MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Seventy-Third Session
February 23, 2005

The Committee on Education was called to order at 3:47 p.m., on Wednesday, February 23, 2005. Chairwoman Bonnie Parnell presided in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

    Ms. Bonnie Parnell, Chairwoman
    Ms. Debbie Smith, Vice Chairwoman
    Mrs. Sharron Angle
    Mr. Kelvin Atkinson
    Mr. Joe Hardy
    Mr. Brooks Holcomb
    Mr. Garn Mabey
    Mr. Mark Manendo
    Mr. Bob McCleary
    Mr. Harvey J. Munford

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

    Mr. William Horne (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

    None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

    Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst
    Rachel Pilliod, Committee Manager
    Paul Partida, Committee Attaché

OTHERS PRESENT:

Keith W. Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, State of Nevada

Paul M. La Marca, Assistant Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, State of Nevada

Mark S. Knudson, Educational Technology Consultant, Office of Technology and Innovative Programs, Department of Education, State of Nevada

Gloria P. Dopf, Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, State of Nevada

Chairwoman Parnell:
[Meeting called to order and roll called.] I would like the members of the Committee to take note of a couple of things in their folders. You have been given a copy of the State Improvement Plan; Dr. Rheault and Dr. La Marca will both be discussing that. I also put in for your information the potential to the state of Nevada if President Bush's proposed education cuts do go through; it comes to $530 million to the state. You will see a list in your folder of programs that could potentially be impacted if those cuts are approved. Dr. Keith Rheault will be speaking on behalf of school accountability. He will be showing us how easy it is to access online information, addressing the issue of how to find out how schools are doing. I was amazed how simple this is to access a great deal of information, so we will be seeing an example.

Keith W. Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, State of Nevada:
Today I have asked three staff members to present. Dr. Paul La Marca will be showing how to navigate the website and know what is on the State Report Card. I think you will find that interesting. The second one is a short presentation on the statewide technology and what is happening in that area regarding the Commission. Mark Knudson will be giving the presentation on that. Then I will have Gloria Dopf give a short presentation on the State Improvement Plan.

Paul M. La Marca, Assistant Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, State of Nevada:
I have provided to you a two-page handout (Exhibit B) that I will loosely follow as part of this presentation. Really what it is, if you find some time tomorrow, I think you could go through it and do exactly what I will be doing today, and that will enable you to really use the tool so you can begin learning how to use it more effectively than what I will show you. What I am demonstrating for you

is the web-based Accountability Report Card, which is a requirement of both federal and state legislation. I am going to take you through how to access it and give you some short examples.

[Paul La Marca, continued.] The easiest place to access the website is through the Nevada Department of Education home site, <www.doe.nv.gov>. You have each of the locations that you need in the future for your reference in this handout. Once at the Nevada Department of Education home site, you will find a link on the homepage to the Nevada Report Card, and you simply click on the Report Card. At this location you have free access to navigate all of the information for all schools in Nevada and all school districts.

There are a variety of different types of things that you can do:
- You can look at profiles of State performance for districts and schools.
- You can compare schools with districts with State results.
- You can make very specific comparisons between schools.
- You can do custom searches, in which you can group schools based on some characteristic and look at comparisons among those schools.

I will take you through a couple of examples looking specifically at a school. This is all publicly accessible information that has been accessible for some time now. There is not confidentiality being violated here.

Once in the Report Card website, you might choose to click on the school. [Used the computer and projector to show Committee members how to navigate the website.]

- Click on the green school button. You can now choose any school from any school district. I live in Washoe County. I live in the Spanish Springs area, and my children are zoned for Spanish Springs Elementary.
- Go to the drop-down menu for the district.
- Choose Washoe County.
- Go to the drop-down menu for schools; find Spanish Springs Elementary School.
- Click "View." The Spanish Springs Elementary School Report Card is immediately shown.

The front page provides:
- The mission statement.
- An introduction to the school.
- The goals of the school.
- The school objectives.

[Paul La Marca, continued.] Along the left-hand column there is a variety of information that can be accessed about Spanish Springs Elementary School. This information has been provided to the State Department through the school district and the schools from their Student Information Systems and other sources.

The buttons are along the left, and there is a very important button called "download."

- Go directly to download. What you can do here is download preformatted summary reports, which are essentially a mini-accountability report. You get this nice little preformatted report that can be printed out in its entirety. This is nice function. It is a summary; it does not provide some of the detailed information you can find elsewhere.

For example, in that summary report, you get limited information about the demographics of the school:

- Click on the "demographic profile" button to get much more information. Here there is an overview of the gender makeup of the school, the ethnic makeup of the school, and special population of the school. That is in graphical form and tabular form.
- Click on ethnic breakdown.
- A pie chart that shows the composition of the school is brought up.
- Directly click on the pie chart and finer-grained information is available. This is information that compares Spanish Springs's ethnic composition to Washoe County's ethnic composition to the State's ethnic composition.

At this point, you can actually click straight into Washoe County, and you can look at all schools within Washoe County and their ethnic makeup. That can be done for any of the different sorts, for gender and special population. There are back buttons that always allow moving to the left-hand side and click into any area that is chosen.

Demographic information is very important. It helps us to understand the results. I think primarily people are interested in accountability these days, Adequate Yearly Progress, primarily in assessment results. I will take you to the Adequate Yearly Progress button to demonstrate a different website. There is some limited information here, but you can link over to our website virtually simultaneously.

[Explained how to navigate through the Adequate Yearly Progress reports.] The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is the general profile for the school for the most recent administration:

- What is seen here is what the school district first sees from the Department, then sends to the school, which indicates area of concern.
- Initially, this school received these red marks, then through an appeal process appealed those.
- An updated chart that indicates the appealed participation rate for the IEP [Individualized Education Program] subpopulation. They were successful on that appeal.
- This also indicates the school's current status—they made Adequate Yearly Progress—and their current school designation—they are adequate as defined by State statute.
- What can be done here, this is very gross level information.
- There is a link button at the bottom of the page to the Nevada Department of Education website, specifically the AYP website. This takes you to a lot of information that will tell everything needed to know about AYP in Nevada. You can scroll down this page. I want to show how quickly this information can be had.

[Paul La Marca, continued.] For Washoe County:
- Choose Washoe County.
- A list of all Washoe County schools is shown, or any school in the state.
- Click on Spanish Springs Elementary School.
- Their full AYP profile in Microsoft Excel or HTML format is available.
- The profile allows anyone in the public to see how this school has done.
- This gives a variety of demographic information about the school.
- Very specific information is available.
- Participation rate information is available.
- Status achievement information is available.
- Safe harbor analysis is available.
- The source data that was used to calculate AYP for the school is available.

Back to the Report Card website, the AYP page. [Backed up to the Spanish Springs Elementary School page.] There are a variety of different things that can be done. That was just a quick demonstration of getting information about Spanish Springs Elementary School. I haven't shown the majority of information that there is:
- Fiscal information
- Per pupil expenditure
- Curriculum information
- Technology information
- Information about student behavior
- Transience rate

- Average daily attendance
- Parent information
- Involvement in parent/teacher conferences
- Information on assessments
- CRT [Criterion Reference Test] data
- NRT [Norm Reference Test] data
- Writing data
- NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] results for the state only at this website

Chairwoman Parnell:
Thank you. That was fascinating. I hope the members of the Committee are pleased to see this and have learned something. I would like you to go back to the one that shows the AYP, because when Mr. Holcomb, Mr. Munford, Mrs. Smith, and I went to Douglas County and had a presentation, we had a visual of the 36 squares that are the subgroup on the AYP. We saw something fascinating about Douglas High School. They had 1 box out of the 36 that had an X in it. That was because they were two students short in the testing of that subgroup. Because of that, Douglas High School did not make Adequate Yearly Progress. Could you show that to the members? I found that visual very fascinating.

Paul La Marca:
Yes. [Explains using the computer and the projector how this is done.]
- Go specifically to the school button.
- Choose Douglas County.
- Go to the school drop-down menu.
- Choose Douglas High School.
- View the report.
- Go into Adequate Yearly Progress.
- The general profile is shown.
- Douglas High School had a problem with participation among their IEP [Individualized Education Program] subpopulation.
- The basic status is that they did not make AYP.
- They are in need of improvement.

Some of the more fine-grained information that you are referencing you would need to cross-reference to the other website, <www.doe.nv.gov>.

- Go to the most recent data, because we actually have the 2002-03 results up as well. Douglas is able to be seen over the last 2 years, if needed.

- Choose either Excel or HTML format.
- Click on Participation at the bottom of the page.
- The results for IEP subpopulation – they had 48 students enrolled.
- They had a 93 percent participation rate, and the requirement is 95 percent. They probably missed it by one student.

[Paul La Marca, continued.] If there are fewer than 40 students, all students but one have to participate in order for the participation requirements to be met. It is a very rigorous standard, we have found. Janice Florey [Test Director for Douglas County School District] would make the same comment. Our participation rate is very difficult, a rigorous standard that we can control better than some of the other indicators. Yes, one student can make all the difference in a school.

Chairwoman Parnell:
I think it is important for the members to understand that as we hear different bills in the next few upcoming weeks and we use the term "not making AYP," that we need to understand there is a vast difference between a school like Douglas High School not making AYP and another school that would have had 35 out of the 36 boxes not making that benchmark. We need to be very careful. It is not as obvious as it sounds, is the point I would like to make.

Paul La Marca:
We have found achievement has been the indicator that has led to most AYP designations. But there are vast differences among the schools.

Assemblywoman Angle:
This is fascinating to me. I was having a conversation with Mary Jane Pierce, the Deputy Secretary for the Western Region Department of Education. She was talking to me about "Just for the Kids," (JFTK) a group started by Tom Luce in Texas. It is an Internet-based program similar to this, but they have one more part. That is that they allow an interaction between schools. When you have schools that have common demographics, they can interact within the state and find out, if one is successful, how that success was achieved. So it becomes an interactive site for schools to improve. If you have a school that needs improvement and you are looking at Anderson Elementary School, you can contact Pete Hall and say, "How did you do that?" Have you looked into that kind of interactive part for this program?

Paul La Marca:
We have. In fact, this is one part Assemblyman McCleary could talk to you about. This is one part of SAIN [State Accountability and Information Network].

It is the replacement of SMART [Statewide Management of Automated Record Transfer] and much more. This is the report card, which is a static site. There is another data collection effort that is much more rigorous. We are collecting data daily from school districts, and we are building on public reporting components that will ready access to the public on an ongoing basis. As part of that portal environment, there is going to be an attempt to allow these chat rooms or ongoing interaction among educators. This site is a static site. It does have these custom search functions that would enable you to select out, based on certain demographic profiles, schools that are similar to yours so that you can do comparisons among those schools. But it doesn't now allow you yet to have that next step of interaction. We think the next part of the SAIN project will allow that. That actually should be implemented before June 30, although the training to get the public using that system will be fairly intensive.

Assemblywoman Angle:
In my talking with Mary Jane Pierce, she said that actually this is a free service that is offered to states which would like to participate in this kind of interaction. So I am wondering if you might get a hold of Mr. Tom Luce and ask him if we can get this set up free in Nevada, so that we can have that interaction, because they are seeing some real improvements in Texas and Arkansas. This is because educators are able to interact with one another and find best practices that are working within their states.

Assemblyman Mabey:
Can you give me where I can find out where the classes did on standardized tests? Do we have information available?

Paul La Marca:
Class level information is not available on this website. In Nevada, at this point in time, when we administer tests, tests are administered in a variety of different ways. Standardized conditions, but they are not always administered by a classroom teacher. In instances in which they are, that information is batched together, so that classroom information can be provided and it is interpretable. But, in many cases, it is not interpretable.

The only link we have right now is the students and the proctor. If the proctor is their teacher, we have that information. If the proctor is someone else, we don't have that information. We are, as part of SAIN, trying to link the student information systems to teacher licensure databases, so we don't have to worry about score sheets. This is so we can make a direct link to teachers. That is part of an ongoing rollout. We will be producing classroom level reports for the Criterion Reference Testing program in grade 3 and grade 5 this school year. There is some classroom level reporting available for the NRTs in grade 4. It also

gets very complex once you get into middle school and high school, where students have multiple teachers.

Chairwoman Parnell:
Are there any additional questions? I'm sure you could spend hours investigating our schools, but I think, most importantly, knowing so much information is really available to the public was the message I wanted to get across, and thank you for doing that, Dr. La Marca. Next we have Mark Knudson. This presentation is a result of the request by Assemblyman Manendo, when he had questions about the educational technology and requested the report by the Commission on Educational Technology.

Mark S. Knudson, Educational Technology Consultant, Office of Technology and Innovative Programs, Department of Education, State of Nevada:
You should have a report in front of you (Exhibit C), which is entitled Commission on Education Technology. I am going to run through this quickly because of our time limit. Feel free to stop me at any point. The first section on page 2 is on current levels of funding. The current state funding that came out of Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session was $9,950,000. I did a report on how much money of that Senate bill had been spent. For the most part, it is down to $0, which means the money has been drawn down by the districts, it has been encumbered by the districts, or we have requests for funds in hand. That does not mean that money has been drawn down may not get spent by June 30, but this money is still alive until June 30.

The six categories for that funding were:
- Computers in the classrooms
- Repair, replacement and upgrading of the inventory that is in the field
- Technical support
- Pilot project
- Library databases
- Distance Learning Satellite Service

The federal funding, on an annual basis, which is currently the No Child Left Behind funding. You can see the table (page 2 of Exhibit C) is split into two different pieces, formula and competitive. The third column for fiscal year 2007 is part of the cuts that Madam Chair spoke of earlier. We were cut $500 million nationwide for educational technology. You can see what a hit that will have on us. It was $3.4 million in 2005; it was already cut by Congress 27 percent in 2006, and now we are getting cut to the bone.

What is turning out to be one of the largest sources of funding for us is the E-Rate Program. The E-Rate program is a reimbursement for telecommunications

costs in schools and in libraries. It is not a grant program; the Congress does not appropriate funds for this program. On your phone bill at the bottom, when you see all the sales taxes and fees, there is a universal service fund access fee. It is 42 cents or whatever it is; that is what it was on my bill last month. All that money is collected by the FCC [Federal Communications Commission] or agents working for the FCC. They collect that money, then they distribute it back to the districts, schools, and even states on some levels for telecommunications costs. There has been some concern expressed that possibly Nevada is leaving money on the table. That is possible to some extent, but the requirements of this program are very strict.

[Mark Knudson, continued.] For instance, there are two different levels of eligible services. They take the amount of money that they collect every month and they redistribute that based on eligible services and based on poverty levels of the schools. So they start with Level 1 services, and then they only fund the schools that are 90 percent poverty or above. That leaves the other schools out. Of all the schools in the country, there are only 16 percent that are within that 75 percent to 100 percent poverty rate. E-Rate hardly ever funds below that, so 84 percent of the schools never get any E-Rate funding, even if they have eligible services.

We are currently between $4 million and $5 million on that. The next page (Exhibit C) has some tables that illustrate that. On page 3, the chart at the top, funding for state and federal programs for the last four biennia and the current one. Then the chart below is the E-Rate for the same period of time. On the top chart in FY2002-03, where the state money is $0, I do have to make a note that there was the same $9.95 million appropriated by the State Legislature. But, because of the issues of 9/11 [September 11, 2001], that money was never released. So in essence, that money was $0, even though there was an appropriation.

The next biennium, fiscal years 2004-05, that same amount that was not released was then appropriated. Currently that same amount in dollars is in the Governor's enhancement budget. The white bars go down because of the cut mentioned earlier in President Bush's 2006 budget, which actually affects us in fiscal year 2007. The 2004 bar on the E-Rate chart is low simply because those numbers have not been reported yet by the Schools and Libraries Division.

On page 4 (Exhibit C), on November 8, 2004 and November 9, 2004, the Commission on Educational Technology met to prioritize the spending for the $9.95 million that is in the Governor's enhancement budget. A pie chart at the bottom of the page breaks out where the Commission recommends that money be spent. There is quite an increase as far as statewide funding in Evaluation

and Professional Development. That is due to trying to move towards Level 2 of our State Technology Plan, which has more curriculum integration, more professional development, and more evaluation. At that meeting there were plenty of district people there, including the IT [Information Technology] folks, and of course the IT folks wanted 75 percent of this money to go to infrastructure. Quite frankly, if you look back at page 3, in fiscal years 1998-99, Governor [Bob] Miller proposed $36 million for technology.

[Mark Knudson, continued.] At that time we didn't have a lot of technology in the schools. That was an inoculation of hardware out into the schools, but now, these computers are now 6 years and 7 years old. So the inventory we put out there is now getting old. So, rightfully, those IT folks are complaining that you can't put this out here and not continue to maintain or continue to replace it. Just to throw out one number, 4 years ago we gave the Governor a budget for technology because he asked. We gave him a number of $108 million. We knew, of course, that was not going to be funded, but that was what we needed. An example of a number out of there was that Clark County alone, if you had a program where you replaced a computer every 5 years—the industry standard is more like 3 years, which means 20 percent of your inventory every year—Clark County alone would have been $12 million, just for that one item for 1 year. That was part of that $108 million budget.

We left the request for funding at $10 million this year, because it is the first time we have ever included technology into the State Board of Education's Budget, which then went to the Governor and ended up in the enhancement units. There is additional information in the back, but I will leave that to your reading.

Assemblyman Manendo:
I am worried about when I hear about replacing computers. Do we have schools that are not up to the standards they should be at right now? Are all the schools wired properly? What do we need to do?

Mark Knudson:
Based on the information that the districts have brought to the Commission, all schools have at least one multimedia computer in every classroom. That includes network access to that computer. Originally, the language was "networkable" and they changed it to "networks." That means that the networking is in place. School districts are trying to move now to getting more computers in the classrooms and then replacing those outdated computers that I mentioned from 1998 and 1999.

Assemblyman Manendo:
I hear that some of the older schools are not wired properly. The wiring is all properly done in all the schools?

Mark Knudson:
On page 2 (Exhibit C), this information at the very bottom, Technology Counts data. This is information that came from Education Week; it comes out every year. There is a Technology Counts survey. This is not collected by the Department of Education. These numbers:
- Student to classroom instructional ratio = 11:1
- Percentage of schools with Internet access = 97 percent
- Percentage of schools with high-speed Internet access = 78 percent
- Percent of fourth graders who use a school computer at least once or twice a week = 34 percent

Assemblyman Manendo:
Are we talking about specifically in Nevada?

Mark Knudson:
Yes.

Assemblyman Manendo:
We have 97 percent of schools with Internet access?

Mark Knudson:
Actually, we have more like 99.9 percent.

Assemblyman Manendo:
Do you know which schools do not?

Mark Knudson:
The only one I know of, off the top of my head, is Mount Charleston in Las Vegas. For all intents and purposes, we are at 100 percent. They are on top of a mountain, and they have some issues getting Internet access up there.

Assemblywoman Smith:
Is there a report that would provide the information to us about what technology is available at school sites?

Mark Knudson:
Yes. We are working on a program called NOTIS [Nevada Online Technology Information Survey]. We don't have data from this previous year, but we are

putting it online right now. We should have that data soon. I'm not sure how soon; we are using an outside vendor to develop the website.

Assemblywoman Smith:
I ask that the Chair be provided with a copy of that as soon as you have it available. [Mr. Knudson agreed.]

Keith Rheault:
I want to remind the Committee that, on the report card for each of the sites in the districts, there is some limited technology information available. You could be able to tell if there is Internet access, how many computers they have, and some of that limited information. That is available, but not in the detail that Assemblywoman Smith questioned.

Assemblywoman Smith:
Do we include any information about the technology that is on a school site that is purchased outside of this money? We know that the outside organizations, businesses, and parent organizations often spend a lot of money on technology. Do we have any kind of a picture of that?

Mark Knudson:
When we collect the NOTIS data, we ask for an inventory of all their hardware, regardless of the funding that it was purchased with.

Gloria P. Dopf, Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, State of Nevada:
Madam Chair, you had identified that the Committee did have the full report. We are looking at this document (Exhibit D) in your binder. I did do an excerpt of that. I will refer to the content in the extract, which is the executive summary as well as the action plan. The full document has all of the data, et cetera. It is my pleasure to talk about the State Improvement Plan today. This is the first State Improvement Plan that has been developed under Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Legislative Session, which required the State Board of Education to develop a State Improvement Plan. That plan was delivered on the due date of December 15, 2003.

At the same time, Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Legislative Session required every school district in the state to develop a District Improvement Plan and every school in the state to develop a State Improvement Plan, whether they were identified as in need of improvement or not. Under federal law, the schools that are required to develop an improvement plan are those that have been designated as not making Adequate Yearly Progress for 2 consecutive years, labeled as in need of improvement, and required to develop an improvement

plan. In this state, under <u>Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Legislative Session</u>, every school, every district and the State were required to develop the plan.

[Gloria Dopf, continued.] In the executive summary (Exhibit D), you will see the membership of the team that helped put this plan together. Ultimately the plan was completed and approved by the State Board of Education as required by statute, but the statute also stated that the Board would also do it in consultation with specific membership. The Board and the Department went beyond the required membership and had a larger group, including parental representatives, representatives from the superintendents' group, and representatives from higher education. It is a very impressive list as you look down the list of the names of the individuals that participated in the plan. We have two individuals here that were part of the planning process, Dotty Merrill [Washoe County School District] and Nancy Hollinger [Washoe County School District], as well as members of the Department staff.

It was a challenge because this was the first time that we had the consistency of the statewide data, as was demonstrated by Dr. La Marca in the State Accountability Report, so we were able to have a significant amount of information data on a statewide basis. Those who were on the team would attest to the fact that we had a binder of data that we worked from, and trying to condense it and make sense of it and put it into an improvement plan process was a challenge. But I think that the group did a wonderful job at that.

A few comments relative to the web and the plan. As Dr. La Marca showed you how to get the Accountability Report, there is a link on the homepage of the web for the whole State Improvement Plan. In addition, there is an appendix that has all of the data analyses that were done at the State level with all of the trends that we did not put into the Plan. Feel free to look on the web at the Improvement Plan as well as the appendix data, which has more of the trend data that is reflected in the plan.

The group decided, after an analysis of all the data and trying to focus in on a plan, they wanted to have it in a format that was consumable by the public, understandable, common terms, trying to get away from educational jargon and create a focus for the State in an improvement mode, looking towards improving teaching and improving student achievement.

I'm going to highlight the five major goals that are reflected in the Action Plan and then talk a bit about the Action Plan and a bit about future activities. This was the first time we did not have the benefit of either the school plans or the district plans, because they were deliverable at the same time.

[Gloria Dopf, continued.] The first goal is to embrace an alliance system so that there is consistency between the format and the outcomes attached to school plans, district plans, and state plans. This goal merely created that expectation. In the future we will have the school plans and the district plan to do the analysis of alignment and to create an expectation. I need to say that all of the plans have been using database decision.

All of the plans were driven by data, and all of the plans used an inquiry process and an action planning process, similar to how we have defined under the SAGE [Student Achievement Gap Elimination] process or the process we used for improvement planning required for Title I schools. There was consistency, even though we did not have the plans to make that balance. What we will be doing in the future is reconvening the group now that we have the district plans, and we have already done preliminary analysis and have matrices to show the needs stated, the student populations identified as needing improvement and helping in their performance, and then what actions have been contemplated at the district and the school level, looking at whether there is an alignment between the State plan and modifying the State plan. The whole concept of alliances and a continuous model of informing each of the stages and forming the rest will be part of the process.

The second is based upon providing data to form the process and to have that data available. This is so schools, districts, and the State can use the data to improve instruction. The data is that which reflects student achievement and the performance of teachers instructing the students.

The third goal is about the need to use research-based strategies and strategies that have been successful and to replicate those in other schools. We are looking at a model where we identify the best practices. We identify the schools that are successful schools, then help those strategies be put in place in other locations. One methodology is to talk together on the web; we have others on mega-conferences focusing on model school strategies. You can click onto the mega-conference on the Department of Education website and see that.

Use the proven strategies to improve achievement and reduce the achievement gap. That is a critical component coming out of the State planning process as well as the district plans. There are areas of achievement gap consistent with national data, yet still not acceptable. We're looking at using strategies to improve and reduce the achievement gap. We're looking at professional development to support the improvement of instruction and to support the production of improved achievement for youngsters and a consistent professional development model that drives from the plans.

[Gloria Dopf, continued.] The last is to look specifically at the issue of secondary schools and high school improvement. Coincidentally, that is a federal initiative as well; we participated in a few federal regional workshops. The National Governors Association is having a spotlight on that this weekend that I am attending with the Governor and his staff to look at specifically how we improve the high school programming and the achievement of youngsters.

Those are the five major goals attached to the State Improvement Plan. Then the group generated some very specific actions per goal. I need to say this will not sit on a shelf; these actions will be incorporated into the Department Action Plans, as well as try to work with the districts to bring these actions in their plans, as well as with our collaborative partners, Academic Standards Council, Technology Commission, and Professional Standards Commission, so that it is an alliance system where the goals and objectives of all of the partners are to improve the achievement of youngsters and eliminate the achievement gap, or at least reduce it.

Chairwoman Parnell:
Thank you very much. It is really amazing for the people in this audience that were around 10 years ago, prior to the Nevada Education Reform Act, to see how much has been done in less than 10 years. It was approved by the 1997 Legislature and to think that we are not even 10 years into it, to really see the outpouring of information and accountability in standards and curriculum that have happened since then. I think it is really worth noting. Are there any questions for Ms. Dopf?

I would like to open the hearing on A.B. 110. Dr. Rheault.

Assembly Bill 110: Revises provisions governing incentives for teachers for teaching in certain subject areas and schools. (BDR 34-376)

Keith W. Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, State of Nevada:
Assembly Bill 110 was submitted by the Department of Education on behalf of the State Board of Education. Just for the record, we submitted that back in May through the Governor's Office. At that time we had not had a lot of discussion. I know there was interest to expand the use of the one-fifth credit beyond the retirement credit. We heard the same things that were reported on A.B. 60 on Monday. At that point, the Board wanted to come forward and didn't know if there would be an appetite for cash stipends or otherwise. They were proposing in lieu of the retirement credit that the funding or the money that was appropriated for this purpose could be used for advanced coursework for teachers who qualified. But after hearing the presentation on A.B. 60, I'm

here to request that if you hold a subcommittee for A.B. 60 that the information in A.B. 110 also be considered at the same time. I don't care if the bills are combined or separated. I think they should all be talked about at the same time, so my recommendation today would be to hold this bill to be reviewed in subcommittee.

Chairwoman Parnell:
What I will do at this point in time—since that has been suggested—in regard to A.B. 110, and that is a Department of Education bill, I'd like to form a subcommittee, chaired by Vice Chair Debbie Smith. I would like Dr. Hardy and Assemblyman Manendo on that subcommittee as well. We will get information out to you as to the time and place. Everyone who came today, hopefully you will be all right to share your comments at that point in time. We were all in here Monday and saw how complex the issue is.

[Chairwoman Parnell, continued.] Dr. Rheault's bill, <u>A.B. 110</u>, adds another option to those that we saw in <u>A.B. 60</u> on Monday. Mrs. Smith will be in contact with the members of that Committee and then all of those interested in testifying. Since we do have to hear Senator Reid [on the Floor], we will not be able to hear <u>A.B. 108</u> today as scheduled.

[Assembly Bill 108](#): Revises provisions governing appointment of hearing officers in certain cases involving licensed educational personnel. (BDR 34-378)

Not heard.

[Meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Paul Partida
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chairwoman

DATE:

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Education

Date: February 23, 2005   Time of Meeting: 3:47 p.m.

Bill #	Exhibit ID	Witness/Agency	Dept.	Description
	A	* * * * * * * * * *		Agenda
	B	Paul La Marca/Department of Education, State of Nevada		Accessing the Web-Based Nevada Accountability Report Card
	C	Mark Knudson/Department of Education, State of Nevada		Educational Technology Summary
	D	Gloria Dopf/Department of Education, State of Nevada		State Improvement Plan