serve more students. As an example, he cited the Go Deep grant—an experimental study and a national demonstration initiative. The Go Deep effort was an attempt to demonstrate the effect JAG Nevada had on students when programs were taken to a larger scale, such as in North Las Vegas. The JAG Nevada program was able to leverage three existing JAG programs in North Las Vegas with commitments from JAG National through AT&T and the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and a grant from Clark County. Part of the problem with fundraising was that those funds had three-year commitments. There were currently ten JAG programs in North Las Vegas and students from ethnic and racial minorities had graduation rates in the 90-plus percentile. Fundraising for JAG Nevada would continue, but he did not want to compromise students based on the uncertainty of fundraising.

Senator Denis noted that 3,244 students were currently served by JAG Nevada and asked whether the intent was to increase student enrollment to 4,100 or whether the intent was to add 4,100 students to the existing 3,244 students in the program. Mr. Contu said that the intent was to increase student enrollment to 4,100. Every specialist served 45 to 60 students. The JAG Nevada program decided not to limit the student-to-specialist ratio and was still able to achieve the 90-plus percent rate for graduation and employment of students. By increasing the national limit of 35 students for each specialist, Nevada was able to lower the cost per student and to serve more students. Other states now wanted to copy the Nevada model.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson compared the allocations of different programs included under budget account (BA) 2699. She noted that recommended enhancement funding for the JAG Nevada program was roughly \$2.3 million for the 2019-2021 biennium, and recommended enhancement funding for the Adult Education program was roughly \$2 million for the biennium. She wondered why JAG programs were more beneficial than other programs under the same budget account.

Ms. Nelson explained that programs in BA 2699 worked in tandem with other programs, but JAG Nevada received a higher allocation because the JAG Nevada program targeted a population of students likely to drop out of high school. The Adult Education program, in contrast, was intended for all students, both CTE students and non-CTE students.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson noted that in tougher times, services provided by nonprofit companies were the first to be decreased or eliminated. Nonprofits, she knew, tried not to be dependent on one source of funding. She wondered how JAG Nevada would continue to operate if the grant funding ceased. Mr. Cantu said that the JAG organization had a director of resource development who engaged in an active, ongoing fundraising process. The intent was to diversify its funding portfolio to ensure that economic downturns

would not affect operations. The JAG Nevada organization was five years old now, and part of the struggle for newer organizations was to build a positive reputation and to not rely on any one source of funding too heavily.

Frank Woodbeck, Chair, JAG Nevada Board of Directors, said that JAG Nevada worked to ensure its program was sustainable into the future. In a downturn of the economy, and if state funding was not provided, JAG Nevada would be forced to reduce services. For sustainability of JAG Nevada, fundraising efforts would continue, because fundraising also helped to ensure that JAG Nevada continued to grow. He added that the Go Deep project in North Las Vegas was intended to provide access to CTE programs for students, many of which were provided at the Desert Rose Tech Center. He hoped to expand access to CTE programs in the Las Vegas area by working with the Clark County School District director. This effort would also expand the Go Deep demonstration project. Mr. Cantu said that JAG Nevada taught soft skills and the CTE program taught technical skills, so JAG Nevada partnered with the Signature Academies and CTE Department in the Washoe County School District. He added that students targeted by JAG Nevada tended to be minorities and low-income students, as well as students with high absenteeism and lower grade point averages (GPAs.)

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson commented that she was cognizant that funds could not always be provided to the nonprofit sector, and she worried about the sustainability of nonprofit organizations that relied on state allocations.

Senator Woodhouse mentioned the demographics of the student population involved in the JAG program. She wondered what the JAG Nevada process was for student selection. Mr. Cantu said that JAG Nevada used the national model's recommendations for student recruitment. There were several elements, one of which was an advisory committee at every high school. The advisory committee consisted of assistant principals, resource officers, administrative staff, teachers, and other individuals recommended by principals. Involvement in the JAG program was not compulsory for students. The advisory committee looked for students with more than 13 absences in the past year and a GPA around the 2.0 level. The committee also looked for students with disciplinary incidents, an indicator of problems. Once students were identified, presentations and interviews were conducted to determine whether students were a good fit for the program. There were 32 barriers to the program, including academic success, socioeconomic status, familial situation, and disabilities. He estimated that students eligible for the program had an average of five or six barriers. The three key criteria, however, were whether the student needed the program as determined by the barriers, whether the student could benefit from the program, and of most importance, whether the student wanted to be in the program. He noted that there were no federal requirements for participation, so students were not rejected.

Senator Denis asked how determinations were made between expanding into a new high school and expanding to offer more than one CTE program in an existing high school. Mr. Cantu said that JAG Nevada had an active board of directors that helped to guide the organization's strategic planning. The star performance framework used in Nevada was also a factor, but he said that no decision was made without the superintendent's input, and parity for northern and southern JAG programs was another factor.

Senator Denis acknowledged the work done by JAG Nevada. He had an opportunity to talk with several students and was impressed by the graduation rates for students who likely would not have graduated otherwise.

Chair Carlton had a breakdown of JAG Nevada expenses. She asked about recommended funding of \$45,000 per year for travel, and she requested more information on the supportive services that were budgeted at \$185,000 per year.

Debbie Tarantino, Director of Finance/Operations, JAG Nevada, said that supportive services included tutoring services; help obtaining work cards, health cards, and bus passes to get to school, job interviews, or work; and other supportive services. She noted that funds were not paid to students, but were paid to support students. Barriers to graduation and barriers to entering the workforce were removed with this funding.

Chair Carlton asked Ms. Tarantino to provide a list of all the supportive services that were offered by JAG Nevada. Regarding travel, Ms. Tarantino said that coordinators, supervisors, and management personnel were required to travel between Las Vegas and Carson City, as well as programs in rural areas. Training efforts also required travel. She noted that additional questions would be asked, but Fiscal Analysis Division staff would contact JAG Nevada for answers. Given the work that was being performed and the growth that had occurred, and because JAG Nevada had been operational for five years, she believed it was time to evaluate the program.

Hearing no other questions from Subcommittee members on the JAG Nevada, Chair Carlton asked for questions from the Subcommittee on the Read by Grade 3 (RBG3) program.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson referred to the RBG3 program's competitive grant process. She knew that grant funds were often awarded midyear, schools had to scramble to hire reading specialists, and she understood that competitive grants were statutorily required. She wondered why the grants were not awarded based on need and lowest test scores, because the funds could get into schools faster than through a competitive process. She asked whether NDE had any strong basis for using a competitive grant process, because the NDE statement should be added to the record.

Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional, Office of State Student Services, NDE, said that the RBG3 competitive grant process was complicated. Each biennium, the opportunity to initiate a competitive grant process before the end of the legislative session had been challenging. In recent years, the needs of local education agencies (LEAs) had been considered. For the current year, a process was selected that allowed for continued funding for LEAs that had successfully competed in the previous year. This allowance was a partial continuation so decisions about staffing could be made, followed the next year with a partial continuation and partial competitive grant process for the 2018-2019 academic year. The NDE had moved to provide a consistent process in determining need within the competitive process. The process looked at the percent of students who were not reading proficiently by grade 3, the level of free or reduced-price lunch eligibility in the school, and the percent of English learners.

Mr. Wilson said there was a stronger emphasis on the competitive process over the past few years to ensure that the LEA-identified strategies were aligned with evidence-based practices. This focus ensured funds were used for students who needed extra support and that the supports had a strong likelihood of success.

Seng-Dao Yang Keo, Director, Office of Student and School Supports, NDE, said that the rationale for competitive grants was because NDE was advised by policy makers, researchers, and education organizations nationwide that the highest performing systems had structures to incentivize, support, and guide schools and school districts to use funds for tasks that were effective and efficient. Under the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), there was a movement to ensure that evidence-based interventions were prioritized at the state level through, as an example, a competitive grant application process. She stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 7 of the 79th Session (2017) enabled NDE to move forward with state grants and ensured that as good stewards of public dollars, grant funds were spent on effective programs. Specifically, this responsibility referred to ESSA evidence levels 1, 2, 3, and 4. She said that ESSA evidence level 1 required randomized control trial studies, ESSA evidence level 2 specified quasi-experimental studies, and ESSA evidence level 3 mandated correlational studies. For all three of those levels, there was a requirement for a statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes. Essentially, that meant money was being spent on functions that were evidence-based, and functions that had data and research to demonstrate effectiveness.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson believed that there were not a lot of programs that met the requirements of ESSA evidence levels, but she wondered why the practice was to request an application with the chance of rejection instead of instructing the school on effective strategies and providing money to support those strategies. Schools in other states had effective programs, and she wondered why successful programs could not be used as a model for Nevada. Mr. Moore said Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's suggestion was a viable option in the event that competitive-based funding was changed to formula-based funding.

Chair Carlton stated that the competitive grant process was not specified in statute, but was a session bill from the 78th Session (2015) that was not codified. That process was continued through practice through fiscal year (FY) 2017, but nothing mandated the continuation of the competitive grant process. She asked Mr. Moore to provide further detail to Fiscal Analysis Division staff on options, because there were concerns about the competitive grant process, and this was a good time for further discussion on methods other than competitive grant awards.

Assemblyman Thompson appreciated the discussions about reading readiness, because Assembly Bill (A.B.) 289 also addressed reading. He asked for more information about rural school districts. He knew that all schools were required to have a learning strategist on staff and asked what challenges rural school districts without learning strategists faced in recruiting and hiring those strategists. He wondered what the NDE was doing to ensure the availability of qualified candidates.

Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional, Office of State Student Services, NDE, said that feedback from rural school districts indicated that it was a challenge to recruit and hire employees who wanted to live and work in rural areas, and that even with competitive grant funding, there were often insufficient funds to provide for an additional staff member. It was not unusual in some rural areas that grant funding was used as a stipend for a teacher on staff to provide additional supports as a part-time assignment. Formula-based funding considerations had been reviewed for smaller rural schools. There were 20 schools in Nevada with 10 or fewer students in grades K-3. Small schools with one or two classrooms for the elementary grade range found that it was difficult to bring in a third staff member to serve exclusively as a learning strategist in that setting. The ability to retain teachers in rural settings was difficult as well, especially with limited funding.

Assemblyman Thompson noted that the goal was to have a learning strategist in every school, and even with enhanced funding, there were often not enough funds available to hire a learning strategist. He asked how the NDE identified schools to share learning strategists. Mr. Moore said there was not enough funding to provide a learning strategist in every school, but he asked the Legislature to fund equity for smaller schools. This might include ensuring that a formula allocation was based on a per pupil rate, although he was unsure of the formula. He believed that the NDE was best suited to provide guidance and technical assistance about other models, and the funds would be provided to each school district for allocation to schools. The NDE would suggest that school districts consider the star-rating system, geographical factors, examination of relevant data, and the home location of the best candidate for the position.

Assemblyman Thompson noted that the program had been active and asked whether the districts had performed due diligence. He requested an example of a successful shared learning strategist position. Mr. Moore distinguished between grants that were allocated in a competitive process in which districts provided plans that were aligned with evidence

levels, and the new model that required a calculation of funding based on a formula and where school districts attested to alignment with evidence-based practices.

Mr. Wilson added that the NDE was in the process of analyzing what different local education agencies were doing. Several rural school districts shared one learning strategist across two schools because of limited funding, especially in situations where the rural schools did not have the greatest need for a learning strategist. Where schools were not located too far apart, having one learning strategist working part time in each school worked successfully.

Chair Carlton asked about the difficulties in recruiting learning strategists in rural areas. Mr. Wilson recognized the challenges faced by rural and smaller schools. One challenge was that the schools needed to have financial resources to commit to a learning strategist position on more than an annual basis. Other challenges included the development of recruitment and retention strategies, and the schools' need to work collaboratively to provide the support that students needed.

Seng-Dao Yang Keo, Director, Office of Student and School Supports, NDE, added that another creative and effective solution would be to look at policies and strategies used by other states to improve abilities, skills, and expertise for educators in rural areas.

Chair Carlton understood that there was a need to fund learning strategists on a consistent basis. Annual funding did not offer a promise of long-term job stability. She also understood that technology should be pursued for those schools that wished to share learning strategist positions, but she recognized that reliable broadband had not been expanded to rural areas.

Assemblywoman Swank asked about the additional \$1.2 million. She stated that learning strategists provided professional development to kindergarten through fourth grade teachers, but she also saw a recommendation for additional funding for professional development. She wondered how the amount of \$1.2 for professional development was determined. Mr. Wilson said that the defined role of learning strategists was to provide teaching concepts and support to fellow elementary school educators. There was a need to improve abilities, skills, and expertise for those educators so learning strategists needed to be trained to share. The \$1.2 million would provide \$2,950 per school to assist in improving reading instruction in the schools. Specific needs in each school were identified and included teaching ability improvements, skills and expertise in using data to make decisions that improved reading instruction, the development of leadership's ability to observe and support effective classroom instruction, and the development of specific evidence-based strategies. Those strategies would be moved to classrooms for Tier 1 instruction with follow-up interventions for struggling Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Assemblywoman Swank asked for verification that the \$1.2 million recommended for the learning strategists to provide professional development to teachers was in addition to other recommended funding for professional development. Mr. Wilson replied that the Governor's proposal to provide learning strategists under Read by Grade 3 funding would require all the funding available plus \$10 million, with funding left for other professional development.

Assemblywoman Swank did not understand why there was funding for professional development in two different places. She asked how many school districts and charter schools applied for Read by Grade 3 grants and were unsuccessful. She wondered what support was given to schools that were not granted funds so those schools might be selected for Read by Grade 3 funding under a grant in future years.

Mr. Wilson said that staff was currently reviewing the number of LEAs that were not awarded funding. During the 2017-2018 academic year, when the factor of demonstrated need became part of the equation, 15 of 17 school districts and 5 charter schools were awarded Read by Grade 3 funding. For the 2018-2019 academic year, 16 of the 17 school districts and 2 charter schools were awarded Read by Grade 3 funding. To discuss the available supports for LEAs that were not awarded Read by Grade 3 funding, Mr. Wilson reminded Subcommittee members that Read by Grade 3 requirements applied to all elementary schools. Schools that were not awarded Read by Grade 3 funds were still required to meet all requirements. Training and webinars provided by the NDE were provided to all LEAs, not just the LEAs that were awarded Read by Grade 3 funding.

Assemblywoman Swank asked for more detail on the supports provided because she was worried that schools not awarded Read by Grade 3 grants would not be able to access those funds in the future. Mr. Wilson said that supports for LEAs included webinars with hints for every school interested in applying for grant funding.

Hearing no other questions on the Read by Grade 3 program, Chair Carlton asked Subcommittee members for questions on the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation (NITEP) program, nicknamed Top Gun for Teachers.

Senator Woodhouse recognized that a NITEP program grant was awarded to the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) and asked whether there was a requirement for graduates of the program to teach in Nevada or in schools that served economically disadvantaged students.

Jason E. Dietrich, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, NDE, said this was a new program for his division, and he had not had discussions regarding the NITEP program. He would pull information from a recent presentation given by NITEP for the Subcommittees, if needed.

Senator Woodhouse said that she would check Senate Bill (S.B.) 376. She wondered why the NITEP budget included recommended funding for principal training when the relevant statute was specific to teacher training. Mr. Moore said that he would provide a more detailed answer, but he believed that component was added to ensure that principals would have the necessary tools and skills to support teachers.

Senator Woodhouse asked for more information regarding the need to provide professional development to teach fellows and attending teachers. Mr. Dietrich said this responsibility was under his direction, and the one employee actively engaged in this effort was no longer with the division. He and Mr. Moore would provide an answer for Subcommittee members.

Assemblywoman Spiegel wondered why there were freshman students who received both Teach Nevada scholarships and NITEP stipends. Mr. Dietrich said he was not aware that students received both methods of funding, but he would contact UNLV to find an answer.

Assemblyman Thompson knew that the Nevada Public Education Foundation was located across the street from UNLV. He asked whether work performed by the Nevada Public Education Foundation was the same work performed by UNLV, and he wondered whether the entities communicated and if the goals of both groups were aligned. Mr. Dietrich replied that he did not have an answer, but he would discuss the question with staff at UNLV and the Nevada Public Education Foundation before providing a response.

Chair Carlton asked how NITEP and the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program meshed. Mr. Dietrich said that from his brief understanding of PAR and NITEP, each was its own separate program. The NITEP was an institutional-based program for professional support, while PAR was a district-based program for professional development support.

Hearing no other questions on NITEP, Chair Carlton asked for questions on the Turnaround Schools Program. Hearing no questions on the Turnaround Schools Program, and because Subcommittee members had the evaluation results, she asked for the next presentation.

EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NDE - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (101-2618)
BUDGET PAGE K-12 EDUCATION-28

Chair Carlton introduced budget account (BA) 2618 and asked for a discussion of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for the Regional Professional Development Program (RPDP).

Andrea Osborne, Director of Fiscal Support, Business and Support Services, Department of Education (NDE), said that decision unit Enhancement (E) 275 recommended funding of \$149,219 per year and covered a two percent increase for salary and benefit costs that

resulted from movement across the pay scale and COLA increases. Without approval of this budget account, the RPDP's ability to provide professional development opportunities would be affected, because the number of RPDP positions would have to be decreased.

Chair Carlton asked how the two percent increase was determined and why the two percent increase was applied across the full budget, especially since school district budgets did not receive similar across-the-board increases.

Chelli Smith, Director, Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program, said that she was advised by a former staff member from the Department of Education that two percent was an appropriate number. The RPDP grant did not include raises when school districts salaries were increased, so over the past eight years, salary increases had been absorbed by the RPDP. This increase would provide better salary parity.

Chair Carlton asked why the two percent was applied to the full budget and not just to salaries. Ms. Smith answered that the intent was to cover many past increases that were not funded in RPDP grants. Factors of two percent and three percent had both been discussed. Three percent of salaries totaled \$78,000 per year for her department, and two percent across the full budget amounted to \$79,500 per year.

Chair Carlton stated that more conversations on the COLA increase were needed, as many departments would have liked to adjust their budgets to account for past years that had no increases. Ms. Smith added that the two percent, in addition to the Governor's recommended three percent COLA in fiscal year (FY) 2020, would not fill the holes in the RPDP budget. The school districts served as a pass-through so the RPDP did not get to decide the amounts that RPDP staff was paid. The district where a staff member was assigned determined the salary.

Chair Carlton asked for an update on the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program and whether grant allocations to school districts were appropriate and used for PAR services. Ms. Osborne said that the PAR program assisted teachers in meeting effective teaching standards. This was accomplished by conducting observations of teachers during instruction and providing feedback to improve the teacher's instructional practice. The program also provided information and resources to teachers about strategies for effective teaching.

Kellylynn Charles, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development and Support, NDE, said that each school district submitted a budget and explained how the funds would be used. In general, the funds were used to support new teachers, struggling teachers, and those teachers identified for additional support. Additionally, peer-to-peer observations were provided, coaching and mentoring services were available, and onsite professional development was provided for teachers who received ineffective ratings. She added that instruction was provided to teachers about the Nevada Academic Content Standards, lesson plan guidance, classroom management, and data analysis.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked about checks and balances that were in place to ensure grant allocations were appropriate and used for PAR. She wondered about monitoring that took place and how the effectiveness of grant allocations was evaluated.

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Office of Educator Development, NDE, said that district allotments for Clark County and Washoe County were specified in Senate Bill (S.B.) 300 from the 79th Session (2017), and rural schools were allocated funds during FY 2019. Authority for program performance monitoring was not provided to the PAR program, although financial monitoring was conducted.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked whether the funds were provided with the understanding that there would be no oversight or accountability. Ms. Galland-Collins said that there was a check to ensure funds were used for the PAR program, but there was no monitoring of program activities or the quality of the program.

Jason E. Dietrich, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, NDE, added that capacity of staff was a factor for this. The PAR funding was spread across Nevada with one education program professional who managed PAR, Great Teaching and Leading, and other comprehensive programs. That staff member did not have the ability to travel around the state to monitor programs.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked whether schools reported to the NDE for accountability. She noted that \$1.2 million was a lot of money to hand to schools with no requirements. Ms. Osborne said that a final financial report was required with the last billing claim.

Assemblywoman Spiegel wondered what documentation was required from schools during the course of the grant for accountability, appropriateness, checks and balances, or approvals. She asked whether the only thing schools had to do was to submit receipts and request reimbursement. Ms. Osborne said that the Grants Unit had a role in this process. One grants analyst had responsibility for 33 programs, and there was not enough time to look at the detail and background information.

Chair Carlton noted that 473 teachers were served by the PAR program, 175 of whom were from the Clark County School District (CCSD) with an allocation of \$1 million, or 83.3 percent of the funding. There were 298 teachers from Washoe County School District (WCSD) with an allocation of \$200,000, or 16.7 percent of the approved funding. She wondered why the WCSD could help so many more teachers with less funding than the CCSD.

Mr. Dietrich said that the services provided were different. He noted that the WCSD spent the funding to provide professional development and PAR services to staff. The CCSD paid

stipends to educators to attend training, both in-state and out-of-state, and used the remaining funding to provide professional development and PAR services to staff.

Chair Carlton stated that Mr. Dietrich's answer opened up a new discussion that Subcommittee members would have as budgets were closed. She suspected that more guidance should be provided regarding the expenditure of those funds.

Hearing no other questions on BA 2618, Chair Carlton asked for the next presentation.

EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NDE - TEACH NEVADA SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM (101-2718)

BUDGET PAGE K-12 EDUCATION-38

Andrea Osborne, Director of Fiscal Support, Business and Support Services, Department of Education (NDE), said that budget account (BA) 2718, Teach Nevada Scholarship Program, was created in fiscal year (FY) 2016 to increase the number of prospective teachers in Nevada. Traditional and alternative institutions applied to NDE annually for scholarships. Scholarship recipients received money for the cost of books and tuition. The institutions selected and granted scholarships to quality candidates who committed to remain in Nevada to teach after completion of their studies. Each total scholarship, which could not exceed \$24,000 per recipient and 75 percent of a scholarship, up to \$18,000 or \$2,250 per semester, was granted to the institution on behalf of the recipient. The remaining amount, not to exceed \$6,000, was retained by NDE and refundable to the recipient after completion of the education preparation program with evidence to document completion of five years instructing in a Nevada classroom. Since inception of the program, over 600 recipients had received scholarships, with the total number of completers at approximately 250.

Senator Woodhouse asked for the plan to ensure provider stipends, the set-aside scholarship funds, and unexpended funds were accounted for and reconciled appropriately.

Jason E. Dietrich, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, NDE, said that based on the efforts of Jeff Briske, Education Programs Professional, Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, NDE, and Mr. Dietrich himself, a full reconciliation, starting with program inception in FY 2016, was 98.5 percent complete. He could summarize the preliminary findings, or final documentation could be provided next week. With that reconciliation in place, the financial status of the program indicated that funds were available for educational institutions for scholarships. Additionally, there were plans to work with staff to true-up the reserve account to be able to expend those funds.

Senator Woodhouse asked that the final reconciliation document be provided to Fiscal Analysis Division staff upon completion.

Chair Carlton asked about those dollars that were awarded but went unused and needed to be returned to the state. Mr. Dietrich clarified that the 25 percent retained by the institutions in FY 2016, FY 2017, and FY 2018 had been returned to the NDE. There was still some funding due from two providers, but that amount would be determined in the remaining reconciliation.

Chair Carlton raised a separate matter and noted that Subcommittee members understood there were institutions which owed scholarship money back to the state because of students who dropped out from the program.

Mr. Dietrich apologized for the confusing terminology associated with the program. Some scholarship dollars that were not awarded had been returned to NDE, and Mr. Briske confirmed that roughly \$709,465 in total funds was owed back to the NDE. That amount included outstanding monies for tuition that was not used by students who were noncompleters, and any outstanding monies that had been paid out in FY 2016 and FY 2017 and needed to be returned to the NDE.

Because there was a difference between the numbers cited by Mr. Briske and the numbers that Subcommittee members were provided, she asked staff to discuss the numbers and provide reconciled numbers. Mr. Dietrich said that the difference in dollar amounts could be because as he and Mr. Briske were nearing completion of the reconciliation, there were daily changes in the amounts owed.

Chair Carlton asked about any plans for process changes to improve the efficiency of program administration. Mr. Dietrich explained that the administration of the program had been discussed internally with staff. The program required substantial financial tracking, and he cited the staff's capacity limitations. He said that a former deputy superintendent administered the program, along with other duties and responsibilities of the position. The program now fell under the umbrella of Mr. Briske, and changes had been proposed to Legislative Counsel Bureau staff. Changes included recategorizing the funding so there would be a rollover of funding at fiscal year-end. That change would provide an ability to access funds more quickly. Because the application process currently required that the number of scholarships be approved by the State Board of Education, there were delays in the award of scholarships.

Chair Carlton asked whether more personnel resources were required to manage the program more effectively. Mr. Dietrich said that additional resources were needed, but not at the level of an education programs professional. He suspected that a financial position was needed and suggested a management analyst position, because there was a need for a full-time

position between the Teach Nevada Scholarships program and New Teacher Incentives program.

Chair Carlton noted that it appeared that the lack of spreadsheets had led to problems. She asked Mr. Dietrich to engage in further conversations with Fiscal Analysis Division staff because there was a need for an additional financial position.

Hearing no other questions on BA 2718, Chair Carlton opened the hearing for public comment. Hearing no public comment in Las Vegas, the Chair asked for public comment in Carson City.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association (WEA), and a paid lobbyist, spoke in support of the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program. She stated that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) program was different than the Clark County School District program. She believed that the program was successful because the WEA and the WCSD worked together to help struggling teachers. She also appreciated the discussion about Read by Grade 3 competitive grants, because these grants were a concern for the WEA and the Nevada State Education Association. The competitive nature of grants did not always help the children who required help.

Lindsay E. Anderson, Director of Government Affairs, Washoe County School District (WCSD), and a paid lobbyist, spoke about the PAR program and accountability. She said that the program was a partnership between WCSD and the WEA. She noted that there were scheduled PAR reviews on behalf of the WCSD Board of Trustees, and the reviews were an important component that supported teachers in a professional growth program. There was a State General Fund commitment on behalf of WCSD, and at the district level, there was accountability for the return on investment in the PAR program.

Brad Keating, Director of Government Relations, Community Engagement Unit, Clark County School District (CCSD), and a paid lobbyist, echoed the comments of his colleagues and spoke about the PAR program. He would provide Subcommittee members with additional information on how the CCSD administered its PAR program in collaboration with the Clark County Education Association. The focus was to provide intensive instruction to teachers in the one- and two-star Turnaround Schools across the district.

Hearing no other public comment, Chair Carlton adjourned the meeting at 10:22 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Carmen M. Neveau
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a PowerPoint presentation titled "Department of Education" dated March 29, 2019, presented by Jonathan P. Moore, Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education (NDE).