DAVID LUNEAU, State Representative, Merrimack County, District #10: So I'll call to order this meeting of the Commission to study school funding, and today's January 27, 2020, and just a little bit after 2:00 p.m. And I want to thank everybody for being able to make it today. I think there's some information on the table over there, an agenda, a draft calendar and a few other pieces of information that, hopefully, there are enough copies for everybody. If not, let us know and we'll make more. And today after we get through a few business items we're going to be hearing from -- from Bruce Mallory of the Carsey School, and then Dan Thatcher from the National Conference of State Legislators going to be joining us via video conference. And then to wrap up the afternoon, we're going to be hearing from Caitlin Davis at the Department of Education about the current Adequacy formula.

So -- so, with that, let's just sort of get started on a couple of quick things. Again, a couple of housekeeping items. These meetings are live-streamed. And there is actually a video archive of these -- of these meetings which is available through the Commission web page. Rest rooms are just outside the hallway. Anybody, any time, please do that. And if anybody needs
to take a phone call or use their laptop, please feel free to do that but out in the hallway. So thanks very much for that.

Like to get started with -- with introducing our new members. We've got three new appointments to this Commission and that were made, offer made and accepted. And one of them is actually with us today, Val Zanchuk. So, Val, would you like to introduce yourself and -- oh, and actually, let me -- yeah, let me talk about how to work the mic, too.

VAL ZANCHUK, President, Graphicast: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: So if you want to speak for a long time hands free like I'm doing, that's push down and leave down the red button. If you want to just speak momentarily, hold down the blue button and while you're speaking and then release it when you're done. So you can give that a try, Val.

MR. ZANCHUK: I'll try the red one for the introduction here. My name is Val Zanchuk. I'm President of Graphicast, which is a manufacturing company in Jaffrey. Past Chair of the BIA and during my tenure at the BIA was instrumental in getting the Workforce Accelerator 2025 up and running which has been working to improve the relationship between businesses and schools to move forward on a work-base learning activities.

I'm the BIA representative on the SB 190 CTE Advisory Council, served with Representative Ladd and Senator Watters on that. I'm also on several CTE Advisory Committees, one at ConVal and the other at Manchester School of Technology. And I think perhaps, most importantly, I'm the Chairman of the New Hampshire Learning Initiative which is an organization that's working with school districts all over the state on innovative teaching methods.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thanks very much, Val.

MR. ZANCHUK: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: And let me just briefly introduce the other two new members of the Commission not here with us yet. Susan Huard, who is the former President of Manchester Community College. She'll actually be joining us in a little bit. She had a meeting earlier this afternoon. And we'll let her introduce herself when she gets here.

And then the third member, a third new member is Christine Dwyer, former City Councilor in Portsmouth and -- and she's travelling today. I believe she'll be joining us for our next meeting and I'll let her introduce herself then. But thanks for that. And on the agenda we've got approval of minutes. Those are actually being copied right now. So we're just going to skip over --

(Rep. Myler whispers to Chairman Luneau.)

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Oh, I'm sorry, that's right. So let me turn things over to Representative Myler to introduce himself since he wasn't able to make our last meeting.

MEL MYLER, State Representative, Merrimack County, District #10: Thank you, Dave. My name is Mel Myler, and I currently serve as the Chair of the House Education Committee. And prior to being elected I was the Executive Director of NEA-New Hampshire for 21 years, and I retired from there and went to the National Education Association where I was the Director of their field operation. I think I need to say something about House Bill 551 which brings us here today.

Both Representative Ladd and I were on a Study Committee, a summer Study Committee, and I'll never forget this. In the first session of the summer Committee to Study School Funding the Chair said, well, we're not going to deal with -- we're not going to deal with SWEPT, and we're not going to deal with this -- with dealing with donor towns and other towns, and we're not going to deal with disparity issues. And both Rick and I looked at each other and we said, well, this is a pretty important part of the study. And so the result of that Committee
was, again, which happens a lot with legislative committees that are ruled by the politics of the day, is that we tinkered round the edges and came up with a recommendation. I filed a minority report basically saying that I thought an independent commission could barely -- should be able to deal with this.

So I introduced the bill. I was the only sponsor of the bill which is unusual. And I put a price tag of half a million dollars' worth of study. Before the -- before the House I basically said this is a shot in the dark. I have no idea whether $500,000 is enough. I'm going to come back to that in just a moment.

So the bill passed. And it was interesting to look at its -- it was a bi -- people voted on a bi-partisan basis for it and what became very obvious in the legislative process was that there was a huge need to look at this. It didn't make any difference whether you're Democrat or Republican. Everyone knows this is a big issue.

So as this bill began to be considered, you know, one of the concerns I have was that what was going to happen to the funding of this Commission. Interesting, it never came up in the conversation. As it went through the -- as it went through the study of the budget and developing the budget, never came up. And I think the reason why it never came up was because of the need.

So we are here as a -- as a Committee to really look at this in a kind of a free spirit look. I mean, I think if anyone brings to the table an answer that they think they have, park it. Because one of the processes that we have to deal with here is to look at all the alternatives here. And from those alternatives, we're going to get input from a lot of different people. Is that once we begin to get this input and identify the critical questions, you know, Einstein once said that if I had an hour to determine how to solve a problem to save my life, I would spend the first 55 minutes in finding the right question
and five minutes in solving it. So finding those questions that we need to deal with is very important.

And, finally, I will say this. Is that one of the concerns that I've had is that we've spent a lot of time worrying about my child. I would hope this Commission would begin to look at our children, our students. We talk a lot about -- about workforce development, et cetera. But in order to look at that workforce development, we have to look at where all the workforce is coming from, not just from the wealthy districts, but we've got children that are out there, students that are out there that are not getting the same quality of education that students are in wealthy districts.

So I would hope that we would keep an open mind, look at those options, find those critical questions, and then move to a resolution that this state has never seen before. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thanks very much, Mel -- Representative Myler. And, with that, I would actually like to -- to skip over calendar. We'll get to that shortly. But I'd like to introduce Bruce Mallory from the Carsey School at UNH, and one of the questions that had or one of the recommendations that had come up at our organizational meeting was -- was we need to bring forth a proposal to really provide services for this Commission in order for us to get a quick start, and really get going on this very important work.

And so I'd like to introduce Bruce from the Carsey School. I think, you know, we're all somewhat familiar with Carsey School and, obviously, UNH being -- being a -- really the research institution here in New Hampshire for so much work and so much work that involves policy and the State as well. And Bruce has put forward a -- or is about to put forward a -- a proposal. I think all members have copies of it -- I believe there are copies on the table over there -- that addresses a couple of the key points in the statute that -- that establishes
this Commission, which is to hire staff and develop a budget, both which we're going to look at this afternoon.

And -- and I'd also when the members are ready and all the questions have been -- been made and answered, to consider that proposal this afternoon so that we can do exactly that and get started.

So, with that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Mallory. Welcome.

BRUCE MALLORY, Professor Emeritus, Senior Advisor, NH Listens, Carsey School of Public Policy, University of New Hampshire: Thanks very much, Representative Luneau, and Members of the Commission. Thanks, really, from the bottom of my heart. This is both professional and a personal opportunity for me. And I'll explain why I say that in just a second. But I really appreciate the opportunity for the Carsey School to describe to you what it is we'd like to provide to the Commission over the next 11 months or so.

When I first learned of the idea of establishing this independent commission as the budget was working its way through last spring, I knew right away that this could be a really challenging and useful opportunity for the Carsey School to support the work of our State Legislature. So I'm glad that Representatives Luneau and Myler reached out to us to discuss that possibility as you were getting organized.

So this afternoon what I want to do is focus on three areas of discussion. Who and what the Carsey School and NH Listens are, who the team is that will be working with the Commission, and what we're proposing in order to help the Commission meet its statutory charge. I expect you'll have questions about all three topics, and so we'll leave plenty of time to answer your questions as well.

The mission of the Carsey School of Public Policy is to address pressing public issues by conducting research that's unbiased, accessible, and rigorous. We offer education that
provides students with research policy and political skills, and we engage with communities to bring people together for thoughtful dialogue and practical problem solving.

The Carsey Institute, as we were formerly known, was established in 2002 with a generous gift from UNH alumna Marcy Carsey. In 2010, I was given the opportunity to leave the Institute as it transitioned with a second gift from Marcy Carsey from a research enterprise to the School of Public Policy.

Today, the Carsey School is nationally recognized for research, policy education, and bringing people together to address important social challenges. We offer master's degrees in public administration, public policy, and community development policy and practice.

At its core, the Carsey School is about making positive change. Our research is rigorous and actionable, our students gain the skills to start and build impactful careers, learning from both meeting scholars and leading practitioners like yourselves in policy, community development, and public management. Our faculty and staff engage communities, advise policy makers, and convene public discussions. Much of the work of the Carsey School focuses on national policy and the changing demographics of the United States.

We also have a strong commitment to policy and community issues in New Hampshire; for example, in our longitudinal study of youth in Coos County over the past decade, our -- and our grounded policy-oriented research on vulnerable families in both cities and small rural communities. In 2010, as we were creating the school from the Institute, Michele Holt-Shannon and I, along with others at the University and in partner organizations launched NH Listens, which is now the primary public engagement program at the Carsey School.

At NH Listens we use the tools of deliberation and dialogue to help New Hampshire residents talk, listen, and act together
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so communities can work for everyone. Over the past ten years, we've engaged thousands of residents in local, community-based conversations, to address a wide range of issues from improving our public schools, to addressing the opioid crisis, to strengthening relationships between police departments and the communities they serve, to helping youth become meaningfully engaged in the life of their communities.

We've worked with several Governors' commissions to gather public input on complex issues facing the State, including expanded gaming, water use and resources, and government efficiency and effectiveness.

In partnership with state agencies and non-profit organizations, we've designed and facilitated policy-focused dialogues on mental health, substance use, regional planning, transportation, the growing opportunity gap, outdoor recreation, early child care and education, and alcohol production and sales among other topics.

At the community level, we support local Listens organizations that are creating sustained capacity for civil and productive dialogue. We've helped public schools, planning boards, youth workers, police departments, and immigrant organizations engaged with the public to create effective means for achieving equity and inclusion for all voices count as local problems are addressed.

We're currently supporting the design and facilitation of the Endowment for Health's Race and Equity Series involving hundreds of residents from across the State working to create an inclusive and welcoming environment for all.

Relevant to the Commission's charge, we've recently been deeply engaged in work in Berlin, Claremont, Dover, Oyster River, Portsmouth, and Hampton School Districts as they grapple with both financial and social challenges.
Our closest funding and program partners include the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation, the Endowment for Health, New Hampshire Humanities, the New Hampshire Institute for Civics Education, and Leadership New Hampshire. We're currently writing the 2020 New Hampshire Civic Health Index, an assessment of how New Hampshire residents participate in public life through voting, volunteering, helping their neighbors, and interacting with public officials.

In 2017, NH Listens was recognized by the Bridge Alliance, Big Tent Nation, and National Conference on Citizenship as the best regional civic collaboration and engagement program in the United States.

As Project Director for the Commission work, I hope to develop a close and trusting relationship with the Commission as a whole and with each of its members. Because of the significant and sensitivity of the work, I'll say a little bit about what I bring to the effort.

I've been an educator all of my life, all of my adult life. I guess I probably was as a kid, too; but I started as a social studies teacher. Then I worked as a Vista Volunteer in Suncook in the early '70s, Director of HeadStart Programs in Belknap and Merrimack Counties in the mid-seventies, and then as a faculty member and then senior administrator at UNH since 1979. Along the way, I spent a year as a staff researcher for the House Education Committee here in New Hampshire where I focused at that time in 1975 and six on statewide kindergarten policy and public school funding. You all have pretty much resolved the former, the latter is why we're still here today. What goes around comes around 40 plus years later.

The proposal before you today is the result of conversations with Representatives Luneau and Myler and a review of the charges in the authorizing statute. In just a minute I'll walk you through the full proposal and the summary that accompanies it. Before that, I'd like to introduce two of the staff who will be assisting on this work.
Jordan Hensley — there you are, Jordan — is a Policy Analyst at the Carsey School with a strong background in education policy, with additional expertise in economic, transportation, and health policy. He has a Master’s in Public Policy from Oregon State University.

Carrie Portrie is a doctoral candidate at the University of New Hampshire with a focus on early childhood education. She has expertise in inclusive practices for young children with disabilities and is currently conducting research on the effects of federal policy changes on HeadStart staff and families. Carrie holds a Master's Degree in Early Childhood Special Needs from UNH.

I also want to emphasize in these initial remarks that we see our role as in-service to the Commission to support its analytic and deliberative processes. We will adhere to the principles of transparency and impartiality as we engage in the activities described in the proposal. It will be the Commission that makes decisions based on its interpretation of the information we collect and what the appropriate policy options are, not us. We'll offer opinions when asked, but take no positions on solutions as they're crafted by the Commission.

Before we get to the proposal, lastly, I want to introduce the practice of group agreements today, for a more lengthy discussion possibly next week. At NH Listens, we ask any group that we facilitate that we work with, no matter how well they know each other or what the topic is, to affirm a set of ground rules or group agreements that can assure respectful, authentic, and fair deliberation. I realize that the House and Senate have their rules for norms and decorum -- rules and norms for decorum so group agreements for the Commission can be aligned with those.

A consistent set of group agreements used by the Commission, as well as in the public engagement activities that will be a part of this across the state, can increase trust in
the process and assure careful consideration of difficult and controversial concepts, even when there are passionate disagreements in the room, and we know there will be. I'll bring samples of group agreements for your consideration next week.

So, you know, walk through the proposal now. Please ask questions as we go along. I think it's -- I prefer having this be interactive. I'll go through each component of the scope of work on the summary sheet that you have, a one-page summary, two-sided, and then we can walk through the more detailed proposal, including the budget material at the end.

At about a little bit before 3 o'clock, in about a half an hour or so, Dan Thatcher from NCSL will be calling the speaker phone. And so just to warn you that the ringer will go off and I'll get up or Jenn will get up and go turn it on. So he'll be able to join us and then when we're ready to turn it over to him we will. He'll join us by Zoom technology on the screen for his segment of the meeting.

So let's take a look just at the two-sided summary sheet here. Just to get a big picture perspective to begin with. Most important, of course, we want to align our purposes with what the charge is that you've given yourselves in the -- in HB 4 last year. So that's -- and I envision working very closely with Representative Luneau to be sure that what we bring to the Commission meets your needs. And that's -- that's what -- again, that's what our purpose is. As I said, we're in-service to you.

We want to act as an impartial service provider, take no advocacy positions. We may be a part of the data generation process. We'll contract with UNH Survey Center. We'll contract with external research vendors. We may use some Carsey staff to collect data. But the interpretation of all of that information, again, is up to you. We'll help you with that. We'll assist in any way that you'd like us to. But we're going to be very careful about understanding that this is your process. We are here to support you. It's not our process.
We'll work across four sort of components of your charge. We'll provide logistical support to the Commission; essentially acting sort of as an expanded staff for you. We'll arrange and carry out and oversee all research activities that are necessary for you to collect the information you need. We will design and facilitate and run and write up reports on various kinds of public engagement activities, which I'll describe in a minute. And we'll assist with a communication strategy and activities of the Commission.

Clearly, one of the most important things you'll be doing over the next several months is keeping the general public informed about your work, about considerations, about activities, about opportunities for public input, and so all of that involves, obviously, communication process that we'll help with. And then, finally, we'll -- we'll with you help draft summary reports on all that you learned, the data collected, the analysis that takes place. And then, ultimately, of course, it's your report back to the Legislature; but, again, our role is to help draft those -- those reports as we go along, particularly as we get into the fall, of course.

So just a few comments about the scope of work. The logistical work support is listed there on that summary. Helping develop agendas, take minutes. We will contract with court reporters. We'll make sure that verbatim minutes are available, the verbatim recordings are available. These are live-streamed as Representative Luneau said. We'll also write summary minutes and post those on your website as well. We'll -- we'll sort of curate the resource materials as they are generated. We'll be a liaison with your state and national partners around data collection and policy analysis.

We will be developing -- we've already begun a process of drafting a Request for Proposals, RFPs, so we can get external vendors to subcontract with them through the resources you're providing to apply their expertise to the questions that you're posing. We'll do all the fiscal management and documentation of
this process. So anybody at any time can know exactly how the dollars are being spent.

We'll assist with these -- what's referred to here as pre-launch activities. I'm not sure exactly what that is yet beyond these kinds of initial meetings that are on the calendar; but there may be other moments when you want to make public communications or announcements or provide early kinds of descriptions of what you're up to, and we'll help with that. And then, finally, as we get into the fall, again, we'll work with you to draft interim reports along the way and then final reports.

Assuming, and I'll say something about timeline here, at the last meeting you all talked about the final sort of timelines. And I think what I heard was an agreement that you really need to wrap up your work by January 1st of '21 or December 31st of this year. And so that's the timeline that we'll be operating from to get you materials and to work backwards for when other products have to be made available.

On the research side we want to work with you to identify your primary research questions. So our vendors are asking the right questions, collecting the right data. We'll develop the research protocols to generate the data you need, select the vendors with your review. Absolutely. We'll want to make sure that all research activities are completed roughly early August and so that you have in your hands by the end of the summer a pretty comprehensive report on the research, the data that's been collected.

On the public engagement side on the back of that page our first phase of public engagement is to work with key stakeholder focus groups. And there's a general question here that you all can have -- obviously, can have input on. We might tweak this a bit. But this is a typical kind of NH Listens question when we're working in communities, when we're trying to help a decision-making body, a School Board, a Planning Board, a Select Board, a City Council come to some decision that it needs some
public input on. And so we never ask a question when we're working in communities like should we build the new middle school or not, because that's an immediate -- that's a yes/no question. It's polarizing, people throw stuff at each other. They get on social media. And you don't have a civil deliberative process when you do that. So we ask questions like this.

What would you want your School Board to think about to prioritize as important criteria or important considerations when the School Board decides whether to build a new middle school or when your budget committee decides to put forward a process for funding that new middle school? So we want input from key -- from stakeholders around to basically to help you think about where should our attention be focused.

Representative Ladd said to me before the meeting, we all know what the issues are, and yes, that's true. This issue -- this topic has been around a long time. But we do want to hear from Superintendents and School Board members and parents and students — mention that a little bit later — and local decision-makers and business leaders about what's most on top of their mind as this long-time challenge to the State continues to be in front of us. And so we'll do that in the spring. And had a little bit of conversation about where we'll go do that. We'll do that around the state. We might, for example, identify -- use the 24 Senate Districts as kind of the catchment areas and hold these key stakeholder focus groups within those Senate Districts around the state.

We envision in our proposal in the details holding at least a couple of those in six or eight different locations so that we'd have about a hundred individuals who are these key stakeholders who live with this challenge every day, that we get their initial response to the kind of broad question that you see there.

We will also contract with UNH Survey Center to do some statewide surveys in order just to kind of take the pulse of the
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general public using random sample survey methodology about school funding issues. Again, the questions that will go into that survey would be questions that you all would develop with us, of course, in partnership.

Hum -- as you begin to collect input, and have your own deliberations, what I'm assuming is that by roughly around Labor Day you'll have enough information to begin to perhaps cast some broad options for directions that you want to go in or at least have some specific propositions or proposals that you're ready for broad public input on.

So the idea in the second phase of engagement is to go out and do what we call all-call community conversations and, again, we would do those around the state, probably a dozen different locations. And those are all calls. So a hundred people could show up. They'll be facilitated with small group trained facilitators, which is what NH Listens does. And we'll -- and we, again, with you will shape some questions that will allow us to have -- enable folks to both hear what the Commission has been doing; but, as importantly, to then deliberate themselves for typically these sessions last two and a half or three hours. It might be a full Saturday morning. It might be a long weeknight evening. And -- and identify sort of hopes, concerns, questions, cautions, and preferences and priorities for where they hope the Commission will land as it develops its recommendations.

We also very much want to be sure we hear from students in this process. I'm not sure that prior, and this I may be not informed, but I'm not sure that in prior efforts to conduct conversations about this really challenging question, set of questions, we've had an opportunity to move -- to hear as much as we'd like from students. And students have a lot to say and students are impacted clearly by the issue before us. And it turns out that when you ask students, high school students and middle students their views, they're pretty smart about what their lives are like and what it's like to be in a class of 15 kids versus 20 kids or 30 kids or to have their teachers
constantly turning over or to not have an AP chemistry class when the chemistry teacher takes leave and there's nothing left. So I think for the ground truth all of our work together as adults will be important to have that student voice.

And then, finally, we'll write a summary report of all of that input sometime in, hopefully, early fall. And then, finally, around communication strategies, we envision creating a website out of the Carsey School that will be linked to your website, obviously, but will allow for links to other resources, other studies, and importantly, allow for two-way input.

So on a website that we would develop, we'll have the equivalent of a chat room. I know that's 20th Century language, not 21st Century language. That's why Jordan and Carrie are helping me. Opportunities for folks to register their points of view, their questions as well, and again, we'll share that, obviously, with you all the time.

Developing a media relation strategy, drafting interim media reports, press releases, other communications. At the end then a statement of who we are, which I've already shared with you, and a little bit about who I am.

I'll stop. Let me pause there. I know that, you know, I'm a Professor. I can get on the train and train keeps going, doesn't stop. We are about to get into the details of this, but let me just stop and just see if there are sort of broader big picture questions or any concerns or comments anybody --

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Sure. Thank you very much, Mr. Mallory. Representative Myler.

REP. MYLER: Could you tell us how many facilitators you have that have been trained to do the community engagement?

DR. MALLORY: Yeah. NH Listens conducts facilitator trainings two or three, what we call one-on-one kinds of trainings, around the state every year. We also conduct another
two or three advanced facilitator trainings. About 180 people across the state have been through those facilitator trainings over the past several years. Some -- and whenever we need to call on their services, we put out a call to that -- to that distribution list and say there's going to be a community conversation in Peterborough on Saturday morning, as there was this past Saturday morning about housing. And, typically, we're able to provide a small stipend of $150 for folks -- for our trained facilitators to then go and spend three hours or so in a community conversation working with a small group of folks. These are all people that we have trained, we have experience with, and we provide some quality control around.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Further questions for Dr. Mallory? I know he's going to be going into a lot of what -- actually, Mr. Ardinger.

WILLIAM ARDINGER, ESQ., Concord, NH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hello, Bruce. Great to see you.

DR. MALLORY: Hi, Mr. Ardinger.

MR. ARDINGER: I wanted to ask you about two capacity questions -- three capacity questions. First, it's -- it's clear that there's a great interest in understanding inequities in educational opportunity, in educational outcomes among different towns and school districts --

DR. MALLORY: Hm-hum.

MR. ARDINGER: -- that's leading to this Commission. And, you know, the question of inequity has tortured folks because we don't know quite how to measure it and determine it. There might be factors like property wealth, maybe median family income, maybe teacher turnover you mentioned, teacher credentials, many things in the literature. What are the capacities of the Carsey Institute to really provide this Commission with a lot of updated, very current data an understanding of how to measure
inequities and educational opportunity and educational outcomes across Districts?

**DR. MALLORY:** That's a -- that's a wonderful question, and it's a huge question. Hum -- we have in-house capacity. I also would expect that a significant amount of ways to address that question will come from partners that we'll subcontract with external national experts who have more experience than the Carsey School does in honing in on that specific question, the correlation between outcomes and inputs, you know, financial inputs and educational outcomes.

We, obviously, have access to the same kinds of literature resources and, you know, on-line resources that others do. And Jordan and others in our staff, Jess Carson, who runs our Vulnerable Families Research Program, have focused on inequities not only in education but in health policy, in recreation, in transportation over the years and so they bring that experience to this.

**MR. ARDINGER:** Thank you. Two more comments on just another issue.

**CHAIRMAN LUNEAU:** Sure, sure.

**MR. ARDINGER:** The -- the other thing that's really important for this, I think, is not to get lost in a silo of New Hampshire's making. We're not the only state in the country that's faced this challenge. You know, I think of our sister state just south, the Commonwealth, you know, we both have about the same amount of local property taxation as a mix of our financing, you know, right around 60%, 62, 57, in there. The question is do you have the capacity to, you know, bring to the attention of the Committee how other states --

**DR. MALLORY:** Yeah.

**MR. ARDINGER:** -- like Massachusetts just dealt with it with a 2015 upgrade of their formula which really is addressing
inequities that they've identified to really help us with -- with that comparison so we get out of the silo.

DR. MALLORY: Oh, absolutely. I think that's going to be critical. And there's always a problem of sort of apples and oranges. Well, that state's not like New Hampshire. We have the New Hampshire way. But that's -- I see that as a critical part of the data collection, analytic process. In a few minutes when Dan Thatcher from National Conference on State Legislators joins us, he's going to provide an overview of what this looks like around the country, what states have been doing this, what states have been using methodologies and asking questions that might be most relevant to New Hampshire's situation. Dan has already provided us with the RFPs that were used to contract with research vendors in other states that we're now adapting for this project as well. So we have Dan at NCSL. We'll be meeting with Education Commission of the States in about two weeks to see what they might bring as well. So using Zoom technology and the resources that they provide us and linking our website to those larger studies we'll definitely -- that will be a major part of our work.

MR. ARDINGER: Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great! Thanks very much. Senator Morgan.

JON MORGAN, State Senator, Senate District #23: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Dr. Mallory for being here. More of a statement than a question. This is most -- most definitely an oversight. But I just meant because we talk about several different constituencies and the input that we'll be looking to hear from, we never mentioned senior citizens. And so I just want to make sure that we aggressively encourage the participation in this process of our senior citizens, as they're a critical demographic, especially here in New Hampshire, the second oldest state in the country.

DR. MALLORY: Thanks for remembering folks like me. Appreciate it. Just very quick story. We have been working the
last couple of years with SAU 3 in Berlin, partly because they've been facing, you know, the Stabilization Cliff in a pretty serious way and with declining enrollments. We've done a lot of community conversations, public engagement in Berlin. One of the most useful groups that we've met with over the last few months has actually been retired teachers who live in the Berlin area, and they have a lot to say, as retired members of the community on fixed incomes, and as -- and as prior teachers in the system as well. So I think senior citizens always both because they have the wisdom of their own life experience, but also because they're so impacted, particularly about property tax questions in our state.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great! Senator Kahn.

JAY KAHN, State Senator, Senate District #10: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I got it. Thank you, Dr. Mallory. So a couple of observations, questions, about the format here. When we talk about equitable, I know there's a rush to determine that in terms of funding, and I really hope that we are trying to determine equitable in terms of opportunities and that's given the breadth of educational scope that there is, either in the field or in our definition, which includes preschool, and will include special-education services, and trying to mine the input of people around the state relative to the opportunities that exist in some communities and are undersupplied or not supplied, available in other communities. I think that's -- that ought to guide us.

DR. MALLORY: Yeah.

SEN. KAHN: To determining how important are those questions.

DR. MALLORY: Yeah. I couldn't agree more. Just another example from the Berlin work. Part of that project was actually a collaboration between SAU 3 and SAU -- I'm going to forget the number -- the Gorham Cooperative School District. 60? I think it's SAU 60. So here we have two communities right next to each
other with very different sort of characteristics, demographic profiles, economic profiles. And the whole purpose of that project NH Listens supported with Nellie May Education Funds was to look -- recognize the imbalance in what resources could be provided in the Berlin schools and the Gorham schools and create ways using technology, changing -- literally changing the daily schedule so that kids could hop on a bus at the Gorham Middle High School and in 20 minutes be at the Berlin High School to take a CTC class over at the Berlin High School. And then a kid at the Berlin High School could hop on a bus and in 20 minutes be back at Gorham Middle High School where there might be an AP physics class that's not offered in Berlin. So equity does not mean equal. We're not talking about every single School District offering the same exact programs. That's not realistic and it doesn't reflect the local sort of characteristics and differences in those communities. And so we can create more equitable opportunities by being creative by asking people to collaborate and by shifting schedules and using technology and so on. So very much want to go -- explore all those possibilities.

SEN. KAHN: Right. And what the overheads are in different delivery models --

DR. MALLORY: Yeah.

SEN. KAHN: -- to make sure that we're inclusive and not stuck in a siloed kind of approach, right? The other thing that's interesting about New Hampshire we have high outcomes but low funding.

DR. MALLORY: Yeah.

SEN. KAHN: Relatively comparative to the nation. I'm sure Thatcher is likely to touch on that. That -- and I think that is one place where getting beneath that and not just relying on generalizations and averages. It's going to be important.
As a result, one of the things that concerns me in the proposal is that we have such a hard cutoff for the input of the consultant. And I hope that the consultant will run over a longer period of time with the Committee through the outcomes of the report. It's just -- I don't think this -- this is a step-wise piece. The consultant delivers findings so that we can, you know, turn it over to you. I don't think -- I don't think we should envision it like that. I think we should envision that consultant being available to the Commission until we conclude our work and we can be testing assumptions on -- through the process.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yeah. Thank you very much, Senator Kahn. I think that's a good question. I think that's something we'll probably be taking up in more detail when we actually look at the RFP in a subsequent meeting. But, for now, I'd really like to get us sort of back so that Bruce can -- so Dr. Mallory can take us through the detailed proposal on this and so that this may put the Commission in a place where we can act on this today and really get going on this important work. So, again, Dr. Mallory, over to you.

DR. MALLORY: I'll take a few minutes to do that. I'm not going to read through this seven-page document you have in front of you. I know you just got it this afternoon; but let me try to just highlight what's most relevant and where you might have questions.

The opening section is simply, obviously, borrows, takes the language out of the RSA that created the independent commission. So in front -- we'll examine in front of us what it is that we're doing, what's our charge, what do we always need to keep our eyes on? Obviously, these purposes are going to form the basis of the research and analytic process they'll be going through.

So on Page 2, the scope of the work and the outline begins. You see that contract period runs, hopefully, over the next 11 months or so. Everything we do will be in consultation with
the Commission through your Chair. Hum -- the timelines that we
give here -- excuse me -- are estimates. This is literally a
proposal for you to shift to be sure it meets your needs.

So logistical support. In constant communication with
Chairman Luneau about agendas, and then working with Jenn Foor
and others to be sure the minutes get posted. Some contracting
with a court reporter to be sure that there's always easy and
accessible transcriptions and minutes for the meetings.
Coordinating video conferencing here or when we're at remote
locations. So if we're doing public conversations, public input
at other places, and we might be Zooming people in, or
connecting those remote locations to each other while they're
doing -- while they're actually engaged in their conversations.

Again, curating resource materials. Collaboration and
coordination with national resources listed here, as well as our
state organizations and associations. They're so critical.

Hum-- managing the RFP process on behalf of the Commission.
All of that, of course, will flow through UNH's sponsored
programs office, and so I think it will meet whatever standards
of legal review and auditing that the State will have. You
know, obviously, our practices are consistent with that.

Again, tracking and documenting all expenditures, providing
regular reports back to the Commission about expenditure of
funds. Helping with the design of any initial activities to get
the Commission known to the state and drafting reports. All of
that -- getting started on all of that, it starts really last
week and today especially, and then continuing into February.
And I know the Chairman will review the calendar for future
meetings with you in a few minutes.

I think that's -- I'll stop there, but I think that's
probably the least interesting and complicated part of this
proposal is logistics and answer any questions on that.
CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Questions for Dr. Mallory on logistics? We'll keep going.

DR. MALLORY: We'll proceed then to really what's going to be the bulk of the work here. Obviously, that's collecting information and you have a lot of information available to you. State Department, of course, is a huge resource. The work of prior commissions. That's a thick notebook that you all have that you're working from. It has a lot of information in it. There's new data being generated constantly.

The impact of the current biennial allocations at school districts. You know, we'll soon have data about what's that meant for school districts as well. And so the sort of quantitative data collection and analysis will be a key part of the work and that will really be the work of the subcontractors, our external experts. The qualitative data will really consist of listening to stakeholders, listening to members of the public, listening to students, listening to folks who are affected by this challenge on a daily basis, and our job will be to collect and analyze and theme that qualitative data as it comes in as well.

So the first thing we want to do is work with you, create that research agenda. So I want a work session with you at some point in the next few weeks in which we can just brainstorm. What are the most important questions that you want to answer? Back to Einstein. Thank you, Representative Myler. About how important those questions are before we even know what problem it is we're trying to solve.

Again, we have a lot experience with this. We collectively in this room have a lot of experience with this topic. So it won't be hard to generate or brainstorm those questions that can then be translated in contract language used with our -- especially or quantitative vendors who are analyzing existing data in New Hampshire and, again, to the other points to, you know, to other states as well.
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Hum -- again, the research questions from the -- from the RSA are listed here; again, just to keep us -- keep us focused. We'll use NCSL and ECS and other resources. I've already spent, you know, a fair amount of time looking at what's available that they have and it really is very rich and very contemporary.

Our job will be to, you know, not only set up those contracts but then hound those folks, keep them on time. Mindful of Senator Kahn's comments a minute ago about being sure that they're available to us over an extended period of time so that the idea, for example, testing scenarios, that they can help us with that.

And then writing -- it says here final research report, but it's probably a little bit more incremental than that, giving you interim input as well. And as we have information available to you, obviously, we'll provide that, and work with you to analyze and summarize that information as it comes in.

Our goal would be to get our responses, to release the RFPs within the next couple of weeks. We have to get a contract in place first between Carsey and the Commission. That's a logistic that once that's in place, then we can go out and be sure that we're in a position to contract with external vendors. But, ideally, we'd like to release that RFP by mid-February, with a 30-day deadline due date on it to get responses back by March 15th. Bring those responses back to the Commission.

You may want to interview potential vendors via speaker phone or Zoom technology, all that TBD, but the selection then would take place starting around March 15th into the first of April, and get those contracts in place by early April, mid-April at the latest would be my hope.

And then as it says here, get their reports back by around August 1st, and then provide a summary of all of that back to you. Again, mindful of Senator Kahn's comment a minute ago that maybe it won't look like this, cut and dry.
So let me stop there. And this is -- this, obviously, is a significant piece of your work, and it will be a significant expenditure of your funds. And so I'll stop and see if you have questions.

**CHAIRMAN LUNEAU**: Questions. Representative Ladd.

**RICK LADD**, State Representative, Grafton County, District #04: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Knowing that we talked about a 30-day possibility as far as getting these RFPs back, and I support that. The quicker, the better, seeing we're on a real tight, short time frame here; but do you think that -- what is your opinion on a 30-day versus a 45-day?

**DR. MALLORY**: It's a good question. And so far the sample RFPs that we've looked at from Colorado, we have a couple from Utah and Vermont on their way into us, in talking with Dan Thatcher, they used the 30-day turnaround time on it and it seemed to work for them. So, for the moment, and we can ask Dan that question when he joins us in a few minutes, but he's looked at a lot of these all over the country and seems to be that 30 days is the practice.

**REP. LADD**: Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN LUNEAU**: Further questions? Yes, Ms. Bergeron.

**JANE BERGERON-BEAULIEU**, Executive Director, New Hampshire Special-Ed Administrators Association: Thank you very much, Chair. Can you hear? I -- just a quick question, Dr. Mallory. In terms of the research, will it include the impact our charter schools are having on funding? Will they be considered separate? Will they be considered a part of our public schools as we know they are?

**DR. MALLORY**: I've not an answer to that question and, obviously, it's occurred to me because of the role of charter schools here.
MS. BERGERON-BEAULIEU: Probably will be an important component, especially from the lens of special-education.

DR. MALLORY: I was operating from sort of the literal interpretation of the RSA language, which I don't believe actually explicitly references charter schools, but it doesn't explicitly leave them out either. So, again, the Commission will want to advise us on how to incorporate charter schools in the study.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: So I think that's a very important question. And as Ms. Bergeron points out, charter schools are public schools in New Hampshire, and they do receive public funding. So I think that will certainly be an integral part of the recommendations that -- that -- the policy recommendations that this Committee -- Commission will ultimately move forward with, would certainly need to address charter schools as well.

DR. MALLORY: We will.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Further questions. Representative Ames.

RICHARD AMES, State Representative, Cheshire County, District #09: Good afternoon.

DR. MALLORY: Good afternoon.

REP. AMES: My question goes to revenue sources, and it's mentioned in the statute our command to us we should be looking at, but I'm wondering where -- where that comes in in this research aspect of this project where we would be finding help on the choices that might be available to us here in New Hampshire to fund whatever it is that needs to be funded?

DR. MALLORY: Clearly, revenue is going to be an important part of all of this work. And -- hum -- again, just taking the language that you got in the RSA, item (b) references a revenue source that's uniform across the state. Determining a school funding formula that complies with court decisions and a revenue
source that's uniform across the state. Now that's a -- that's pretty vague language, pretty -- pretty high-level language, and I think it's going to be your work and we'll do this with you, obviously, is to figure out, you know, what that really means and what the implications of that are. It's way too early in the process, obviously, to know where that might -- what pathways that will lead you down; but there will be some interesting pathways there, I'm sure.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you. Yes, Representative Ladd.

REP. LADD: Yes. We've mentioned charter schools. But there's one more I don't want to leave out of the equation here, Career Technical Education Centers and our skills necessary for pathway towards the careers that -- and I hope one of the stakeholders, which we're really going to engage, are small and large business here in state to ensure that we're providing the skill level that's necessary for us to be a successful state economically in the future.

DR. MALLORY: Agreed. And as I've travelled around the state I've seen how important those centers are to the communities and the surrounding communities that they're located in.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great! I think these are all very important, you know, comments and suggestions when it comes to, you know, the type of research that we need to get into, you know, as the -- as the work of the Commission moves forward. And I know we're going to be talking about calendar a little bit after presentations. But unlike today, when we're -- when we're really looking at a proposal today and, hopefully, you know, acting on this so we can get -- get moving, we'll be looking at two meetings to review the RFP. So sort of envision Dr. Mallory bringing in a draft at the next meeting.

DR. MALLORY: Right.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: And then having some time in order to really ask questions, review that, and then the following
meeting looking at a -- at a final RFP proposal that we would authorize before -- before it's released. And I think it's really important that that, you know, that we really be able to sort of hammer into that, particularly a lot of questions that have come up with respect to Charters, CTE, and other aspects of our, you know, public education in New Hampshire. Make sure we're able to consider all of the components that, you know, that really go into that.

So let's see. Any other questions on research? No. Then we'll keep going.

**DR. MALLORY:** Then public engagement. Again, I described this briefly a minute ago. Again, we see these key stakeholder focus groups with what we call grasstops as opposed to grassroots folks happening in the spring. Two groups, six focus groups across the state, six sites. Two focus groups at each site with about 8 to 10 people for a total of 100 to 120 participants.

I'll want your input on who that sort of invitation list should be. You know, I mentioned constituent groups, and we have to go, you know, more level -- lower level specificity when deeper level of specificity and I can see us, obviously, reaching out to the School Board Association, School Administrators Association, the NEA, the AFT, Parent-Teacher Associations. We can't -- there are literally thousands of those people all over the state. And so we have to have an efficient way to reach out to them and identify folks to come together to spend a couple of hours with, again, with our fellows and facilitators to get the input that you need around the question, again, that you all will affirm over the next few weeks.

So that's -- that's spring with a report back to you no later than May 1st. I think this is going to be really valuable input to you. And so I know you'll want to see that sooner than later.
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Conducting surveys using UNH Survey Center we want to do in the spring as well, again, depending on given the questions that you all think should be asked. The Survey Center does a quarterly Granite State Poll. So once -- once a quarter each year, so four times a year, the Survey Center does sort of the standard poll to -- to assess the variety of opinions. These days you can imagine the focus is on things like the Primary. Recently, in the September administration of that poll, NH Listens added questions about civic life and civic health. We asked people questions like how much civics education have you ever received in your life? Do you trust your neighbors? Do you trust national government? Do you trust local government? So we -- we always have the option of adding questions to the Survey Center's quarterly polls. And so we'll shoot for their spring poll. And I expect that, again, Dan and folks from ECS and other places will be helpful. We can look at other kinds of statewide surveys that have been done around school funding and equity issues. I'm sure they're out there to help guide us as we design those.

And then in the fall -- thank you. Go ahead and plug it in. In the fall with this larger statewide community conversation process that we mentioned earlier --

CARRIE PORTRIE, Doctoral Student, Department of Education, Carsey Fellow: He's going to be calling in through this conference line.

DR. MALLORY: Okay. In a few minutes we'll transition to Dan, but we're just doing the tech right now. And he'll call in on the conference line in a minute.

Hum -- how many of you, actually, do you think you've ever been to a NH Listens community conversation? A few of you. Yeah, right. So somewhat familiar with that. It's -- it is always designed with small groups of 8 to 12 people with a trained facilitator. It might be a school gym or cafeteria with 120 people in it, in which case we have ten small groups working through a discussion guide with a trained facilitator,
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everybody's working with the same set of questions. And they have a significant amount of time, a couple of hours at least, to do that. At the end of the evening or the Saturday morning, then each of those small groups shares briefly its key findings, key recommendations, key questions, before everybody goes home; but we then collect all of that, transcribe all of those notes and write a summary report. And we work really hard to get people who -- not go to meeting people to come to those meetings, to get everyday folks who oftentimes may feel like their voice doesn't count. Or child care -- child care's an issue so they can't go to a Tuesday evening School Board meeting. So we'll provide child care and refreshments and maybe coordinate transportation, as needed, to get a good broad cross section of residents in New Hampshire to turn out and, again, it's a two-way process. Hear what the Commission's work is, what your efforts are, and then also to have an opportunity to give input about what they see as the ways in which this topic affects their lives as parents, as students, as senior citizens who may not have kids in the School District anymore, as young families who are deciding to move to a community and so on.

And then a student voice piece of this as well, which we'd like to do in the spring. Things get pretty crazy and nutty as the Superintendents and School Board members here know. Once you get past about April 30th, it is a very busy time of year for schools. So we'll try to push forward to do some student dialogues in the spring. If logistics are such that we can't complete that process in the spring, we'll complete it right after Labor Day when everybody comes back. And then, again, write summary reports of that engagement process for you.

And, finally, let me just finish this because I know you want to hear from Dan as well. Finally, the communication piece. You know, I don't need to repeat what I said earlier about that; but I am mindful -- and I am mindful that this effort will have a lot of public eyes on it for good reason. Let's see, somebody want to catch that? Thank you, Terry. That's Dan.

(The phone is ringing.)
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DR. MALLORY: Okay. Good. Thanks. We're all set. Dan, we'll get to you in just a few minutes. Just a small miracle that the technology works for the moment.

So, anyway, just understanding that this process and this topic will attract a lot of interest and a lot of opinions, and a lot of folks who think that they have the answer, right? And God bless them, because we need a whole range of perspectives and opinions and potential answers.

And so the communication process will be -- a part of it will be carried out in the engagement work that I just described. A lot of it will be what are the messages that we need to send out on a regular basis and where are the opportunities for people if they don't show up at a community conversation or aren't one of these stakeholder focus groups, where else can they have their voice registered, their ideas registered. And, again, the website that we design will do that as well.

I expect many of you are familiar with the work of New Hampshire Citizens Count, formerly the Live Free or Die Alliance, which pays a lot of attention to what legislators do, and there's opportunity for public input through them as well. We partner closely with Citizens Count and so we might see if they want to partner with us on this effort as well. Be another place where there can be some on-line conversations moderated, civil conversations about this topic.

So let me just jump to Page 7 then. And what is there is a broad, sort of a high-level budget for this effort, using the resources that the Legislature has appropriated to the Commission. And so you see roughly, you know, I've chunked this out by those program areas or work component areas that I just described. So there's logistical support which is our staff time and travel and supplies, things like that. The public engagement process is getting out to people, paying facilitators' stipends, providing child care at those sites, refreshments. Generally,
we use sites that don't charge rent, but if we have to then we'll -- so we generally use community centers, school facilities, libraries, function rooms if they're big enough, those kinds of things.

The research piece there is, most of that would go out to our external vendors, Dan's going to talk to us about in a minute. Some of those resources may be used within the State of New Hampshire. We all appreciate the work that organizations like Reaching Higher are doing. And we've already begun our conversations with Greg and his staff about the work that they're doing and how that can complement the work that we're doing as well.

The website development and putting it up and then some communication staff time are indicated there as well. And then, finally, the overhead charges that UNH has negotiated with the Federal Government. Those rates then get applied to our contracts with State Agencies as well. And the bottom line on Page 7 is that the overhead on this project will be about 17% based on the way that the University calculates it, and what our direct charges are and our subcontracted charges are. Obviously, we'll have -- we internally have a much more detailed budget, and I'm happy to share with the Commission, the Chair, as we move into the contract process in the next week or two.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you very much, Dr. Mallory. I'm sure there's questions on what we've just heard. So happy to take any questions now. Representative Myler.

REP. MYLER: One of the points that I think we need to look at is in this community engagement. The community engagement piece of this is critical. What we have found as we've looked at other initiatives across the state to create a new school funding program, it's usually done in a legislative committee. And so when the legislative committee does all their work, brings it back to the Legislature, guess what happens? It either goes on the shelf of indecision or it gets defeated,
because it has not had the community input along the way dealing with the questions that we're going to come up with.

So the goal of this community engagement is really a second rail of this initiative so that we can begin to have people engaged in this along the way. Whatever we come up with will not be a surprise. It will be reflective of the questions they have, the questions we had, and that's why this community engagement, I think, is vital to this. Because, otherwise, we come up with a recommendation, there's no engagement out there, there's no understanding to how we came up with this stuff. Community engagement provides that background, that backdrop, so that folks can come forward and say oh, no, we helped to create this, based upon our input. That's the vital point that I think this initiative has vis-a-vis that of what's happened in other states.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you, Representative Myler. Further questions or thoughts on this? Representative Ladd.

REP. LADD: I -- I concur with what Representative Myler is saying; but there's a charge which we're going to have to look at. The House of Representatives in this state is 400 people, 400 Reps representing different Districts. And Representative Myler stated at the beginning we've got to look at the common good of the state and all the students in the state. That's going to be a difficult task for us to achieve given the nature of each time we hand a spreadsheet out, the first instinct is let me look at my community and see what the impact is. So somehow we're going to have to overcome that.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you very much, Representative Ladd. Yes, Mr. Ardinger.

MR. ARDINGER: I -- I think I hear what you're saying that in the past these efforts have ground to dust on spreadsheet town by town thing. It's interesting what Representative Myler said at the beginning. What we've got to do is define the problem we're trying to solve. If the problem is defined in
terms of, you know, making sure that every child, no matter where they live and they reside, is getting access to a good educational opportunity, an educational outcome chance, maybe the issues of town by town will become a different debate and we're trying to get to the point about how to address inequity.

Now, you know, I know, Mr. Chair, we have not defined yet exactly what problem it is that we're trying to solve, but we need to do that sooner rather than later.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yep. Thank you -- thanks very much for that. That's absolutely right. I mean, I think we've talked right from the beginning of this that the energy of this Commission right out of the box is to -- is to understand the problem or problems that we're facing so and not run off to solutions. And I think we've heard a lot of, I think there's general strong agreement on that as the process, and I think the proposal that we've seen Dr. Mallory put forward really puts the emphasis on that definition of the problem and really understanding the challenges that -- that communities all across the state are facing.

And Representative Ladd actually talked about something that we've talked about quite a bit in the House Education Committee which is -- which is having some spreadsheet discipline when -- when -- when out comes the spreadsheet, we're going to see one in a little bit, hopefully, if we get to it on Adequacy, current Adequacy. But -- but it would be real easy for me to jump to H and figure out what -- what Hopkinton gets out of this but don't do that. It's really more important, particularly when we -- when we heard from so many superintendents and mayors that wore out sets of tires driving down from Berlin, but actually you don't have to drive two hours each way into Concord to -- to find problems. We have people that drove ten minutes into Concord that are suffering enormous challenges, too. And I think the Education Committee, and I'm not trying to say what a great job we did because we did what we could, but -- but we understood that. And I think as we -- we proceed with this work we'll have a much better understanding of
what the problems are across the state and as we go into developing solutions really being sensitive to that. So any other thoughts, questions?  Senator Kahn.

SEN. KAHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I -- I sense that where we need to go in order to meet some timelines is to empower our Chairman to act on behalf of the Committee to continue to negotiate this arrangement. In 15 minutes I'm going to go to another Committee and, hopefully, get back here in time; but just recognizing that that is likely an outcome of our conversation today.

We -- given some of these comments about we've got a lot of people to convince after January 1st of 2021 of what direction the Legislature and public funding ought to take, we're -- with this proposal, we're leaving ourselves without the resources, other than our traditional legislative resources, to pursue public conversation beyond the conclusion of the report. And I just -- I suspect you've given some thought to that question. And I think given the way that this is structured very tightly towards a fixed timeline, can you just reconcile that for us so that we -- we have that vision of so what does happen after January 1st of 2021 if this is the agreement that we enter into.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: No, I'm happy to -- to address that and then certainly love to hear Dr. Mallory on it as well. But -- but -- so there's a couple of things. The -- the -- stepping back to the establishment of this Commission, this Commission endures beyond just the work of an initial policy. In fact, it will continue working until the Legislature acts on -- on -- on the school funding policy for New Hampshire. So, that said, I absolutely agree with everything Senator Kahn said. That -- that there's going to have to be some effort, you know, that goes beyond let's say, a December 1st report deadline. And I think there's a lot of interest to have -- to have all of the work of this process or the -- complete in time to have a December 1st report.
I think it's worth that the members note that a new Legislature comes into play, I believe, on December 2nd. So -- so what that would mean for this Commission is that new members or members would have to be reappointed or new members appointed. So it's important that we hit a report deadline. But as far as the work that the Carsey School and the University System do, you know, it's -- this is kind of a big deal, and -- and it's a big deal for UNH as well. So they've got a lot on the line and I'm really glad they have stepped up to support probably the biggest question that we're going to be considering here in 2020 here in Concord. And -- and while I don't think any of us, hopefully, are -- are prejudiced on a -- on a particular outcome, but other than -- other than that the policies or that the -- that a recommendation that comes out of this Commission ultimately gets adopted, and we know how important that is.

And so success, I think, is going to be defined in two parts. That this Commission did rigorous work in terms of understanding the problem and developing policy solutions that address that. And, two, that we're looking at policy solutions that -- that actually will be able to be durable legislation going forward in the next legislative session and really become the school funding policy for the State of New Hampshire for one or two decades to come as the last round has been. And so there's a lot on the line here. There's a lot on the line for us and for the University System in order to meet that goal. And I'm confident that our relationship with -- with Dr. Mallory, Carsey School, and UNH will be in place in order to achieve that. So, Bruce, any comments?

DR. MALLORY: If I could make a comment. I appreciate Senator Kahn's -- the dilemma that he laid out. And, actually, initially when I was thinking about the proposal and the use of the funds, I actually had like a 14 to 15-month timeline in mind to go into '21, into the late winter and spring of '21, because I simply didn't understand all of the deadlines that you all are facing and the critical fact is that the Legislature changes obviously in -- on December 2nd.
So let me just say today that this budget that you see could be stretched to allow for some activity to take place after your report is submitted to the Legislature to allow for the possibility of continuing public dialogue, public conversations, as -- as your proposals to the Legislature get shaped and get refined. And so our contract doesn't need to end on -- with you, doesn't need to end on December 1st or January 1st. We can manage these funds to allow for some additional activity, as I say, into early '21, if that would be useful to you.

SEN. KAHN: So -- so something like a no-cost extension --

DR. MALLORY: Yes.

SEN. KAHN: -- beyond the initial period. We might do that with our consultants as well.

DR. MALLORY: Yeah, yeah.

SEN. KAHN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Terrific. Any further questions of Dr. Mallory?

REP. AMES: I guess I have something.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Representative Ames.

REP. AMES: This really gets back to my earlier comment about revenue sources, and it's really the other side of Senator Kahn's question before we reach that point to be sure that we've covered everything in this research work that we have. And as that -- I think as we go forward into the details of the research allocation, I want to be sure that we're going to be doing it in a way that brings back to us the information that we need to guide us in assessing the way to go on revenue. It's going to be options. It's going to be -- it's going to address, for example, your -- your references also in the statute to
Class A, B, and C properties, whatever that means. And it will be more than that.

So I just want to be sure that as we allocate for research, it doesn't all go to what is incredibly complex and difficult and perhaps foremost in our minds, what is Education Adequacy and how do we define it in a way that ensures that every kid, wherever they are, is appropriately provided for but also how we pay for it.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thanks very much, Representative Ames. Any further thoughts or comments? Senator Kahn, did you want to make a motion?

SEN. KAHN: No. I'd like to have a conversation with you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Like to have a conversation with me. Then what --

SEN. KAHN: If you could hold that off. After Thatcher.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Okay. Are you going to be able -- are you staying here for this?

SEN. KAHN: I will.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Okay. Okay. Then terrific. I'm going to turn it back over to Dr. Mallory who I think will be introducing our guest. We'll move into the next part of our presentation.

DR. MALLORY: And thanks very much for your questions and comments. Really helpful to us in our thinking and refining how we want to move ahead.

I'll just -- this is sort of medium tech, not low tech and not high tech but here's Dan Thatcher. Dan, you can see the hearing room. Dan's already been very helpful to us given his experience in helping states around the country address similar kinds of policy questions. And so without further ado, Dan, I'll
let you sort of introduce yourself and folks have copies of the slide set that you're going to be referencing as we go through this conversation. And can you hear in the room pretty well?

DANIEL G. THATCHER, J.D., Program Director, State Education Finance Policy Specialist, National Conference of State Legislatures: Can you hear me?

DR. MALLORY: We can hear you.

MR. THATCHER: Can you hear me?

MR. ARDINGER: Yes.

DR. MALLORY: Yes.

MR. THATCHER: Great. Okay. And you have the slide deck?

DR. MALLORY: Yes.

MR. THATCHER: Great. Okay. Thank you. Well, thank you for inviting me and it's an honor to work with New Hampshire again. My very first time out date providing testimony was to New Hampshire in Concord in twenty -- in 2007, I believe. It's a state that I love and I've been there a few times now and vacationed there with my family. I'm from Colorado. I love the mountains, and I love the mountains of New Hampshire, too.

I want to give a little bit of information about NCSL, who it is. Let me find the slide. There we go. We are an organization that's been around for over 40 years and we are an instrumentality of state legislatures. We work with all 50 states and territorial legislatures. We're bi-partisan, and we provide research, technical assistance, and opportunities for legislators and staff to get together at meetings across the country to share ideas and talk about what's been working and not working in their states.
We're also in this space, education finance, somewhat unique because we don't bid on the types of studies that you're contemplating right now. We just decided this is a capacity we do not want to develop. We're more interested in helping states on the front-end in crafting what kind of information they want out of a study that would be most conducive to their state context. So in some ways we're -- we are a unique space that I get to interact with a lot of the education finance experts around the country, but I stop there and I don't engage in the kind of costing out work that so many of them do.

And I've been asked to give a little information on what it is that you could be bidding or putting -- placing bids on for or submitting an RFP. And I've created a little web page for you all to access some of the resources I've put together already for you. This has all kinds of information, including links to other states' RFPs so you can get an idea of what they look like. I've also given all this information to Dr. Mallory to share with you.

So I'll hand over all this information as time goes on; but, for now, I just thought I'd put it all on one web page. And some of the resources have been or I will discuss this afternoon will be on this website as well.

One of the things I wanted to do before getting into kind of the meat of this, more in terms of I might talk too long and not get to the meat of it or rather not get to the resources that I do have that I want to really point you toward. And one is this paper that I wrote last year and it's based on a collection of interviews that Dr. Jacob Adams, a researcher and I did almost ten years ago, where we interviewed legislators and staff from around the country that oversaw successful implementation of and transition to a funding formula. And we interviewed them about what were the conditions pertinent that enabled them to change the funding formula. And we put together all of our interviews and synthesized the responses and nothing happened to it until just last year I decided to write up. So I think this might be helpful for you. There's six things in here
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that -- that may be helpful for you in thinking about this transition to a new funding formula.

The other resource I want to share is an Education Finance Fellowship that I started with the Learning Policy Institute last year or actually, excuse me, a year and a half ago we had Jesse Levin who is one of these individuals who does costing out studies give an introduction on Adequacy studies and how you measure an Adequate Education, et cetera, through our Finance Fellows. And this is a great presentation. It's an overview of these studies. So what I may not capture here this, again, will be linked on that web page. You can go back and look at these slides and I think they're very informative and helpful.

The other resource is -- was put together by other individuals who work on these kinds of studies, Augenblick, Palaich & Associates and Picus Odden. And they have -- this is published in 2014 and it looks at all the costing out studies between 2003 and 2014. What types of methodologies they used, what was the outcome of it, how much money was -- per pupil and total were proposed to meet Adequacy targets, et cetera. So here's another excellent resource for you.

And then a chapter from this book on Measuring Equity and Adequacy for those who want to get more academic. And, finally, I'll be talking in a bit about comprehensive studies. The kind of -- not just the costing out methodologies but a framework to match the goals of your education system with your finance system. And this is -- comprehensive studies are becoming more popular and more common, particularly in Maryland where they've gone the farthest with this kind of approach, and Nevada approached it, too, and New Mexico most recently.

And then, finally, there's been somewhat of a new methodology -- maybe not a new methodology, but research has really exploded with the advent of big data, big education data, and the ability to get really microscopic in terms of where -- where inequities lie, where resources are needed from
neighborhood to neighborhood. And the example of this would be The Opportunity Atlas.

This is a map of the Concord area looking at neighborhoods where the adult incarceration rate for low-income parents, the darker the red, the higher incarceration rate. And you can even look by all kinds of different measures, including high school dropout or high school completion. And it's a way that school finance researchers are thinking that if we can marry this triangular data with our funding systems. It's still kind of initial stage, a theoretical stage, but I want to put it out there just so that you're aware of it.

So when you're looking at engaging in a education finance study, there's two ways you can approach this and two ways that we've seen really within the last five years of how to approach this. And that is how should the resources be allocated in order to achieve the equitable distribution of funding people and providing an Adequate Educational opportunity to all public students, regardless of need or circumstance versus how -- what is the cost of providing an adequate education -- educational opportunity to all students in a state public school system to meet its defined state standards and academic outcome targets.

So I have the proverbial deck chairs on the ship under how and where. And this is really getting at the question of for those states that have a foundation funding formula with weights added to it, differentiated, absorbed costs associated with student types, for example, English Language Learner students at-risk of academic failure. Other cost differentials would include rural or sparse areas to the state. Those kinds of things that would impact the cost of education.

Some states have -- often they go with this route in their finance studies, Mississippi being a good example most recently and Colorado to some extent has moved in this direction. And this is really looking at the weights and the allocations within the existing formula and deciding whether or not these allocations need to be reconsidered or changed based upon the
cost differentials on the ground, 'cause these change. They change quite a bit.

I've got a little bit more on that. And if you go this route, you'll get a simulator, you can plug in what your base funding amount is and change the different weights based upon these cost differentials, and it will simulate what each district allocation would be under the new formula.

So I heard a little bit of talk about this spreadsheet and spreadsheet dilemma. This is kind of what generates that spreadsheet. And most recently this would be -- the firm that did this was EdBuild and EdBuild is closing up shop this year. So I'm not sure who will really be taking on this approach moving forward, but it's one of the approaches that I do want to make you aware of.

And then, of course, there is the more traditional costing out study which, again, is costing out the -- the revenue needed to meet -- for all students to meet basic state educational outcome, goals, and targets. And over the last 40 years there's been different -- four basic different methodologies developed to measure these Adequacy targets. There's the input based and the output based. And I'll just go over quickly the basic definition for each one of these types of methodologies.

Professional judgment based methodology is current spending by a set of high-performing schools. And it identifies the professional judgment because they'll get together, the professionals, with these higher-performing schools and ask them questions about what they're doing with their money, how much -- given how much money they do have, how are they using it? Where are they allocating it? And what are the -- the levels of resources that they do have? And using this information the -- the researchers can develop a very sensitive and fine-tuned allocation system for your state. These really don't work. You can't really transfer them over from state to state. The researcher's really on the ground based upon a condition on the ground, and they'll typically come up with a
per pupil cost for each input or unit within the cost of education.

And then the next one in terms of input based would be the evidence-based model. And this was developed by Larry Picus and Allan Odden years ago in the 1980s mostly, I think late 1970s, where they take a review of the research of the field and the economics of education and apply the evidence from the field and the research to come up with a prototypical school and district and the number of individuals and adults needed to support students from an elementary school, junior high, high school, middle school, et cetera. The number of counselors they need, the number of libraries, et cetera. What types of textbook lessons is needed. Really kind of what the research would say on all these different inputs into education. And with this they develop a prototypical effective school. And recently from Allan Odden wrote that, and this is in 2008, I think, that he wrote this, that the national per pupil average was about, you know, about their target for a successful school, for a prototypical school, and back in 2008 that was about $8,000.

Then we get into the output-based methodologies. And this one, the more common of these would be the successful school districts. This is a methodology that the researchers they come into the state. They ask for the average spending districts or schools, and then look at who of these schools and districts are performing the best on some sort of outcome metrics.

Then they go to these schools and do a study of what's working. Determine an adequate cost by calculating average expenditure among these Districts that have been identified as successful. And then they apply these costs across the state to districts and schools across the state. And I say schools and districts because your analysis here can be both.

Now the final common methodology, which is also the most difficult one to really explain because it's the econometric approach, based on calculations linking performance outcomes with spending and other variables, there is -- let me grab my
notes to read about this. This is a little bit more difficult for me to explain. They statistically evaluate the relationship among spending outcomes, cost factors. They use a model and regression analysis to protect the costs to associate -- to achieve specific levels of outcome. And this has been a method developed early on by Andrew Reschosvky and later developed and honed by Jennifer Imazeki, and it's been used most recently in Kansas as a response to litigation the commission in costing out a cost function study. And that was performed by Lori Taylor at Texas A&M in conjunction with WestEd. But this is a -- the images on the screen here kind of give an explanation of the components that go into it.

The image on the far right is from the original article in 1994 from Andrew Reschosvky where he proposed using this type of approach to measuring Adequacy.

The two -- these are the four basic approaches used. The most recently was in the last five years. What's more often -- more often seen than not is many of the consultants and the firms are coming together to respond to RFPs and to propose a hybrid approach to the study.

In many of these instances, and Maryland is another good example, Augenblick, Palaich Associates, Mike Griffith formerly at ECS and Picus & Odden Associates, they submitted a proposal where they would use the evidence-based approach and the professional judgment approach. Other firms will provide the professional judgment and the cost -- cost function approach. I would not be surprised at all if the responses that you get would be from firms collaborating together and proposing to use multiple methodologies.

Then the final I'd like to make you aware of and that's when I mentioned the comprehensive study and that's looking at outlining larger goals of the school system with your finance study. And what Maryland did most recently was look at in international context looking at the best practices internationally, the best -- the high-performing countries, and
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then align those practices with their state, and then they asked Augenblick, Palaich and Odden Picus to run the costs for -- for achieving those new policies from an international context. That's just something to keep in mind that is another new approach, a new novelty within a build.

I'm going to stop there and again reference you back to the website that I showed earlier. I'm going to -- I'm putting together a list of the most common -- commonly -- the firms that most commonly respond to the RFPs. Give you a sense of who is -- you will most likely hear from and what type of methodology they use. The article that shows the 2003-2014, the article on Comprehensive Review of Adequacy Studies also will have a lot of this information for you as well. But I just wanted to make these major methodologies aware to you, and I'm happy to answer more detailed questions about each, if you would like, or answer any questions at all.

REP. MYLER: Questions of the Committee? A lot of information there, Dan. Mr. Ardinger.

MR. ARDINGER: Yes, thank you, Representative Myler. Thanks very much for your report. I'm very happy to hear from NCSL. You know you heard from Representative Ladd that New Hampshire's faced a problem in the past where there might be a right way of doing things to address, you know, equity concerns that are identified in, you know, in lawsuits. But somehow the ability of the Legislature to get to yes on a formula that would target itself to fix those inequities, runs into a problem that every town, every district, would like to be treated in a particular way and it becomes very difficult to cobble together a consensus that's focused on a good principle but may have some redistribution effects in terms of aid. How do other states and based on your experience, if you can, structure their Commissions to try and avoid that the shores of those town by town kind of competitions?

MR. THATCHER: Sure. Thanks, Chairman. The -- one of my favorite quotes in the research that I did was over ten years
ago was from a legislator in Colorado who said that all politics is local but school politics is localer. And her take away from that is that the -- there's just -- the importance of engaging at a really micro level all the stakeholders from district to district, the School Board Associations, the NEAs, the PTAs, and having this ability to reach out and garner input from each constituency is so critical at the onset. Even doing so may not guarantee a successful outcome. But where -- where these states have been most successful and these endeavors have been most successful where the buy-in from each constituency group occurs. And I sort of mentioned earlier, too, about the defining the problem early on and that is also critical. We've seen that states that have consensus on what the problem is have a lot better opportunity to get consensus on what a solution could be. So I -- I was pleased to hear that that conversation occurred.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great, great. Further questions for Mr. Thatcher? Representative Ladd.

REP. LADD: Thank you. Representative Ladd. In our conversations we've all recognized our formula is based on a per capita allocation and we're being stung by a shrinking student demographic. In looking at some of these other options, as far as a foundation formula or a basic formula for education, how do you incorporate weighted factors or how do incorporate programming into that formula or program needs?

MR. THATCHER: This is one of the trickier parts of transitioning to a new formula is that you have programs that require a level of funding that will do the same regardless of whether there's ten extra students or ten less students in a system. And so when you have a district where one year to the next 50 students move out and your foundation formula is based upon that per capita population of students, you run into this issue where the state funding based upon that count will be significantly less and not sufficient to meet the programmatic funding requirements.
So what states have done have incorporated hold harmless provisions into their funding formulas. These hold harmless provisions would say that from one Fiscal Year to the next, regardless of student population the District could be guaranteed X amount of dollars to meet basic programmatic funding. The issue with these that we see the hold harmless provisions can extend decades in some states. Illinois and Pennsylvania have hold harmless provisions that really negate the whole impact and purpose of reverting to new funding formula. So most experts will say that it need to be no more than really five years in their application. But that's one of those common ways that we've seen Districts deal with a change in populations from one Fiscal Year to the next. There's other different, more complicated ways of getting at it but that's the basic idea.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great. Thanks. Thanks so much. Further questions. So -- so, Mr. Thatcher, I wanted to -- I had to step out of the room a couple of times, but I wanted to thank you for participating and joining us here today via Zoom. I think this works really well. And, also, you know, really sort of introducing to -- to a lot of the members really the capabilities that -- that NCSL can bring to, you know, the work that this Commission is doing. I know this isn't the only time we're going to be -- we're going to be working with you and hearing from you during this process.

At this point, let me just ask if there's any other questions or thoughts for Dan right -- right now? And -- and if not, Dan, what do you -- how do you see sort of like the next steps with NCSL, Carsey School, and the Commission?

MR. THATCHER: Thank you, Chairman. Well, I do want to say that we're ready to help expeditiously because it sounds like the turnaround time that you have is time is of the essence. There was some mention about the turnaround for RFPs for the responses to come and I -- I wouldn't look so much to what other states timelines are. You make your timeline what you need it to be for New Hampshire. And I'm certain that the major players in
the field will -- will meet that timeline. There's a lot of interest in helping you out from the firms and individuals out in the field. So I just want to make that suggestion at this point. But I just think that we can answer any questions that you may have about the impact of a study that you've heard about or the -- any specific questions about one of the costing out methodologies. Happy to get into the granular details with you about any one of those. So whenever there's a question from anyone or the Committee please reach out and we'll turnaround as quickly as we can to get you that information. And, again, we don't have any skin in this game on this. We're here to be supportive of you. We're not going to be responding to the RFP. So we're just here to help any way we can in conjunction with the Carsey School, his school and Dr. Mallory and with you, the Chair, and your members of the Committee.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Terrific. Thank you. So much for joining us this afternoon, Mr. Thatcher. Appreciate all the great work you're doing.

MR. THATCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: At this point, Dr. Mallory, are there any -- any further questions or presentations from NCSL?

DR. MALLORY: No. I know I'm not on mic right now. I'll also add loudly thank you, Dan, very much. I'll follow-up with that additional information. I'll be a conduit between you and the Commission and the Chair in the process. But you're a gold mine and I appreciate you setting up the dedicated website for us already and we're off and running.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Terrific. Thanks very much, and we'll be doing more of this and look forward to seeing you soon, Dan.

DR. MALLORY: I'll sign off. And I'll step back.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great. Thanks everybody for that. Couple things. We're going to -- we're going to shift gears again
and -- and hear a very high-level overview on Adequacy from Caitlin David of the Department of Education. And she'll be back. She'll be here, I'm sure, at just about all these -- these meetings. It is not adequate to cover Adequacy in ten minutes or five minutes. We know that. So -- but because there are some handouts today, we wanted to give Miss Davis an opportunity to introduce them so that when you -- when you take them home and look at them that they will sort of have an understanding of how they work.

I think many of the Members who have been on either Senate or House Education Committees, certainly Finance Committees, have spent a lot of time with these before. But let me turn it over to Caitlin to sort of march us through this. Thank you, Caitlin.

CAITLIN DAVIS, Department of Education: Good afternoon. Is this on or --

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: I don't know.

MS. DAVIS: Now is it on? Okay. All right. So I have some documents in front of you. I'm just going to basically I think I'm just going to tell you what you have in front of you, tell you to go home and look at it, and then we can talk about it next time. So, most excitingly, we got a new printer at the Department of Education and it prints on very big paper. So you have in front of you Fiscal 20 and Fiscal 21 Adequate Education Funding Formula. This is the money that's actually being distributed to School Districts. Fiscal Year 20 is the money that is mostly final. We're making payments on. Fiscal 21 is an estimate that we did in November based on the beginning of the year data, this year, and that will be distributed to School Districts next year. But the reason the Department of Education does an estimate is because the School Districts need that for their budgets which they're obviously preparing and will be getting voted on very shortly. So that's what you have in front of you. This is funds spreadsheet knowledge.
The other thing you have in front of you is a 35-page packet with some useful information for you, mostly relative to school finance. So the first thing that you have in front of you, the very first page, it's a State Summary Revenue of Expenditures of School Districts. So Senator Kahn mentioned before that we have a very low amount of money that we're spending per pupil. I wanted to just kind of explain that further. And it's a very low amount of money we're spending per pupil at the State level. We actually usually are the very last or second to last as far as state funding to School Districts. But we actually have usually in the top ten spending per pupil. So we're actually spending a lot of money per pupil.

What that means is if you look at the revenue sources you have there in front of you, you have local taxation. These are the state averages. So the way that we put this information together at the Department of Education is we collect something called a DOE-25 which is essentially the financial statements of the School Districts. It's 25 pages, hence the 25. And we put together all of that information, we summarize it all, and this is what we come up with. So you can see 62% of funding is coming from local taxation.

One thing I also want to point out is is that Equitable Education Aid, which is the funding formula which I hadn't planned to talk about today, that's 28%. In that 28% is the Statewide Education Property Tax. So a lot of people would like us to present this data in a different way, because they would like the $363 million in the State Funding Formula to actually be included in local taxation as well, because it's on local municipality properties. But for this intended purposes it's a State revenue and it's a State funding source so that's why it comes from there.

Other state sources, those include Building Aid, State Special Education Aid, which is formerly known as Catastrophic Aid, Free-and-Reduced-Lunch funding from the State level, Public School Infrastructure, Tuition and Transportation to CTE Centers. And then the federal money is all the federal money.
that's flowing to the Department of Education. That's Every Student Succeed Act money that people know as Title I, Title II, the IDEA Act, which is the special-education funding, Perkins, which is career and technical education funding, Adult Education and the Child Nutrition Act which provides federal money for Free-and-Reduced Lunch meals. So that's kind of the summary of everything that is the revenue sources that's coming into the state to pay for funding.

You can see when you look at the expenditures it's about $3.3 billion. So statewide in a year the total education funding in public district schools. I want to say district schools does not include Charters, non-public, anything like that, is about $3.3 billion spend. So that's important.

So next I'm just going to kind of take you through the packet and then we can discuss the other pieces later. So next on Page 2 we have the State Average Cost Per Pupil. So, again, using that same DOE-25 and the data we just discussed the Department of Education calculates every year a State Average Cost Per Pupil. We calculate it for each School District, and then we also calculate the State Average. Last year the State Average was about $16,000 per kid.

And so then the following page -- pages, has the Average Cost Per Pupil of all of the school districts. So that's --

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: So, Miss Davis, just on the State Average.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Question on that. That's calculated by sort of, I guess, simple -- simple math of -- of how much we spend -- how much total is spent divided by total number of students, ADMA.
MS. DAVIS: Yes. Average Daily Membership in Attendance, which is lower than residents because kids are going to school outside of state or out-of-district placements.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: So State Average would be different than the average spend by School Districts.

MS. DAVIS: It's the same ratio. It's being calculated, yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Right, but it's an aggregate of.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: As opposed to looking at what School Districts spend and then calculating that average.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: The average of what a School District spends.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, yes. Yes, it's not the average of the averages.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Right, right.

MS. DAVIS: The next page --

REP. LADD: I have something. Caitlin, I’m sorry.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: They're going to come as we're going.

REP. LADD: If we're going walking through this. You walked us through last summer on some of this, on the DOE-25 form. I've been doing some work at the House on transportation.

MS. DAVIS: Hm-hum.
REP. LADD: And on Page 2 of 1 here, or second page in the full packet, we have the cost, the total cost, you know, of elementary, middle, and high school, and then you've got the total which is a little less. Does this incorporate or include the actual cost for athletics in that or is that -- or is this just based upon the amount that's in the foundation, the Base Adequacy, the original $315 per head?

MS. DAVIS: I believe it's all transportation cost, but I will verify that for you.

REP. LADD: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great. We'll keep going then. Thanks.

MS. DAVIS: So next is you have the local district information for the cost per pupil. So you can see when you look at that that this is all over the place. It ranges from anywhere about $10,000 per pupil up to $45,000 per pupil. So that's just in there informational.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Hm-hum.

MS. DAVIS: The next thing that's in your packet on Page 7, and there are -- some of these have their own page numbers on them. They're just pdfs. But the page number I'll be referring to will always be in the lower right-hand side of the page.

So next on Page 7, you actually have the Department of Education explanation of the Adequate Education Funding Formula. And then on Page 10, you have something called Calculating Education Grants. The LBA actually prepares this document, as much as I like to take credit for it because I use it all the time. This document very easily explains the Adequate Education Funding Formula. So it actually was published today, updated for 2020 and 2021. And next time we'll go through actually to explain how this works.
Same sort of thing on Page 11. So we have the written explanation of the '21 formula. And then, again, the LBA calculation of the '21 formula. Typically, the formula is the same for every -- for each year of the biennium. But I'll just remind you all that the Legislature and the State Budget actually had some one-time money that was included in the '21 formula which was Fiscal Capacity Aid and additional Free-and-Reduced Lunch Aid. So that's one-time money and there's explanation of that one-time money there in front of you as well.

Next and on Page 15 --

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Just a quick question, Miss Davis, on Page 8 on the FY 20 formula under Stabilization Grant, we're at 100%.

MS. DAVIS: We are at 100%. Yes, that's a mistake. I'll take that out.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: All right. Thanks. We worked hard on that.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, right, very hard. Hum -- the next that you have in front of you there is just really a breakdown of how it works for a town. If anybody is curious, this is actually the Town of Lempster. I actually did this for their School Board meeting. That's why I had this prepared. But what it does is it shows you what they're getting under '19, what they're getting under '20, and what they're getting under '21. And it shows you kind of each amount that they are getting per the individual pupils. And it shows you the '21 amounts with their Free-and-Reduced-Lunch percentages, which that new aid relies on and the equalized valuation per pupil which, again, the new aid calculates or accounts for.

Next on Page 16, you just have several years' worth of data. This is just something that the Department puts out every year just so you can look back to see maybe how many
Free-and-Reduced-Lunch kids there are. What the base population is. What the amounts per pupil are.

One thing I just want to point out though that if you're trying to look through year to year, this year and every year going forward we have full day kindergarten aid, so '14 through '19, the ADM actually was lower than the actual number of kids enrolled because each kindergarten kid counted as half. So it's not true apples to apples when you're looking at this anymore. It used to be but it's not.

But this is really the purpose of this was to show how much we're spending each year, which this does show you how much we are spending each year.

Next in your formula or in your -- in your formula -- in your packet, you just have some information that I typically get asked for which are enrollments. So it's enrollments by grade for this fall. All that information is there. And then, again, on the back of that page is more enrollment information. And this is historical information for the last ten years. This is really helpful when you're looking at how much the population of the State of New Hampshire has actually decreased. And it actually lists out public schools, non-public schools, charter schools, and then there's some State totals as well.

The next thing in your packet is the Equalized Valuation Per Pupil. So that's important to understand specifically if you're looking at the education funding formula this year or in 2021. So what that -- what that is is we take the equalized valuation provided to us by the Department of Revenue and we look at the number of kids enrolled in the School District, and we actually just simple math come up with an equalized valuation per pupil.

And then next in your packet is the Valuations, Property Assessments, and Tax Rates of School Districts. So this is, again, something that we get a lot of requests for at the Department of Education and that's just by municipality. That is
the most recent data we have at the Department of Education. That's why it's been provided. And I think that is -- that is the last thing that was included in your packet for this time.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Terrific. Thank you, Miss Davis. Questions very quickly for Miss Davis?

MR. ARDINGER: One follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yes, go ahead.

MR. ARDINGER: You mentioned at the beginning some comparative information. You said -- let me see if I got it right. That New Hampshire with its total spending, regardless of where it's coming from --

MS. DAVIS: Right.

MR. ARDINGER: -- is like normally you said in the top ten nationally?

MS. DAVIS: Yes, that's correct.

MR. ARDINGER: So New Hampshire spends a lot of money per pupil?

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. ARDINGER: And the second thing so that I understand it right, is that you said but New Hampshire has a great deal of that total coming from local sources.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. ARDINGER: And so that's more like, you know, like you said, 62.5%.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.
MR. ARDINGER: And that's like Massachusetts is 57%. It's very high local component.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. ARDINGER: Those were two things were different but two points you mentioned; is that right?

MS. DAVIS: Yes, that's accurate.

MR. ARDINGER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you very much. Any further questions of Miss Davis? Yes. Yes, Mr. Zanchuk.

MR. ZANCHUK: Just one question. Is this grand chart here available as a spreadsheet?

MS. DAVIS: Yes, they're on our DOE website.

MR. ZANCHUK: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Further questions? Miss Davis, we'll be back, that's for sure. So -- so thank you very much, Caitlin, for all your great work.

REP. LADD: If I may ask?

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yes, go ahead.

REP. LADD: Caitlin, you provided to the Committee the MS-25 form, which is or not yet, the DOE-25 form which has 25-pager with expenses and revenue.

MS. DAVIS: Hm-hum.

REP. LADD: Through the Chair could we have that provided to us or is that in the packet here?
MS. DAVIS: Just a blank copy of one?

REP. LADD: No, I want to have the most recent one.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: From each district.

REP. LADD: Didn't we have a compilation sheet which shows the --

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: That was in here.

MS. DAVIS: We do have a compilation sheet, but it's not really something that we can print out.

REP. LADD: Well, I have one right here from 16-17.

MS. DAVIS: Maybe I'm thinking of something different. Let me look at what you're --

REP. LADD: Okay. Happy to.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Great. Further questions? So thank you very much, Miss Davis. And we'll go back to the agenda. I know I'm holding people a little bit longer --

REP. LADD: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: -- than I -- than I had planned. We like to have these at two hours, but we've got a couple of business items we need to -- we need to look at very quickly.

So on your -- at your desks are a copy of the draft minutes from January 13th, 2020. That was just a short two weeks ago. So, hopefully, despite everything else that's happened between then and now, we all can remember some of what happened then. It's a really quick read. I'll give everybody sort of like half a minute to read it. Representative Heath.

REP. HEATH: Chair, would you like a motion?
CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: I'd love a motion.

** REP. HEATH: I'd like to move that we accept the minutes as written.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you very much, Representative Heath. Is there a second?

MR. ARDINGER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: It's been seconded by Mr. Ardinger. Are there further questions, clarifications, amplifications, changes anything anybody wants to make? If not, all in favor? Any opposed? The minutes carry. Thank you.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: And the other -- another item wanted to review very quickly is the draft calendar that I think you all -- you all have in your seats. I think at the last meeting we talked about times that worked for people. Obviously, Val, you weren't there, but we're sort of thinking Monday afternoons I think now is the -- the time where we're sort of honing in on. So 2:00 p.m. start times I think give people to get a lot of stuff done during the day and then get to Concord in time. Hopefully, that works for our Superintendents on the Commission.

DR. DAVID RYAN, School Superintendent, SAU 16: We'll make it work.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Fantastic. I certainly understand that, you know, we're going to have a lot of meetings between now and -- and when our report comes out in December. And -- and I certainly understand that people are going to have conflicts from time to time. So if you do know that you're going to have a conflict, if you can just, you know, send me a quick e-mail on that letting me know that and if you can't, that's fine, too. We understand things come up at the end as well, so.
But anyway, what -- what we're -- what I'm trying to do here with this -- with this calendar is really take us through the beginning of April where the RFP would basically be -- the open period of the RFP would really be back and we'd really be starting in on -- on, you know, collecting data at that point and getting some of the results from the work that the Carsey School would be doing with the community outreach.

So between now and then, looking at meeting the next two Mondays, so February 3rd and February 10th. February 17th is a federal -- is Presidents' Day so the State House Complex is closed. Looking at meeting the Friday of that week, which I hope might be a possibility for people, because the following week, the week of February 24th is February school vacation week for many, many schools here in New Hampshire. And I think people said that they might not be available during that week. So we're trying to dodge some of these federal holidays, school vacation week and stuff like that. So that's why -- that's why these first three meetings planned.

And then we are right into March and, hopefully, can get back onto a -- a weekly or close to weekly schedule on Mondays. And I did not put March 16th in, and I'm not sure why at this point. It may have been that may have been a thought we needed a break from the weekly push of meetings. But -- but might put the 17th back. I mean, the 16th back in.

JOHN BEARDMORE, Hopkinton, NH: Also the 30th, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: And the 30th. Yeah, and the 30th. So let me take a look at those. Obviously, may have been a little bit over ambitious in terms of scheduling time and we're going to need, obviously, more time with Miss Davis and the Department on a number of these.

But for -- so there's a couple of -- couple of viewpoints I wanted to make on the calendar. Obviously, dates that you might want -- that you should pencil into your calendars. But also
really start thinking of how we go about framing up agendas going forward. A lot of what I think we need to hear from early on are sort of like what we heard from Dan Thatcher at NCSL and Caitlin Davis at the Department. And so -- so looking at -- at -- and I may juggle these up a little bit, but -- but looking at the various components that go into public education here in New Hampshire, not saying Adequacy, because I think that's something that we've got to determine later on. But as far as Commission Members hearing about what -- what goes into public education, so we'll certainly hear more from -- from Miss Davis on -- on the current Adequacy formula. But things like Building Aid, special-education laws, state graduation requirements, general overview of -- of regulations. We talked about the federal Every Student Succeeds Act, what goes into that. What are sort of the requirements from that in terms of -- in terms of PK-12 education and public education in New Hampshire.

At some point having a presentation from the Education Commission of the States which otherwise known as ECS. And they do a lot of -- a lot of the research work. Also, Reaching Higher-New Hampshire, a lot of research work. How's New Hampshire schools performing? Probably going to want to hear a little bit from them and learn a little bit more about early childhood education and what goes on there. I know we have got some experts on the Carsey School -- from the Carsey School team on that.

Representative Ladd has talked about the importance of CTE, Career and Technical Education. So bringing somebody in from -- from our CTE Programs to talk about that. We have a very, very strong Dual and Concurrent Enrollment Program that I believe just in this last year we expanded to -- was it sophomores?

REP. LADD: Tenth grade and Manchester ninth grade.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Right. So and these are through partnerships that -- actually through -- through agreements that
we have with the Community College System where students can earn community credits at our community colleges, which transfer into other schools. And I believe it's $150 for a -- for a class.

REP. LADD: That's right.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Compared to maybe six or $700 for a class in our community colleges. So extended learning opportunities. Attainment goals. Mental and behavioral health, school counselors, Medicaid to Schools, school nursing, New Hampshire Retirement System, interscholastic sports, Charter schools, transportation, McKinney-Vento, the list actually goes on, and I'm sure I've forgotten things on here; but take a look at these things. We can juggle them up. They don't have to be on these specific days. But I would like to sort of frame up what agendas may look like for the next two or three months going out. So that -- so that this Commission really knows what it's going to be -- going to be looking at for business every week.

So any -- oh, and I made some marginal notes on mine. I know Mr. Mallory talked about maybe a work session or a brainstorming primary research questions. Obviously, that's going to be something very important early on as -- as the listening tour really gets up and started. And -- and Mr. Mallory also brought up our interest to maybe interview the research vendors after the close of the RFP period. So that may be something that we want to put on the calendar as well.

For our next meeting we're going to have an RFP draft from the Carsey School for technical support contracts and these are basically research vendors. So we're not going to -- we'll be talking about that RFP at next week's meeting. We're not going to need to act on that. But we -- what we will be acting on at next week's meeting is the proposal that -- that we heard today from the Carsey School. So we don't need it in place right now, but we're going to need to get that in place at next week's meeting so that at our meeting following that on the 10th that -- that we'll be able to approve the RFP to go out. It will
be disseminated through the Carsey School to -- to -- there's really a small number, a handful of -- of organizations in the country that do this type of research work. And, obviously, the Carsey School needs to be brought on board in order for them to be in a position where they can -- they can do that. So that's what we're looking at for the next -- next couple of meetings. Yes, Representative Ames.

REP. AMES: You don't have time, start times on these meetings? What do you have in mind?

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yeah, I'm really thinking 2:00 p.m.

REP. AMES: What about Friday? I express a preference it would be morning.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Would be morning on the Friday?

REP. AMES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: How do people think about that on the 21st?

MR. ZANCHUK: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: We'll look at a -- a -- you want to do a 9 a.m.?

REP. AMES: That be great.

SEN. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, just note of awareness there's a New Hampshire Fiscal Policy Institute meeting that day.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Is that more noontime?

SEN. MORGAN: I'm not aware of the start time. Want to make sure.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you very much, Senator Morgan. We'll take a look at that.
DR. MALLORY: Mr. Chairman, excuse me. That is scheduled for first thing in the morning. Starts at 8:30 at the Grappone Center.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Oh, it is? I'll take a look at that. Maybe we want to juggle this to a 10:00 a.m. start so that people may want to be able to attend the beginning part of that or something else. We'll -- we'll -- I'll take that offline. We'll figure that out. So at this point --

MR. BEARDMORE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: -- any further thoughts? Yes.

MR. BEARDMORE: Could I just give one suggestion? Super ambitious timeline. I think all of these entities are appropriate. One suggestion I would have for an early presentation and a robust presentation would be from the New Hampshire Department of Justice regarding the current status of Adequacy litigation. First and foremost, it's my assumption that we probably wouldn't be sitting here if we thought there wasn't some risk in the courts that our current system of education finance was potentially in jeopardy by a lawsuit. So I'm most interested in understanding from the Department of Justice, which I understand is tasked with representing the State's interest, which is the current law, which may or may not be what we believe is the best way of funding education; but I think important information, nonetheless, and perhaps a bit of a trip down memory lane understanding, you know, the various Claremont lawsuits and how we got to where we are.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Terrific. Thank you very much, Mr. Beardmore. I know I forgot a lot of stuff off of here. So I appreciate the suggestion to getting these on. Perhaps hearing from DOJ and hearing from somebody that -- that, you know, that can speak to the -- the Claremont -- the Claremont Opinions, as well as the ConVal Opinion, and not necessarily do it from the standpoint of defense on it. So as you pointed out, the DOJ is
tasked with representing the current status. So I wouldn't necessarily want to put them in a position where they need to comment on maybe other aspects of that. But, you know, somebody that's independent of that to be able to speak to the -- speak to those court rulings. So --

REP. AMES: Yeah, I would --

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Hang on a second, Dick.

MR. BEARDMORE: One suggestion might be Attorney Tobin who I know has joined us for a couple of our meetings. I know he's been there perhaps from the very beginning and perhaps provide us a sort of down the middle explanation of where the courts have been on this important issue.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Perfect. Thank you very much, Mr. Beardmore. I'm seeing some nods around the table. That's great. Representative Ames.

REP. AMES: Yeah, just to underscore that. I think that our DOJ is involved in this litigation and representing one perspective. Mr. Tobin is actually entering into the case on the other side and so we need to get both perspectives.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Agreed. Representative Myler.

REP. MYLER: I would encourage the members of the Commission who have not yet read the brief that's in our packet of the most recent court because they basically have brought all the data up-to-date, and it really is very informative of where we are right now from a status quo standpoint. So it’s just to underscore the need to understand the status of where we are within the legal structure of the school funding.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Terrific. Mr. Ardinger.

MR. ARDINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On a slightly different mechanical logistical. For these meetings some of them I'm
looking at are in the school vacation area here. Is it possible that members of -- I know it is possible legally, but for members of the Commission if they need to call in and participate by phone. That might be easier on days when there might be snow hitting the Peterborough area or a school vacation might be on one of these days.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Sure. No, thanks very much, Bill. I think that's a great suggestion. And, you know, I think we want to make, you know, participation on this easy rather than difficult from a logistical standpoint. So -- so if participation via -- via either just audibly on a conference call, or I think we saw the Zoom, you know, video conference thing worked, too. But, you know, I can try to accommodate.

MR. ARDINGER: I think in terms of Commission participation, I think just a simple cell phone would work fine. It's listen in and hear and stay up-to-date with the meeting.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yeah.

MR. ARDINGER: I think that be helpful.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Fantastic. Thanks very much, Mr. Ardinger. Any other further questions or thoughts while we're -- while we're here at this juncture? Then I'm going to open the floor up to members of the community to share any -- any thoughts they have. And then we'll wrap things up. So is there anybody that would like to make a few comments? Mr. Hall, welcome.

DOUG HALL, Esq., Concord, NH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, I'm Doug Hall. I've been involved in this issue since 1984 in various ways. And based on what I've heard here today, it seems to me the two things that you're going to be engaged in, which are really important and which have been lacking, I believe, in the legislative committees that have looked at this over the last maybe two decades, one is the
ability to get out with community outreach and get community input. That's been lacking.

The second is what was beginning to be presented in the NCSL which is we're one of 50 states. We're not the only place that's had to deal with this. But we haven't reached out to other states in the past to gather information from them. So I think this is really a good starting point and your plan looks good.

Representative Myler said when he was introducing himself at the beginning that there were critical questions, and here's my critical question for you. In 2020, what should constitute an adequate education for every child in New Hampshire? So you answer that question, all the other things are putting the cart before the horse. And once you answer that question, there's a follow-up question. How do you make sure every child has access to that defined education, no matter where they live? Mr. Ardinger mentioned that part of that.

So I just hope that in the planning for presentations that you will have in coming weeks that you try to take that question of what should be the defined adequate education. What do we want for every child going to school in New Hampshire and make that part of the questions you're asking people. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Thank you very much, Mr. Hall. Any other -- any other comments while we're here? Anything else from the Committee? If not, then I guess we are done with our --

REP. LADD: I've got one.

CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Oh, yes, Representative Ladd.

REP. LADD: Is Caitlin Davis' DOE spreadsheet report going to continue at the next meeting or are we -- because that's -- that's -- this is a critical component to what we are doing here, and we did it in, what, ten minutes.
CHAIRMAN LUNEAU: Yeah. Thank you. It's -- yeah, that was just an overview because we certainly didn't have time to give it -- to give it adequate and complete review today. But -- but Miss Davis will be back to go through this in more detail. I'll take it under advisement as far as next meeting and let everybody know.

Anything else? We're done with our agenda. Everybody drive safe. We'll see you next week, February 3rd, 2:00 p.m., right here. Thanks.

(The meeting concluded at 4:32 p.m.)
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