

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Seventy-Third Session
March 3, 2005**

The Committee on Education Subcommittee was called to order at 4:08 p.m., on Thursday, March 3, 2005. Chairwoman Debbie Smith presided in Room 3161 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:

Mrs. Debbie Smith, Chairwoman
Mr. Joe Hardy
Mr. Mark Manendo

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Keith W. Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department
of Education, State of Nevada
Lonnie Shields, Representative, Nevada Association of School
Administrators (NASA), Reno, Nevada

Joyce Haldeman, Executive Director, Community and Government
Relations, Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada
Dr. Dotty Merrill, Assistant Superintendent, Washoe County School
District (WCSD), Reno, Nevada

Chairwoman Smith:

[Meeting called to order and roll called.] We are here today to discuss A.B. 60 and A.B. 110. Assembly Bill 110 allows retirement credits for teachers in schools, psychologists who work with “at risk” pupils, schools that “need improvement,” hard-to-fill positions, and provide signing bonuses for newly-hired teachers.

Assembly Bill 60: Revises certain provisions regarding school personnel. (BDR 34-477)

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

We have one amendment that was offered in the previous hearing. Committee members, in your folder, you have a copy of the amendment that was previously offered, as well as some general informational pieces that I collected from Ways and Means this morning. They may be of general interest to you. Substantive changes in the amendment would delete the 5 years required service from the language, and—I am assuming that the NSEA [Nevada State Educational Association] will probably want to address that again—it would also expand the list of eligible employees to include paraprofessionals.

A few issues that I have outlined, I think we will want to talk about, then we can open this up for discussion. Other issues that come to us are the testimony that indicates that the signing bonus language needs to be considered right away, because we have recruiting teams out as we speak, and they need to know whether this is going to be an issue. You will also remember that this has to go on to Ways and Means. That would be one issue. We could have one option of taking one of these bills and putting the signing bonus language into that, and then using the other bill for the other issues that we are talking about. Then we have options on the table as we have heard in discussion. We can have stipends, retirement credit, college credit, and housing vouchers. The amendments in the other handouts are available for the audience as well.

I wanted to note that retirement credits and signing bonuses are already included in the Governor’s budget of the things that we are talking about. We

need to keep that in mind. Dr. Rheault, do you have any initial comments that you would like to make?

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

I have a few numbers—if you are talking just the bonus—I had mentioned that if we had applied it this year, it was 186 individuals, or \$376,000 would have been the added cost to pay for all licensed personnel new to the state to receive the bonus. In the Governor's recommended budget, there is approximately \$5.1 million per year. That amount would have to be added. The figure in the Governor's budget only includes projected new teacher hires, and so the difference would be all the licensed administrators, anyone that holds a license. That would not address the issue that came up about the LPNs [licensed practical nurses] who work as health professionals. They are technically not school nurses, because we only issue school nurse licenses to RNs [registered nurses], and there are certain qualifications. That would not address that problem, but the \$376,000 per fiscal year would have to be added to the note, because that would be above the Governor's recommended budget.

Chairwoman Smith:

The \$376,000 would encompass the other licensed personnel, but not the paraprofessionals?

Keith Rheault:

The other licensed personnel, but not the paraprofessional or other non-licensed specialists. I hand-scratched some figures just on the retirement credit, just to give you some examples of how this would work. I think it might help set the stage, although this is policy end, and I'll have time if we know what might come out of this bill and who would qualify, and then I could give you some specifics. For example, the "at risk" schools in the 2004 school year, 124 schools qualified. That was either schools that did not make AYP [Adequate Yearly Progress] or had 65 percent or more of their students with free and reduced lunch. Of the 124 schools last year, there were 2,477 teachers who qualified. I am using averages to get a handle on what this might run. That came to 19.98 positions per school that qualified. If you take that amount of the 2,477 teachers that received the one-fifth credit last year, it costs the State \$6,497,171, or \$2,623 per qualified applicant.

I used those averages because that is the first year that we had any data that we can say this about what it might cost on average. I took that to the numbers this year and kept the same number of positions, although the variables are things we can't control. For example, if a school on the AYP list is Jackpot, Nevada, versus a high school in Clark County, there is a big difference

on how many staff qualify for it. We can't control the years of experience. The more experience they have, the bigger the cost to the one-fifth retirement because their salaries are higher. All of those are factors that make it hard to estimate. The third factor is how many schools qualify.

[Keith Rheault, continued.] The "at risk" schools are pretty stable. If they are 65 percent free and reduced lunch, we have a few go off and a few come on. That list is stable from year to year. The one that is not stable is the schools that "need improvement," and that one can jump. This year we have 122 schools that are on the "needs improvement" list. We have 99 schools on the "watch list," which means all the 99 could be eligible to be added to the schools next year. I expect some schools to jump off the list, and then you have to factor in that some of those 99 schools that do not make AYP are also "at risk" schools, so they would probably qualify. They are probably already on the list.

All of those factors need to be considered when we make an estimate about how much this might cost us. To give you an example, if we applied those same figures from last year that we had to this year—we are just now collecting that information—there are 192 schools that are eligible this year, up from 124. It was primarily due to the jump in schools that did not make AYP. If we take those same ratios, I am estimating 3,836 teachers will qualify for the one-fifth retirement for only the "at risk" schools. Take that same amount by the average cost that we paid out; it is going to run about \$10 million for this year to pay that. In the Governor's recommended budget for the "at risk" schools in 2006, there is \$7,522,000, and there is \$6 million for the hard-to-fill. There is \$13 million to pay for this one-fifth credit in the Governor's recommended budget. It goes up a bit in 2007.

Chairwoman Smith:

That does not include adding the other personnel?

Keith Rheault:

That does not include adding new personnel, the additional personnel which we are talking about. The one factor that I have to throw in, beginning this year—and we have data on that—there were 3,077 teachers that qualified for the hard-to-fill positions, and those are the positions of secondary math, science, ESL [English as a Second Language], special education, and school psychologists; 3,077 teachers—they do not have to be at "at risk" school if they are teaching the subject—qualified. That will play a factor again in how much we pay for the "at risk" schools, because the statutes say you can only get one payment for one-fifth credit. You can't get the one-fifth for the hard-to-fill and then one-fifth for being at an "at risk" school. We don't have any

experience on how many of the teachers who received the one-fifth hard-to-fill are in the "at risk" schools.

[Keith Rheault, continued.] I did an example in Carson High School, which is both an "at risk" school and has teachers that qualified for the hard-to-fill. In my going through their list of employees, 42 percent of the staff taught in hard-to-fill positions. Those will be eliminated when we pay out the "at risk" portion later this spring. That is a very large high school. If you are talking a small elementary school, it is not going to do that, because the only hard-to-fill position at an elementary would be a special education or an ESL teacher. It is a complicated system. I know that we were underfunded because of bad projections, I would guess, from the first year. The last year the districts ended up paying over \$3 million out of their own budgets to cover the shortfall from last year's projections. If we paid today for only the hard-to-fill positions that came in at about \$9 million, we are almost \$3 million short there; we can pay 61 percent of the cost with the State appropriations. I am hoping that we can offset the underpayment there when we eliminate them in the "at risk" schools, although we added over 70 schools this year. I am not optimistic that we will cover the cost on either side, the "at risk" or the hard-to-fill.

Chairwoman Smith:

Dr. Rheault, I know that we are waiting to see the actual numbers on the hard-to-fill positions, whether those numbers have changed since we started this retirement credit. Do you know, generally, whether it has been beneficial or not?

Keith Rheault:

All I can go by, because we haven't collected that from the testimony of school districts, I don't think it has been. This is from the Department of Education. Personal opinion: I know the NCLB [No Child Left Behind Act of 2001] wants us to make sure that highly qualified teachers stay at "at risk" schools. Not necessarily schools "needing improvement," to stay, but they want us to show experienced teachers. I think that somewhere down the road, if we add 80 to 90 more schools next year, if you keep it as a retirement credit for AYP schools and "at risk" schools, there are going to be 400 of the 562 schools on this list. You might as well pay everybody.

You probably need that discussion today as to what we intend to do with it. My opinion is, the "at risk" schools are consistent, and that is where we have trouble getting experienced teachers to stay. They want to go to the suburbs and new schools. To me that makes sense. The school districts have testified already that it really is a disincentive to have AYP, because if you do make the progress then they lose the incentive. Is it a disincentive to offer an incentive

for being on that list? It makes sense if you are at an "at risk" school, which I would say needs to be redefined because right now it is 65 percent free and reduced lunch. Most high schools do not collect that information, because they do not offer free and reduced lunch. They may be "at risk" but we don't show them that way, because they have no free and reduced lunch numbers.

Chairwoman Smith:

Do you have a suggestion for that?

Keith Rheault:

They did use another factor at one time in Clark County on poverty level records. The percent of students or families that were on, I think, welfare. I would have to go back and research that, but there is probably another means that you could use, one or the either/or, to qualify them.

Chairwoman Smith:

Would you check into that for us?

Keith Rheault:

It has been about 4 or 5 years since Clark County used that percentage. There was some reason they stopped using it. I know they were doing it in cooperation with the welfare office or something along that line.

Chairwoman Smith:

Are there any questions for Dr. Rheault? I only have Lonnie Shields signed in to speak.

Lonnie Shields, Representative, Nevada Association of School Administrators (NASA), Reno, Nevada:

I don't want you to think that because I am the only one to sign in, that I am the only one that has any answers. I don't. That is the sad part of this whole thing. The very fact that we are meeting here today to discuss possible incentives to attract highly qualified professional educators—to either one, begin their careers in our state, or two, to move into an "at risk" school in which their skills are badly needed—proves how precarious a position our education system is really experiencing in our state. From the testimony that we have heard, we feel that the hiring stipends are working.

Our request would be that they would be fully funded, so that it did not remain to become a burden upon any of our school districts. Also, what I have been hearing is that the retirement incentive is not doing what we thought it would do. It is not attracting the teachers in the highly qualified fields to the "at risk" schools. The other side of that, as I mentioned in front of the full Committee,

would be that we are pushing our best and our brightest out sooner, rather than trying to keep them here longer. If it is not working, why keep it? Why not take those resources and put them into other forms of incentives that we would hope would work better? The chairwoman of the Education Committee asked us, when she formed a Subcommittee, to try and think outside the box. We went back and dug. Frank Brusa tried to think outside the box. We had no trouble getting outside the box. The trouble was building new walls once we were outside the box.

[Lonnie Shields, continued.] Everything came down to money, and it came down to an awful lot of money to do it. Money talks in this business. I can give you one example of that. When I was executive director of the Washoe County Administrators Association, we had a principal move up from a highly "at risk," "in need of improvement" school, and she was doing an excellent job. But she moved into another position. When it came time to refill her position, and we put it out to our general membership and asked who would like to move to this school, we didn't get anyone that wanted to move. They didn't want to move because of the sword that was swinging over the head of that school for the administrator, whoever it happened to be, that would move into that.

I sat down with Paul Dugan [Superintendent, Washoe County School District] and we talked about it. We said, "What would it take to put a highly qualified administrator, one that we hope could turn that school around, meet the requirements of the school district, into that school?" It came down to money. When we finally put it out, we worked on an agreement where there would be a certain amount of money in addition, if you want to take over the principalship of that school. We would open it up to any principal in the district that wanted to transfer in. Then of course, we went through the regular transfer procedure under the contract, and the district could pick whichever of those highly qualified people that they wanted. We suddenly had applicants for that position, and one was chosen. There are ways to attract people. Whether money is always the answer, I do not know, but it happened to be in that particular case.

Chairwoman Smith:

I know that we talk about working conditions and the pressures that all staff feels, especially in the "at risk" schools, as a factor in addition to many. I am wondering what the thoughts are about the new pot of money that hopefully will be available, that is in the Governor's budget, which will be discussed in the money committees. Will that be an incentive for staff? Do you think that there will be some new money and more flexible money, hopefully, for them to utilize in schools?

Lonnie Shields:

I think we are in favor of that move, and that I believe that would help, yes. I think when you are in an "at risk" school and you face the challenges of an "at risk" school every day, and you see the transiency that comes in and the turnovers of students, teachers, and administrators, you are faced with an entirely different set of problems than other schools face. Any incentive that gives those people hope that tomorrow is going to be better than today is going to be good. I think the Governor's \$100 million is what you are talking about. That approach to it is a good start.

Chairwoman Smith:

That is why I raised the issue. I thought it is more than likely about more than just salary. That probably is some type of incentive.

Lonnie Shields:

Finally, two things that my association would request of the Committee, and that is that we would want to be part of any equation that comes out of that. We feel that administrators should be included in any of the discussions or any of the outcomes that this Committee decides. We would ask to, please, fully fund those programs so that our districts are not faced with the negative impact of having to come up with money to meet the incentives that are there.

Chairwoman Smith:

Of course the funding part of it is not our job, but it will be mine down the road.

Lonnie Shields:

I know, but it is on the record.

Chairwoman Smith:

Thank you for that testimony. Are there any questions for Mr. Shields?

Assemblyman Manendo:

Out of curiosity, I know we are not the money committee, but to fully fund the stipends that you were referencing, how much would that be?

Lonnie Shields:

I don't know. I couldn't tell you; I'm sorry. I don't have that information. I know when I spoke with Dotty Merrill earlier from Washoe, she has the figures for Washoe.

**Joyce Haldeman, Executive Director, Community and Government Relations,
Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada:**

When you brought into the equation the \$100 million in the Governor's budget, I wanted to weigh in on that a bit, if you don't mind. First of all, we think that is a wonderful step forward for the districts to be able to make some progress at schools that really need some extra attention. Although \$100 million over the biennium seems like a lot of money—I'm not trying to sound ungrateful—it is not enough to do all of the things that need to be done at the schools. When we were talking about it with the Governor's Office, he indicated that there are several parts of iNVEST that he believes can fall under that. For example, the AYP attachment that we have that is \$42 million by itself; the needs for ELL [English Language Learners], which is in the \$70 millions, I think; all-day kindergarten; a lot of different programs that we have outlined as separate parts of iNVEST; he is rolling all together into that \$100 million. That is a very good idea.

I am simply saying that is not enough money for all of the different things that could be and should be done with that amount of money. One of the things that I think is very important for the Committee to remember, when you find the funding for these incentives, is that every school is different, so there needs to be a certain amount of flexibility that the districts can use. The school that I like to refer to when I talk about a turnaround at a school is C.P. Squires. I know some of you are familiar with Principal Carol Lark, who was there for a number of years at that school. There were a lot of things that she did differently and some of the things that she did without permission, because she felt so strongly about doing those things. Those things paid off; they made a difference. That school had every negative indicator that you could think of: the transiency rate, the number of kids who didn't speak English, a lack of parent involvement, and socio-economic needs. Every indicator that you could think of that predicts how students will achieve, they were on the bottom of the list.

After four years of being there, she was able to help that school meet AYP [Adequate Yearly Progress] and on their way doing great things. She did it by being very creative, by flexing grant funds that were available to her, and by doing her own thing and making sure that people looked the other way as she did it. Those flexibilities, I think, are very important. One of the things that she did for her teachers one year, because none of them lived in the neighborhood in which they taught, she leveraged a private donor to give them gas cards to help pay for gas when it was very expensive. Of course, she could not get that to go on for a long period of time, but that made a huge difference to her teachers, even if it was only a recognition that money was coming out of their pockets to go to a neighborhood where children really needed help, and they were willing to make that sacrifice. One of the problems that she faced—that is

still a problem at that school, because they are eligible for many grants that are from the federal government—she went through three office managers in the space of 2 years, because of the significant amount of paperwork which they had to do to maintain and report on those grants. Maybe an extra support staff person to help with some of those things at a school would make a difference.

[Joyce Haldeman, continued.] There were a lot of other things that she did that helped turn things around: building teams in the school so there weren't disparities between the backgrounds that they were from, working with teachers to do extra things after school, and working with parent groups to learn English, and be involved. All of them required grants, creativity, extra hours, and extra time. Her methods of using incentives might differ from those another principal in a different part of town might use. I would like to encourage you, as you look at this, that the language be flexible enough in whatever is designated that principals be able to use it for what their schools need the most of.

Chairwoman Smith:

Your comment reminded Carol Stonefield to remind me about a survey that we heard about recently from the California Teachers Association, that the number one thing that kept teachers at a school was a good principal. The teachers would follow that good principal, so when we look at incentives, they can be different. I wanted to clarify that when I was talking about the \$100 million incentive, I wasn't talking about using any of that toward incentives for principals. I was talking about knowing they have some money they may be able to access. Would that be considered an incentive? Is that something new and different that might encourage principals to either move to or stay at a more difficult school?

Joyce Haldeman:

We still don't know the details of exactly how that is going to be used, but I know the Governor's intent is to have a lot of flexibility for that very reason. Some schools might need all-day kindergartens, some might need programs for second language, and some might need other things. So the ability for the money to provide exactly what that school needs, I think, is critical.

Chairwoman Smith:

That has been my understanding, as we talk about it moving through this process, that the ideas that it will not be cumbersome to apply for and will be flexible in the nature that it can be used. Are there other questions?

Assemblyman Hardy:

Where does this fit with the concept of "let's give the teacher a fund," so that the teacher draws on the fund for school supplies and other things? Is this what are we talking about? Can that be part of this discussion?

Joyce Haldeman:

Absolutely. One of the things that Carol Lark did was to go to the local Wal-Mart and let them know that the teachers were supplying basic supplies for these kids, because their homes did not have them. I remember one story that she talked about. One teacher gave an assignment for the children to go home and cut things that were red out of a magazine and then paste them on a piece of paper and bring them back. Nobody in the class did the assignment. When she asked them about it, not only did they not have magazines, but they didn't have scissors or paste. One of the things that she worked with was getting those basic supplies that many of us take for granted in our homes, so that the children could take home a little packet of things.

Then the next time she asked them to do the assignment, they were able to do it because they had the tools. Without that kind of help, if a teacher wants to give those kinds of assignments or other basic things in a classroom, they often have to go to their own pocketbooks to take care of it. That is adding insult to injury for a teacher who not only spends his or her own gas money, but the time it takes to get to a school, plus funding out of their own pocketbook, so they can do a good job.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Are we talking about funding that kind of fund, or are we talking about not funding that kind of fund right now?

Joyce Haldeman:

I think there needs to be flexibility. If the school is in the heart of an affluent neighborhood, you probably do not need money for that. But a principal ought to be able to designate what that funding is best needed for in that school. I think that lends itself to your belief and the comment that Carol made about the importance of having a strong leadership principal there who can examine the school and identify what they need that will make a difference for them. There has to be a trust level that the principal is going to use the money in a way that will best suit those children.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Are you only talking about "at risk" schools? My schools in Boulder City who wouldn't be considered "at risk," the teacher does the same thing; \$1,000 to

\$1,200 per year out of their pocket to buy stuff. Are we talking about “at risk” schools or all schools?

Joyce Haldeman:

It depends on whether you want to be talking about reality or not. In a perfect world, we should be supplying all of those supplies from the school district operating funds. We should have enough per-pupil funding that we could make sure that every school was staffed and stocked with all the things and supplies that they need. That simply is not happening. Do we have enough money that we could give it to every teacher? I hope so. Eventually that would be wonderful if we did, because every teacher deserves that. I think what we are talking about right now is about incentives to attract teachers to “at risk” schools. That is where I would start. If there is one more thing that you can offer to a teacher that makes it worth their while to teach at that “at risk” school, instead of a school where life is a little easier and closer to home, I’m all for it. Dr. George Ann Rice has done a lot of work, and you have the things that she has talked about.

One of the things that she mentioned to me had to do with the fact that there are some things that have to do more with the quality of life of teachers who are new to our community. That homesickness factor, being away from their family and support group, is a huge issue. That is one of the reasons why people leave Las Vegas after they have been there for a short amount of time—they are not able to fit into that. The flexibility should be to such an extent that principals can help form support groups for teachers who need that kind of social and moral support.

Chairwoman Smith:

Joyce, I provided this chart ([Exhibit B](#)). It is from Clark County School District, regarding retention and the signing bonus. I wondered if maybe someone would be able to talk about that. I brought it from Ways and Means. It is certainly pertinent to our discussion today. I keep talking about my personal need for us to see, by numbers, that what we are spending money on is making a difference. I believe that with the signing bonus and retirement credit, we should be able to see some hard proof that something is working. This is one little piece of information that I brought from Ways and Means this morning, looking at percentages of teachers who are leaving after joining the district. Do you want to comment on this at all? Had you seen it before?

Joyce Haldeman:

No, I have not seen this chart before. I haven’t had a chance to look at it, but I would like to comment on it. I am looking at the number of teachers—the bottom line, the 12 percent—that left after one year. I think that is too high. I

would like to also know what the percent of teachers that left after one year was before we had the signing bonus, because we may have had a similar situation. In talking about this particular incentive, George Ann Rice, who hired over 2,400 teachers to come to the Clark County School District, feels that it is one of the most important things we can do to attract teachers to come to Las Vegas. This is because we have to get so many of our teachers from so many other states across the U.S.

[Joyce Haldeman, continued.] The profiles of many of those teachers who come to live with us are students who have finished college, who may have had student loans, or, at the least, have depleted the good welfare of their parents. They are on their own; they have moving expenses, the first and last month of rent down payments, the utility deposits. She feels strongly that if we are asking people to make a commitment to come to a city to teach 1,000 miles from home, a minimum thing we could do, if the feeling that offering \$1,000 to \$2,000 is a stipend, that writing a check for them is too much, she thinks we could offer instead to pay first and last month rent or to give them housing subsidy. Housing is going to be such a big issue in Clark County, that without this signing bonus, we will be in jeopardy of being able to attract the people that we need to come to a community away from home.

One of the things that happens routinely when somebody calls the Clark County School District, they understand that we have positions available. They know that we are in a position of growth. They will call up and ask what the base salary is. The answer they get to that doesn't excite them, and then they ask what kind of incentives we are offering. Before the time when we had the bonus, when we said, "We don't have any incentives, but the sunshine is wonderful." The answer was, they hung up on us. They wanted an incentive. Even though our incentives that we offer are not as great as some other states, other states offer housing subsidies. The loan forgiveness they offer, the higher signing bonuses they offer, are very attractive to a 22- or 23-year-old that may have a lot of student loans or may not have any funds. There were stories that we heard about new teachers who came to the Clark County School District, who actually lived in their cars until they received their first paycheck. This really makes a difference in us being able to attract and sign teachers who really are in need of some cash up front.

**Dr. Dotty Merrill, Assistant Superintendent, Washoe County School District
(WCSD), Reno, Nevada:**

I heard a question from Assemblyman Manendo, if he could repeat, it please. I would be glad to provide information if there are questions.

Assemblyman Manendo:

Out of curiosity, on the fully funding of the stipends in Washoe County, what would that run?

Dotty Merrill:

We did some rough calculations on this, and I think it would be in the neighborhood of \$1.5 and \$2 million dollars, if we include all of those groups.

Chairwoman Smith:

Clarify that for us, for the record, please.

Dotty Merrill:

That would be principals, counselors, school psychologists, and all licensed personnel. This would not include LPNs, who in our system are classified employees, not licensed personnel. It would include school nurses. I would like to provide the information that, for the current school year in our district, we hired 427 new teachers. That represents about 11.5 percent of our teaching staff. We are at about 40 percent trained inside the state, and 60 percent from outside the state. For us the signing bonus is also an inducement for teachers to come to the Washoe County School District.

Chairwoman Smith:

Dr. Merrill, could you provide us with the same type of information that we have here from Clark County on the data regarding signing bonuses?

Dotty Merrill:

I haven't seen the piece of paper that you have. I'm sure that we'd be glad to get back to you with that information as soon as it could be gathered.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Before we leave that document ([Exhibit B](#)), so I can understand it better, the way it is arranged you have:

- The funding year
- Total new hires
- Number separation
- Total percent separation
- The number of teachers leaving after 3 months, 6 months, 9 months, and 12 months
- The percent of teachers left after 1 year

What jumps out at me is the percentage of teachers that left after one year as compared to those that left after two years, or left in between. There is a jump after the first three years. What happened after year 2002 that accounts for the

jump in 2003 and 2004? We funded education more so why do we have more people leaving?

Dotty Merrill:

We think, and Dr. Rheault might want to comment on this, it is more about when the recordkeeping started. Based on when the stipend started, some of the information may not have been tracked as far back as when this report starts. That makes the statistics more startling.

Assemblyman Hardy:

My point being, if Washoe County is going to provide the same thing that I can interpret, I'm not sure that I want it.

Keith Rheault:

We provided that via Clark County in our packet this morning. I can go back and ask George Ann Rice to clarify what that meant, when they started keeping records, and by having blanks the first couple of years, were very small numbers. What that meant was that they didn't track it, which is what I believe wasn't done in the last two years, you see that there was much better data.

Chairwoman Smith:

I would assume that we would need to have another Subcommittee meeting on at least part of this discussion, so I think we will be looking for some of these numbers for that next meeting.

Dotty Merrill:

You began by remarking that it might be necessary to shift the signing bonuses into one or the other of these two bills and address other issues in the second of the two. Certainly, if that can be moved forward with great expedience, that would be advantageous as we do move out and begin to try and recruit high-quality personnel. We would support Dr. Rheault's suggestion, including licensed personnel, administrators, teachers, counselors, and school psychologists, to attract those individuals.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I'm going to ask a political question. Do you think that if we passed out A.B. 110, having not heard any Subcommittee testimony about it, that it would have a better chance of coming out quicker than A.B. 60, which has lots of things in it that I'm not sure we all can get our hands around right now? Or vice versa?

Chairwoman Smith:

I think what we were talking about is not necessarily staying with the language in one or the other. They open the same statute; you could replace all the language in one with the signing bonus language and move forward with that, and then keep the other one for the discussion about all of these other issues. That might be a good way to move this forward.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Are you ready for a motion?

Chairwoman Smith:

Certainly.

Assemblyman Hardy:

If the intent of the Chair is understood, I would be thrilled to look at putting the signing bonus language in one place, whatever language that ends up being, and discussing everything else in the other bill. Get the message out: that is what we have.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO USE ASSEMBLY BILL 60 FOR
SIGNING BONUS LANGUAGE.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairwoman Smith:

At this time I would entertain any other discussion. I may not have given someone the opportunity to discuss this before we move forward.

Keith Rheault:

I was going to offer A.B. 110 to put the signing bonus in, because we can get our intent on the other. Either way, and delete all of A.B. 110 and put signing bonus in that one. Whatever is the cleanest, we will support that.

Chairwoman Smith:

What I should do, Dr. Hardy, if you could restate your motion to allow the drafters to make that decision which bill would be best.

Assemblyman Hardy:

That is exactly how I would state my motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE
MOST APPROPRIATE BILL OF ASSEMBLY BILL 60 OR
ASSEMBLY BILL 110 AS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE FULL

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION TO ADOPT LANGUAGE FOR
SIGNING BONUSES AS PRESENTED.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairwoman Smith:

We should have clarified. The personnel that are included in the motion, is it all licensed personnel that are included in your motion?

Assemblyman Hardy:

Yes, ma'am.

Chairwoman Smith:

I want to suggest that we have a second Subcommittee meeting to then carry on the discussion about the other issues, and there will be some numbers that we will be looking for before we do that. Dr. Rheault, I had a couple of questions for you before we do that. Does the "needs improvement" language stay? Does it need to change, or will it be the correct language in these bills?

Keith Rheault:

I don't think the language would have to change, but what you need to make a decision on is it appropriate to fund the incentive for it.

Chairwoman Smith:

That part I get, that we need to decide whether we're going to go to...

Keith Rheault:

I am using Douglas High School as an example. They had one special education student that didn't qualify. They are on the list for participation. Should they be entitled—for all of their teachers at the school—because they didn't make AYP for that reason, for two years in a row?

Chairwoman Smith:

Maybe we should reiterate your comment that, as the numbers of schools start increasing, we may have to be looking at something like "at risk," rather than "needs improvement."

Keith Rheault:

The reason those are fairly stable, once you define what "at risk" is, they don't take whole populations unless they've had reorganization or rezoning at a school

district. They are stable and you can count on that kind of funding from year to year. It is much easier to project what we would have to pay out.

Chairwoman Smith:

The other question I had in the language, talking about college credit. It refers to "graduate course." Is graduate course the right terminology? If I am going back for a TESL [Teaching English as a Second Language] endorsement, would that qualify? But wouldn't necessarily be a graduate course?

Keith Rheault:

I think graduate is the appropriate one, because once they get a bachelor's degree, to move up it is a graduate course after you get a bachelor degree. They can take it for a bachelor's credit or a master's degree credit. Most of them take it as a post-baccalaureate credit, because they already have a license. They have already received a bachelor's degree.

Chairwoman Smith:

Did anyone else have any other questions for Dr. Rheault while he is here? Are there any other comments from the audience regarding our intention to hold another Subcommittee meeting and discuss the rest of the issues? One of the ideas that I have heard mentioned is developing some type of "cafeteria plan." That would be the term for it; it would be some type of flexible plan. We have heard about retirement credits, stipends, housing opportunities, and college credits, that may be the idea would be that you could develop some type of plan that would be flexible. You would have options within those categories. That might be something that we can talk about and work on. If there is no other comment to come before this Committee, the Committee will stand adjourned [at 4:56 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Paul Partida
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Chairwoman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Subcommittee on Education

Date: March 3, 2005 Time of Meeting: 4:08 p.m.

[illegible]