UNLV | THE LINCY INSTITUTE

Education Collaborative Advisory Board
October 20, 2014

Meeting Goals:
- ✓ Agree on Priorities
- ✓ Identify goals and success
- ✓ Begin to develop action plan
- ✓ Identify education and community leaders to invite to future meetings

I. Welcome, Purpose, and Review Previous Meeting Notes

II. Review and Discuss Board Survey Results
   a. What are our priorities?
   b. What do we value most?
   c. How do we define our priorities?

III. Identify Possible Action Plan based on Survey Results and Priorities
   a. How do we define our short-term goals and success?
   b. How do we define our intermediate-term goals and success?
   c. How do we define our long-term goals and success?

IV. The Lincy Institute commissioned K-12 Adequacy Funding Studies
   a. Dr. Anna Lukemeyer and colleagues
   b. Augenblick, Palaich and Associates

V. Next Steps

VI. Updates, Wrap Up and Next Meeting: January 12, 2015

K-20 EDUCATION COLLABORATIVE ADVISORY BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

Date/Time: October 20, 2014; 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM
Location: UNLV Stan Fulton Building

In attendance:

Gwen Merchand *(University of Nevada, Las Vegas)*
Edith Fernandez *(Nevada State College)*
Julie Pippenger *(Andre Agassi Foundation for Education)*
Seth Rau *(Nevada Succeeds)*
Victor Wakefield *(Teach for America)*
Robert Henry *(Clark County School District)*
Angela Silva *(Clark County School District)*
Ruben Murillo *(Nevada State Education Association)* W/Guest: Mike McLamore – (*Director of Education and Public Policy)*
Cheri Ward – (*Southern Nevada Executive Director)*
Tiffany Tyler – (*Nevada Partners)*
Magdalena Martinez *(The Lincy Institute)*
Emily Garcia *(The Lincy Institute)*
Caitlin Saladino *(The Lincy Institute)*

Introductions, Updates, and Review of Minutes

Dr. Martinez went over the meeting minutes for the last ECAB meeting in August. She reviewed the purpose of the advisory board and The Lincy Institute.

What Are Our Priorities? Review of The Survey

Dr. Martinez began by reviewing the survey results, which provided a snapshot of the ECAB members' opinions. According to the survey, ECAB members identified The Lincy Institute's main audience as *local and state policy makers* followed by *social and public organizations*. Dr. Martinez then discussed the short-term and long-term goals identified by the ECAB survey respondents. The top two short-term goals were K-12 equitable and adequate funding, followed by K-12 principal leadership preparation and a tie between teacher preparation and retention and K-12 governance. The top two intermediate-term issues were charter schools, followed by higher education equitable and adequate funding. Other intermediate goals identified were: quality early childhood education, family engagement, English language learners, education and workforce alignment, and high school dropout and graduation. The long-term goals were: college completion followed by a tie between access to higher education, family engagement, and

disproportionate disciplinary action in schools. The issues to monitor were: changing student demographics followed by a tie between disproportionate disciplinary action in schools, English language learners, and higher education governance.

Mr. Rau mentioned that there is a lack of emphasis on K-12 governance. He asked the members, "What does equity and adequacy look like?" Mr. Murillo suggested that the two issues of higher education funding are in the buildings and resources. He used zoom schools as examples to show the disproportionality of funding. Professional development for teachers is also an issue. Mr. Wakefield mentioned the teacher pipeline, and what an adequate teacher pipeline looks like. He spoke about a teacher pipeline meeting he attended where 15 or so advocates convened to talk about teacher preparation issues. The biggest issue identified by the members at the meeting was the increase demand for teachers, but lack of prepared teachers. Dr. Martinez invited the ECAB members to the next teacher preparation pipeline meeting on Oct. 24th at the Tam Alumni Building. Mr. McLamore suggested that the focus should be on retention efforts after adequate teachers are placed. It was concluded that K-12 equitable and adequate funding was the most important community education issue.

K-12 Governance

Dr. Martinez brought up her research on higher education governance. Dr. Tyler suggested that we should start thinking about decentralized governance. Decentralized governance would incentivize creative leadership and specialization. Mr. Murillo mentioned that it is a long-term goal, but as a short-term goal we could tackle the composition of governance. He thought about governance from the classroom point of view. Dr. Martinez mentioned that there is a blur between advisory boards and governing boards. She thought it would be helpful to explore what governance means in terms of trustees. Mr. Wakefield suggested that there should be better data, transparency, and reporting of the current status of each school. Dr. Tyler mentioned that there should be a document that provides different models of governance (a SWAT analysis, for example).

Defining Education

It was stated that the purpose of education is to create a public/private good and create a diverse democracy. Dr. Martinez suggested that we should start talking about the interconnectedness of all these concepts.

Dr. Fernandez was interested in future updates on how The Lincy Institute disseminates information and research. She asked, "Is it getting into the hands of the people we need it to?" Seth then asked, "Who needs this information and doesn't have it?" Tiffany replied by saying, "stakeholders, community members, etc."

Adequacy Studies – Anna Lukemeyer and Carrie Sampson

Dr. Lukemeyer and Ms. Sampson presented on the adequacy studies that are currently being commissioned by The Lincy Institute. The studies look at Nevada K-12 Funding. They estimate the cost of providing a student with an adequate education. Dr. Lukemeyer detailed the goal of the project, which is to estimate the level of funding necessary to allow a typical student to obtain an adequate education. She is currently collecting data on schools and their characteristics. She mentioned that cost function studies require quantitative indicators of student achievements such as test scores, graduation rates, etc. In her presentation, she stated that they come up with a cost by considering cost as influenced by two factors: (1) Factors that educators/policymakers control and (2) Factors outside school and district control (ex. student needs and characteristics). For example, it costs more to educate ELL students, which a school has no control over. Also population density is taken into account. Dr. Lukemeyer presented the education cost model, which looks at school spending based on student outcomes, resource efficiency, student needs and characteristics, and resource and structural costs. Mr. Rau commented that the studies should factor in individual school spending. Mr. Wakefield commented that the Nevada Report Card gives misinformation on what schools spend and that it uses a dummy variable to estimate teachers' salary. He asked, "How do you factor in non-school based spending?" Dr. Henry commented that the studies should also take into account that many schools write their own grants and schools are not required to report their grant funding. Dr. Martinez mentioned that The Lincy Institute intends to host a community forum after the studies are completed. The ECAB members are welcome to monthly check-ins and meetings. District and state charter schools might, or might not be included in the studies.

Next Steps:

- Continue to re-visit long-term goals.
- Look at short-term priorities at the next ECAB meeting.
- Make an internal white paper for the ECAB members.
- Invite other professionals to the meetings – Mr. McLamore suggested having a speaker on school construction to talk about funding/spending that goes into school construction. Mr. Wakefield and Dr. Tyler suggested having additional perspectives from principals, stakeholders, parents, etc. through a forum of some sort.
- Determining Meeting Location – Mr. Rau and Dr. Fernandez offered to have a meeting at InNEVation or NSC. The members seemed to support the location of the Stan Fulton Building for future meetings.
- ECAB members were asked to take the Strengths Finder test by the next meeting.

Next Meeting – Jan 12th, 2015
Recorded by:
Emily Garcia