

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

**Seventy-Third Session
March 23, 2005**

The Committee on Education was called to order at 3:49 p.m., on Wednesday, March 23, 2005. Chairwoman Bonnie Parnell presided in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada, and, via simultaneous videoconference, in Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Las Vegas, 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
Mrs. Debbie Smith, Vice Chairwoman
Mrs. Sharron Angle
Mr. Kelvin Atkinson
Mr. Joe Hardy
Mr. Brooks Holcomb
Mr. William Horne
Mr. Garn Mabey
Mr. Mark Manendo
Mr. Bob McCleary
Mr. Harvey J. Munford

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1,
Clark County

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Paula Berkley, Legislative Advocate, representing Food Bank of Northern Nevada

Barbara Clark, Member-at-Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Carson City, Nevada

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

Lucille Lusk, Chairman, Nevada Concerned Citizens (NCC), Las Vegas, Nevada

Lonnie Shields, Legislative Advocate, Representing Nevada Association of School Administrators (NASA)

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

Dr. Craig Kadlub, Director, Government Affairs, Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins, Executive Director, Center for Charter School Development, Sparks, Nevada

Ray Bacon, Executive Director, Nevada Manufacturers Association (NMA), Carson City, Nevada

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

Sara F. Jones, State Librarian, Division Administrator, Department of Cultural Affairs, Nevada State Library and Archives

Rhonda Glyman, Co-Chair & Founder, Nevada Partnership for Inclusive Education (PIE), Henderson, Nevada

Scott Reynolds, Executive Director, Student Support Services, Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas

Martha Sutro, Client Services Manager, The Grow Network, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York, New York

Tisha M. Pryor, Director of State and District Partnerships, The Grow Network, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York, New York

Anne K. Loring, Legislative Advocate, representing Washoe County School District (WCSD), Reno, Nevada

Terry L. Hickman, President, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), Las Vegas, Nevada

Dana R. Bennett, Legislative Advocate, representing Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy (AACPA)

Julie Whitacre, Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA)

Chairwoman Parnell:

[Meeting called to order and roll called.] Today we are going to start by continuing the hearing on A.B. 184 that we didn't get to finish when we adjourned early on Monday.

Assembly Bill 184: Requires development and distribution of parental involvement compacts. (BDR 34-921)

Paula Berkley, Legislative Advocate, representing Food Bank of Northern Nevada:

We had submitted a friendly amendment ([Exhibit B](#)) that we wanted to add to the parental involvement compact. If you will recall, this bill was about accumulating key information and providing to parents, so that they had all of their information in one area at one time and could refer to it. What my amendment would do is add information describing the breakfast, school lunch, and summer food programs that are available through the school, as well as the federal forms that allow their children to qualify for free and reduced meals.

I don't know about you guys, but half the papers that I would have been given to take to my mom never made it back home. It was a 50/50 chance. We see this as an opportunity to increase that 50/50 chance of getting that information to parents, so that they can make sure that their kids are eating every day. We also know that there was a study done in the state of Maryland that showed that only 30 percent of kids eat breakfast every morning before going to school. If we could even pick up some of those—so that they get those breakfasts—it would be a good thing.

We had checked with the author of the bill, as well as the Committee before, and we think that this is a friendly amendment.

Barbara Clark, Member-at-Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Carson City, Nevada:

Nevada PTA supports A.B. 184. As was stated at the Monday hearing, in 2001 there was legislation, authored by Assemblywoman Smith, which mandated the State and school districts to adopt a parent involvement policy. The parent involvement policy was based on the six standards that came out of 30 years of research from Dr. Joyce Epstein out of Johns Hopkins University. Why does that research show that parent involvement is so key? It shows that it is either the first or the second—quality of teachers being the other—indicator of student academic success. The standards are communication, parenting, student learning, volunteering, shared decision making, and community involvement.

[Barbara Clark, continued.] Research shows that when you use all six standards and they're integrated into the fabric of every aspect of educational environments, then parent involvement begins to have a direct impact on student achievement. What we basically have now is a good-looking policy on the books and not too much of an implementation plan. The first standard, communication, is the most important. Without effective two-way meaningful communication, all else is hard to accomplish. Assembly Bill 184 provides an implementation tool for the districts to implement that parent involvement policy in that area of communication.

I cannot even begin to convey how varied the types of delivery systems are at every school or school district across the state. What A.B. 184 does is create a level playing field for all parents, at least in the arena of receiving some basic information that is key to parents being able to be effectively involved. Parent involvement is often seen as a feel-good phrase. The standards were adopted so that everyone is on the same page, as far as what the definition of parent involvement is. Now we need to implement those standards. We can tell what we value by the time, money, and resources that we allocate to it.

Parent involvement is more often that not the abandoned stepchild in the educational system. We all say that we want parent involvement and believe in parent involvement, but it's not enough to sit back and say, "Why don't we have it?" We have allocated time, resources, and monies to developing quality teachers, more professional days, funding RPDPs [Regional Professional Development Programs], raising salaries, and providing incentives to attract and retain quality teachers.

Where are the resources, money, and implementation plans for parent involvement? Assembly Bill 184 is a wonderful and needed implementation step for providing parents some of the basic information and basic tools for helping your children succeed. This is a basic step and an important step, and if we truly believe and have a desire to have parent involvement, we know it will lead to academic success. This implementation step is one of the first steps in making that happen.

I handed out a piece of paper ([Exhibit C](#)) that made some broad statements about how it takes work to accomplish parent involvement. You just can't say it; there is actual work involved. This is one of many of Joyce Epstein's books on how to implement the six standards. You can see that the research is there. You need to do the work involved. It's not just about saying; it's about doing and implementing how those action steps happen. I know on Wednesday several people indicated in their testimony that you couldn't legislate parent

involvement. That's not what this is about. We're legislating districts and entities to develop the steps that will bring about parent involvement.

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

Dr. Steve Mulvenon, the Director of Communications for the District and the administrator responsible for parent involvement and our parent involvement coordinator, was here on Monday. Dr. Mulvenon would have provided the testimony that I am about to share with you. However, he was not able to be here this afternoon, nor was Lisa Marie Lightfoot, the District's Parent Involvement Coordinator. I am here in Dr. Mulvenon's place to indicate to you that the District certainly supports A.B. 184 as amended. We appreciate the opportunity to have met with and discussed this bill with Assemblywomen Gerhardt and Smith. We appreciate their willingness to let us have some small contributions regarding the clarification of the intent and the implementation details of this effort.

We know that many teachers already have effective methods of communicating with parents, and they've gone out of their way to ensure that there are meaningful opportunities for parents to be involved, but this bill would put into law the requirement that all teachers do that. As Ms. Clark has just said, it's an implementation and a process that is discussed, and we certainly support that. We would look forward to working with the Nevada Department of Education (DOE) to ensure that this legislation is implemented smoothly and efficiently, without adding undue fiscal or administrative burdens to our administrator and teacher responsibilities. With the testimony that you have received, you will see that there is a March 2005 report ([Exhibit D](#)) that was issued by the Education Commission of the States. It's not clear to me whether you have this in front of you today. I want you to note that this was just issued.

The title of this report is "Parent Involvement in Education." I know that all of you have seen those lists where Nevada ranks forty-seventh, forty-eighth, fiftieth, or some number close to the bottom. But the good news about this report is that on the very first page, we see that Nevada is among only 17 states to have enacted legislation that requires all districts to implement parental involvement policies. We think that is something good about the list that we see. We think that is a good place for Nevada to be and we certainly appreciate the work, particularly which Assemblywoman Smith has done through the years, to make this effort statewide and to push forward with its importance.

Lucille Lusk, Chairman, Nevada Concerned Citizens (NCC), Las Vegas, Nevada:

We are in support of the concept of this legislation. We think that it requires the provision of a lot of information that would be very valuable to parents to have

in one place. Most of this information is already provided, as you know, but sometimes, when things come in bits and pieces, they are difficult to access. We do think that the wording creates some questions. Some of those questions have already been addressed in your previous hearing, and some have not. I'd like to state them distinctly and ask the Committee to please consider them as you move forward:

- Is it necessary to have a new statewide form, or is the list of required materials actually sufficient?
- Since many of the materials duplicate those already provided, is it sufficient to gather those materials into a packet and distribute them together, rather than having them put on a form?
- How will the distribution take place in a school where each student attends multiple classrooms? As you know, page 1, line 35 requires each classroom teacher to distribute.
- What is the purpose of the parent signature? Is it simply to acknowledge receipt of the materials, or does it contemplate some specific obligation?
- What if a parent does refuse to sign?

[Lucille Lusk, continued.] As you know, there are numerous bills dealing with parental involvement this session. It might be wise to consider those together as a package, so that the ultimate outcome is cohesive and works together for the benefit of students, parents, and the schools.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I think I can answer a couple of your questions, and it was brought up on Monday, especially the question about what do you do if you have multiple teachers. I'll give an example. When I was teaching at Carson Middle School, we had a booklet that had school policy. It addressed many of the concerns in this bill. It did not address all of them. What it did not have was every teacher's individual classroom grading policy, as an example. The only thing: if I were still teaching and this bill passed, I would just have to make sure that I had my individual classroom rules, anything that was particular that I wanted my parents to know, and insert that in with the school manual. I taught social studies. I had to drill the students in all of the rules and dress code, and that is all it would be.

I think the intent of this is to make it consistent throughout our 17 school districts. That is what we are seeing. We are seeing some teachers in some schools who do a beautiful job communicating with parents, but if we don't have it as a benchmark—to bring the importance of parental communication where it needs to be—then I think, indirectly, we failed our students. I hope that answers some of your questions about the process. The other part about

parents: if parents don't sign it, they don't sign it. There is no misdemeanor or any kind of follow-up to the parents if it isn't. I think it is, "We would like you to read it, and we would like to know that you have read it and have discussed it, perhaps, with your child."

Lucille Lusk:

I agree with each of the things you said, in terms of the intent. I think that the language of the bill needs some adjustment in order to reflect the intent. The concern about the signature is not for the parent, but for the teacher, where it requires that the teacher obtain the signature. It was discussed Friday. You might want to adjust it to a good faith effort to obtain it, or best effort—something like that—rather than requiring that they obtain the signature. That is the concern. It's for the teacher in that area, rather than for the parents' sign off.

Lonnie Shields, Legislative Advocate, representing Nevada Association of School Administrators (NASA):

Recognizing the importance of parental involvement and how that directly affects student achievement, we want to be on the record of supporting this bill along with the friendly amendments.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Is there anyone else wishing to speak either in support or opposition to A.B. 184? I do not see any at this time; do we have any desire to move on this bill today? We have had presented before us two amendments. One is from Paula Berkley with the Food Bank, regarding the addition of the information on the availability of school breakfast, school lunch, or summer meal programs. The other one is from the prime sponsors of the legislation, Assemblywomen Gerhardt and Smith.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I stated last time that I liked the concept and the rationale of the bill. I did express the concern about the mandatory nature of this. I am of the feeling that, depending on what you want to hear, I could move on the bill and get it going with the provisions that those language issues and mandatory issues are fixed, if that helps you.

Chairwoman Parnell:

It does. I think we certainly recognize that there are a couple of areas in the language that we need to have Legal take a look at.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 184.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I would like to see the language, so I reserve the right to have that reviewed. I would like to get it going. I'm reserving the right to have further discussion, even on the Floor if needed.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Terrific. That is accepted.

Assemblyman Munford:

I wanted to say one thing. When Mark Coleman came over at the Sawyer Building, he was trying to present something on the basis of a parental involvement program that was based on technology to some degree. Many of these things that you provide in this package could also be brought up on a computer. We had something like that at the high school I last taught at, Bonanza. It wasn't as extensive as this, but I'm sure that could be implemented. All the parent has to do is type in their name, the school they are at, and everything pops up.

Any information relating to class performance, school policy, rules, and regulations was all right there in the computer. This is just another one of those features that you want to use in education for bringing the parents into it. It's okay. I'm not totally against it, but I still feel that it's something that, in some respects, is already out there—doing something related to this. I would probably still support it. I know there are some schools and high schools that have something similar to this going.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Mr. Horne was not present for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

At this point in time, I will open the hearing on A.B. 70.

Assembly Bill 70: Exempts certain nonprofit educational organizations from charges associated with use of school property. (BDR 34-842)

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1, Clark County:

I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to present A.B. 70. First of all, I'd like to explain what A.B. 70 is for, to give you a little bit of background. This bill prohibits a board of trustees of a school district from charging nonprofit educational organizations for the use of school buildings, grounds, and equipment, or for the lighting, heating, janitorial, or other associated expenses with its use. To be more informal, I will explain why I brought this bill forward. Currently, we have some situations within our communities where the school is the only place that we can have groups meet. It is safe, it provides consistency, and our schools are open during operational hours to late afternoon, if not into the evening.

Right now, I feel as if the groups that are working the hardest to support our schools and stand behind our schools are actually being punished by having to pay to use our schools. The groups that we want to support our schools—to make sure we get enough dollars in the classroom that support our teachers—are taking the money that they are spending to use the schools—for instance, maybe \$35 for an hour and a half meeting—that they would have normally put into the classroom, providing for textbooks, school supplies, or backpacks to begin the year.

We are not helping the situation. We are just moving the money from one side to the other. The most important thing is that we get this money into the classrooms and to the kids who need it most. We are familiar with a lot of these groups. They range from PTAs [Parent Teacher Associations], PTSAs [Parent Teacher Student Associations], PTOs [Parent Teacher Organizations], to scouting groups, and they are in our community. They are helping our community every day. I am thinking that we need to work together to allow them to use the schools that are already open, so that we continue to divert the money into the classrooms and to the students.

By building a community, it works much better. These are the groups that are getting involved. You were just having testimony on parent involvement, and these are the parents that are being involved. However, at this time, other parties that are concerned with this bill have some concern that the language may be a little broad. I would like the opportunity, Madam Chair and Committee members, to go back to the table and work with the parties that are involved and come back with a friendly amendment so that we are all working to get to the same place.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Thank you. There is a way to solve this, I think. I would certainly hope so.

Assemblyman Munford:

Is this primarily in the elementary schools, middle schools, or high schools also? Is that what you are asking for: the use at all three levels?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

Depending on what the group is, what the event is, and how the community has set aside, it would affect most schools. For instance, with Girl Scouts, currently they have a service unit of 300 kids. We have nowhere to meet, and the hotels do not want the kids running through the hotels. I don't want to be responsible for the 300 kids running through the hotels. In that case, we would ask to use a high school. It depends on the group and the amount of people. I couldn't define it down. Basically, it would be the kids that live within the community using that particular building within their community.

Assemblyman Munford:

You don't mean to use the gym? Do you mean to use the gymnasiums and everything for nonprofit groups? If they had some type of basketball program or team that was nonprofit—a bunch of Boy Scouts or something want a gym to practice at and work out—you want the high school or middle school gym to be available to them?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

At this time we are trying to define those particular issues, which is why I'm asking to take it back to the table to work with all the other parties interested.

Assemblyman Munford:

I think you should have the right to use it, but I wanted to make sure that, as you say, you have to define it and determine what levels or what people you want to be dealing with. That is a tough thing. The administrations at the schools are really concerned about making their schools available to outside groups. When I was coaching, everybody used to ask if they could use the gym for various reasons. I hope everything works out for you. I think you should be able to use it.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

I'm going to leave you alone today and allow you to work it out. I do have some questions and I will talk to you about it later, if you are proposing to work on it and bring it back at a later time.

Assemblyman Mabey:

I have some concerns. I hope that you can work it out. What if there was a nonprofit organization that really wasn't appropriate to be using a school? They might want to use that. How would you decide who would do the scheduling?

Would it be the principal? Would you decide that one organization couldn't? It seems like there are some issues that will need to be worked out.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

Currently, I agree with you. The whole intent here is to make sure that we don't take classroom dollars away from the classrooms. I don't want to spend a ridiculous amount of money to heat the school and take it out of the classroom. With your concern—currently, in Clark County, their principals do have a slip that they fill out, they have a master schedule that they use, and depending on the schedule, they currently have to provide their own insurance. I know that in most cases that it is a \$1 million liability policy to use the school. There currently is some of this already in process. However, going back to the language being too broad, to define it to truly the community, is really what I'm trying to get to, because the school is open during operational hours, and those are the hours that we need to try and use.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

You just said that schools will be open to these nonprofit groups pretty much during school hours. You are not talking about extending the school hours. You are talking about being able to use the school when the school is open? Will you define that? I know that some schools are open longer, depending on programming, et cetera. That was my question at first.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I spoke with Washoe County today as well. The children are in school until approximately 3:30 p.m. or so, depending on what age group that they are in. However, they do have custodians in the school, and they have safe key programs. They have other programs throughout the school until approximately 11:00 p.m. What we are looking to do is, between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m., give or take, let the kids use the school during that time that it is already open, the power is already on, and we already have a supervisor on staff.

Chairwoman Parnell:

We wish you the best of luck. At this time, I would like to open the hearing on A.B. 206.

Assembly Bill 206: Provides for issuance of special license for persons with certain graduate degrees and work experience to teach pupils in public schools. (BDR 34-996)

Assemblyman Garn Mabey, Assembly District No. 2, Clark County:

I would like to explain a little bit of what I would call the “embryology” of A.B. 206. A couple of years ago, I attended a meet-the-teachers night, or back-to-school night, at Bonanza High, and my daughter’s health teacher requested that I help teach a class. I told her that I would be glad to and she asked the principal if I could do that. The principal felt uncomfortable, so I was unable to do so. It queried my mind to see what I could do to teach high school. I am a physician. I can teach at medical school, I can teach residents, and I could teach at a university, but I couldn’t teach high school. I had the interest of knowing what the current law was.

I asked Ms. Stonefield to investigate that, and I received a number of papers from various states throughout the country that do have alternative routes to licensure. These are different than what ours is. From that, I—with others that are in this room—picked language from the state of Maine. We used that as a template to develop this bill. Some might say, “What are the requirements if I wanted to teach in high school?” I would have to complete 120 hours of teaching provided by the school district, then I would have to go back to the university to receive 14 semester hours of instruction. That wouldn’t be practical for many of us. I was curious to see how many people do use the alternate licensure route that is available through our state now.

The pamphlet ([Exhibit E](#)) shows that, in the 2004-2005 school year, a total of 281 people went through this, and the vast majority of these were for elementary English as a Second Language (ESL) and special education. Only a handful were for math, science, and English—which are very much in demand, especially in Clark County. I also became aware that in Clark County—this coming week or the following week—in your power bill, you will receive an insert ([Exhibit E](#)). There are over 700,000 residents in southern Nevada that will receive this. On the second page it says, “A Call To Teach: If you hold a bachelor’s degree with a strong concentration in English, science, or math and have a desire to make a difference in the life of a child, the Clark County School District has an opportunity for you to become certified to teach. To find out more, attend a general information meeting at Valley High School on April 13 at 4:00 p.m.”

In my opinion, there really is a need for an alternative route for persons like myself and others that may have the desire to have another career as a teacher, but because of the current restrictions, it makes it somewhat impractical. With that in mind, I sat down with Mr. Hickman from the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), Dr. Rheault from the Nevada DOE [Department of Education], Clark County School District (CCSD), and also the Chairwoman. I appreciate that. With that background, if you like, I could proceed through the

bill. I appreciate that there will be questions. Some of those would probably be best answered by Dr. Rheault, who is much more technical at that than I, but I would be glad to answer those in any way.

[Assemblyman Mabey, continued.] On page 2, Section 1, as we discussed in a prior bill, there is a need for mentoring, and it was felt that anyone that went through this licensure would need to be mentored. We decided in this case that the mentoring would last for the first three years of the teacher's employment. I think this is pretty obvious. A person like myself would benefit from the skills and expertise of an expert teacher in one of these fields.

In Section 2, subsection 7, it outlines the requirements. If you'd like, I could read those:

(7) Providing for the issuance and renewal of a special qualifications license to an applicant who holds a master's degree or a doctoral degree from an accredited degree-granting postsecondary education institution in a field which the applicant will provide instruction in a classroom and who has:

(I) At least 2 years of experience teaching at an accredited degree-granting postsecondary educational institution in a field for which the applicant will provide instruction in a classroom and at least 3 years of experience working in that field; or

(II) At least 5 years of experience working in a field for which the applicant will provide instruction in a classroom.

Those are the requirements. When the bill came out of bill drafting, we decided that we did not like the wording exactly and we would like to propose an amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) that would come in on line 10, which would deal with basic licensure. Let's say that someone like myself wanted to teach a biology class. As long as I was board certified and had passed those tests that were necessary as a physician to be licensed, I would not need to take the test, but if I had not, then there would be a test provided by the State that I would be able to pass.

Subsection 8 deals with the subject matter. Should this bill pass, I would not be able to teach an English class, but I would be able to teach a health class or a biology class, and vice versa. If an attorney would teach a class, he would be qualified to teach certain classes under that subsection, which would be set forth by the Department of Education. That is pretty much the bill.

Assemblyman Hardy:

You don't really mean board certification in the statute, as much as you do licensed professional?

Assemblyman Mabey:

Yes.

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

I am here to support the bill. I appreciate the input we've been able to provide to Dr. Mabey as he was putting the bill together. If we can't find teachers in specialty areas of math and science, it is time to expand the box beyond teacher education programs. I think the one issue is accountability and quality, to make sure that is there in this type of position. The bill has been pretty much patterned after the alternative route pieces we already have in place. I don't have any concerns with it. There is enough information in the bill that gives the intent.

It's still going to be the Commission on Professional Standards that will develop the regulations for the special license. I would envision the Commission would probably impose a few other requirements that they've done similar to alternative routes, such as the 120 hours of upfront training or orientation before the teacher would be allowed in the classroom. That is basically how to use record books, grading, and a number of training things that would be helpful. They did that as part of the alternative route. I think Dr. Mabey has already mentioned that if you look at the numbers from alternative route, it has been good for elementary to fill hard-to-fill positions, but the secondary requirements seem to have stopped the use of that at the secondary level.

I think the difference between what is required in this bill and our current alternative route is that we will be able to use the master's and doctor degree levels versus a bachelor's level. What we will do at the Commission is we will look at the degree—it could be a medical degree—and define which courses would be applicable to be taught by that degree. That is not going to be a problem. I brought along a tattered book. We called it the License Correlation Directory for every different course that is taught in Nevada. We have already identified which endorsement you need to teach that course.

We would do the same thing with the degrees here, and those would be outlined by the Commission. That would be well defined. We would, I'm sure, start with the most common degrees. There are probably 5,000 different master's degrees out there. I could tell you: probably not all every master's degree is going to qualify for a course in high school. There are some that don't

apply. For the more common ones, I could see licensed CPAs [Certified Public Accountants] teaching accounting courses. There are a number of things. There are a few classrooms in some of the vocational schools that provide some basic architecture work—a licensed architect could provide that. It would be a matter of taking where they got their degree, what they have their experience in, and outlining the courses. I could answer any questions or concerns that you might have. I think there is enough intent that the Commission could take it from there to get this going.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I think what you are saying too, if there is something that we haven't addressed in this—and we did discuss the mentoring and classroom management and that side of teaching that is not content based—if the Commission feels something has been left out of this that needs to be addressed, then they have that purview to do that beyond what we send out of there. Is that correct?

Keith Rheault:

Correct. For example, they do require three years of mentoring. There is no fiscal reimbursement to the districts. It is their decision to hire a person with this license. If they are in difficult positions, like secondary math and science—where you can't find them—you can probably offset some of that cost with some of the recruiting costs that you have to do year round trying to find these people.

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

We appreciate the clarification that has been made by Dr. Rheault about what might happen with regard to this kind of licensure when it is considered by the Commission on Professional Standards. We had some concerns about the actual instructional capabilities, as well as facilitating and understanding of the way schools work for someone who has not gone through a preparatory program. We are pleased to hear about the 120 hours of collegial in-service that Dr. Rheault described.

For purposes of the Committee, one of the things that we think is important about that process is that it also provides the opportunity for the licensee to understand about individual education plans (IEPs), behavior management plans, accommodations and modifications, inclusion, classroom safety, and other issues that we think are important, but might not necessarily have been in the previous experience of the licensee. Thank you for this opportunity to provide that clarification.

Dr. Craig Kadlub, Director, Government Affairs, Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am speaking in support of A.B. 206. I would like to thank Dr. Mabey for the extensive opportunities for input prior to this hearing. We do support the amendments and believe that this will allow us to tap a little deeper into an existing talent pool.

Lucille Lusk, Chairman, Nevada Concerned Citizens (NCC), Las Vegas, Nevada:

We too are here in support of A.B. 206. It is clear that we are reaching the point where alternative licensing for well-prepared professionals to teach school is essential in order to fill some of the shortages in critical areas. We like A.B. 206, especially because it opens up to those with master's or doctorate degrees, who have actual work experience in the field. We prefer the alternative licensing provisions in this bill over those in A.B. 162 because of that, because it opens up to those with actual work experience. It is also more consistent procedurally in going through the Professional Standards Commission, than in recreating another procedure.

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins, Executive Director, Center for Charter School Development, Sparks, Nevada:

We are also in favor of this. I am very happy to see that you are looking at alternative certifications. I know from experience with working with charter schools that they also, like district schools, have a great deal of difficulty finding persons who are qualified to teach—especially in math and the sciences. One school in particular, Coral Academy of Science, was founded by two engineers with Ph.Ds. They have been in existence for six years now, and neither one of the founders continues to work in a teaching capacity at the university. A third one is actually a microbiologist at the university, and they are unable to teach any of their math or science classes at their school. I welcome this, and I appreciate it.

Ray Bacon, Executive Director, Nevada Manufacturers Association (NMA), Carson City, Nevada:

We rise in support of the bill. We'd love to see it go further. As you are well aware, math and science, in particular, are major concerns of the industrial community. This looks like one way to close that gap. Mr. Hanlon is not here, but he is one of those people. He and I continually press the issue of needing better math and science teachers, and we need people who have actually worked in the field and understand what the math and science is used for. We look at this as one way to do that. We strongly support the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ANGLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 206.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblyman Horne was not present for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

At this time, I would like to open the hearing on A.B. 335.

Assembly Bill 335: Makes various changes regarding education and makes appropriations. (BDR S-482)

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB):

This legislation relates to instruction and assessment. You should be receiving a section outline ([Exhibit F](#)), a table. I will run through the sections of the bill. I believe that there are a number of people here who will have additional information on these proposals. Most of these proposals were brought to the Committee by others and asked for their support, and they were included in the package of recommendations that came from the Committee.

Section 1 has to do with educational technology funding. The Commission on Educational Technology was created by NERA [Nevada Education Reform Act of 1997]; that was Senate Bill 482 of the 69th Legislative Session. The first funding occurred in 1997. The Legislature gave the school districts over \$36 million. In the 2003-2005 biennium, the appropriation was \$9.95 million. That is the amount that is recommended in A.B. 335. Previously, the Legislature broke the \$8.75 million into specific items that included minimum level of technology per classroom, maintenance, and technical support.

This time, all of those are rolled up into \$8,750,000, and then there is a requirement that the Commission on Educational Technology would identify priorities, rather than setting it into the appropriation. They would come up with the priorities and submit those to the Legislative Committee on Education for approval.

Section 2 is actually a replication of the language that was provided in Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session, when the appropriation was made. I should note for you that the \$9.95 million for educational technology is in The Executive Budget this time, although there it is broken down again into the maintenance, technical support, and so on.

[Carol Stonefield, continued.] Section 3 relates to a program that has been established in the Clark County School District (CCSD). The Committee received a presentation on it. It was called the "Inclusion Partnership." This is a proposal to expand that pilot program into a co-teaching program in the CCSD. Special education teachers are paired with the general classroom teachers to plan instruction for the special education students. The appropriation would be used to provide planning time for the general education teachers and substitute teachers, so that the classroom teachers can attend training.

Section 4 is an appropriation to the Interim Finance Committee for study guides for pupils who fail one or more portions of the high school proficiency exam. The study guides would be developed for each individual student following the administration of the high school proficiency exam for those students who fail whatever portion, and then the study guide is designed specifically for that student, with additional resources, sample tests, and other information to help the student study.

Sections 5 and 6 would establish an advisory task force to review certain academic standards and the high school proficiency exam. You may recall that the Legislature in 2003 intervened in the high school proficiency exam administration and actually reduced the cut scores. The high school proficiency exam performance was a concern to the members of the Committee throughout the interim. Different indicators seemed to cause concern for the members—raise some questions, actually—about high school graduation requirements, test questions, and cut scores. This task force is simply asking a number of people in Nevada—I believe that the task force has 14 members designated, and it would include two legislators, one from each House, as well as test directors, curriculum directors, teachers, a couple of members from the Counsel to Establish Academic Standards, and parents—to examine a number of items included in the bill, including graduation requirements—whether the Legislature should impose certain kinds of math and English graduation requirements. It appeared that the answers weren't clear, so the request is for a task force to consider all of these various factors and come back with a recommendation to the Legislative Committee on Education and then the 2007 Legislature.

Section 7 asks the Department of Education to review distance education opportunities. The Committee heard from a panel of college students who mentioned that some of them, particularly from the rural districts, did not have the same opportunities to take advanced placement course and some other upper level courses. They arrived as freshmen at college and found that a number of students had already accumulated a number of credits and were nearly finished with the credits in their freshman year, for example.

[Carol Stonefield, continued.] Upon further investigation, we learned that, according to NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] Chapter 388, if a district allows its student to take a distance education course that is provided by another district, the home district's portion of apportionment in basic support from the Distributive School Account (DSA) is reduced by that class period. If, for example, a district were to have \$6,000 in basic apportionment, that one class period would represent a reduction of \$1,000 for that particular student, and it would be paid to the district that is providing the instruction, regardless of the cost to that district providing the instruction.

This may have a chilling effect on districts that would be contracting with others to provide those services. This is simply asking the Department to review distance education, the current funding scheme, and opportunities available throughout the state, and then come back with a report to the Committee on what can be done and what recommendations the Department might make to make distance education opportunities more consistent and uniform throughout the state.

Section 8—we have mentioned this before—the Committee came to view the transition from high school to post-secondary education or the workplace to be something that deserved additional attention. It is a recommendation to itself to study the transition from high school to post-secondary education in the next interim. The effective date is July 1, 2005. That is the summary of the bill.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Are there questions for Ms. Stonefield at this time? I don't see any. I know we have individuals here wanting to speak to a particular section within A.B. 335. What I'd like to do is start with Section 1.

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

I'll start with Sections 1 and 2, since those deal with the Educational Technology Commission and the funding. We are here to support that. It's in the Governor's recommended budget at the same amounts you have in the bill. We do have Mark Knudson, who you heard from a couple of weeks ago, that provided information on how they used the funds, and he's here to answer any questions. We also have Sara Jones, who is on the Education Technology Commission, and I know that she'd like to speak, since they oversee, administer, and approve the funding for that. I'll hold off on the other sections that I'm not as positive on.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I know Section 2, I believe, is the section that references Section 1, the libraries. For the record, I wanted to note that Martha Gould, a librarian for Washoe County, called last night voicing her strong support for that section of the bill. She was unable to be here today, but I told her I would convey that for the record.

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

I was here a couple of weeks ago and I gave you about a seven-page report. I brought two of those pages today ([Exhibit G](#)). You should have it in front of you with the pie chart. The Commission did work for two days to come up with priorities for educational technology funding. There is probably some assessment that would need to be done if this bill is passed. I do, as a representative of the Commission on Educational Technology, want to express our support for this bill. Particularly, I would like to support Section 1, subsection 3, which talks about the Commission establishing a list of priorities for the funding. The Commission works very closely with the districts. It is quite a cumbersome process, a time-intensive process, to figure out the financial and technological needs. I think the Commission is best suited to do that; they have the most familiarity with it.

We are also in support of proposing those priorities to the Legislative Committee on Education as stated in the report. We would not be opposed to rolling up all of these dollars into subsection 2, paragraph (d). That would allow the Commission to make decisions on the funding in its entirety. We do like this language a lot more than what's in the Governor's budget, which is basically a copy and paste from last year's statute.

Sara F. Jones, State Librarian, Division Administrator, Department of Cultural Affairs, Nevada State Library and Archives:

Before I talk more specifically about this bill, I want to tell you as a parent, that I thank you so much for the support of the educational technology. I have a third grader and a fifth grader who have benefited greatly from this funding. I came from Elko, so my kids first went to Spring Creek Elementary School. They're here in Carson City, attending Bordewich/Bray and Fritsch. What I can tell you absolutely, as a parent, is that this leveled some playing fields. It made schools equal across the state, and it made computers available in every classroom. I commend you for that, and I hope that you will continue to support it on that level.

I wanted to speak very specifically about what I provided you today in some documents ([Exhibit H](#)), what we do with the funding that comes from the

Commission on Educational Technology to license library database information, informational databases. The Nevada Legislature provides through this funding \$500,000—\$250,000 in each year of the biennium—then I match that with federal funding with at least that level. It has really been approaching about \$350,000 in each year. What we can do by that is broker that statewide. I buy these databases.

[Sara Jones, continued.] I've shown you which ones that we do purchase with these fact sheets. There is company called EBSCO [Elton B. Stephens Company]—we literally get more than 50,000 titles from this individual vendor. We have another company called Gale, who has about an equal amount of titles. We are talking about newspapers, magazines, reference materials, almanacs, and just about anything you can imagine. The most recent one that we bought is Facts on File, which I'm really excited about, because Facts on File actually does grades 2 through 8. It does it in a curriculum support way. They are very good for supporting education. These databases are available in every school in Nevada. They are available in every public library, and they are available to every Nevadan with a library card.

We believe that this truly supports education, and we highly support that you continue funding the Commission. Also, these would not be of any value if we didn't have the computers in the classroom and the Internet infrastructure that your investment over the years, since 1997, has provided.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I've heard great things about the database. Thank you for complimenting our public schools; that is nice to hear.

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins, Executive Director, Center for Charter School Development, Sparks, Nevada:

This is a great bill. The only concerns that I really have are that charter schools are not specifically addressed in the grant sections; for instance, in number 1. I know that many times, in bills and our current statute, charter schools are referred to, and sometimes they are just considered to be part of whenever the wording "school district" is mentioned. That has led to some confusion over time. What I'd like to suggest is that on page 2, item (d), those grant funds specifically talk about going to local school districts. School districts, most times, notify charter schools in their sponsorship that grant funds are available, but not all the time. We now have state-sponsored charter schools that wouldn't, according to this specific wording, be eligible at all. I'd like for you to consider that in this bill.

[Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins, continued.] Also, as you look at other bills, while generally charter schools are included, we have to abide by all of the same regulations and statutes. When we develop, we get the school law book and everything. Every time we see "school district," we know that also means us, even if it doesn't say charter schools. Even in this same bill, there is specific reference to charter schools. I want to make sure that we don't get left out of the money end of it. That's all I had about those two sections, but I think there was another section that we will get to in a little while.

Chairwoman Parnell:

We have Rhonda Glyman and Scott Reynolds joining us from Las Vegas to talk about co-teaching, and that is in Section 3.

Rhonda Glyman, Co-Chair & Founder, Nevada Partnership for Inclusive Education (PIE), Henderson, Nevada:

[Handed out [Exhibit I](#).] I am here to speak in favor of A.B. 335, Section 3. The mission of Nevada PIE is to strengthen public school education that is respectful of and responsive to the many cultures, languages, and diverse learning styles of Nevada's children and youth. We are a public-private partnership between the Clark County School District, the University System, and the community. I am very excited about many of the initiatives that we've developed collaboratively together over the last two years—the University System leadership, the many leaders within the Clark County School District, and many leaders in the community. Today, in the interest of time, I'll speak specifically to the issues around co-teaching, and then I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

Co-teaching is considered, nationally, a vital component of schools that are inclusive, comprehensive, and successful. They are part of a continuum of services to meet the needs of all students. Specifically, when we speak about co-teaching, we are referring to the pairing of a general education core-content teacher—that would be an English, math, science, or social studies teacher—with a special education trained teacher daily throughout the year, really bringing the best of both worlds together in the regular classroom.

Research shows that when students with special needs are exposed to the richness of the general education environment, they learn and perform at a much higher level. This allows those students to be successful when they are in the general education environment. The benefits of co-teaching: not only do students with disabilities who come from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds benefit, because there are a variety of teaching methods implemented to reach the many different styles that those children have of

learning, but we have found—and research shows—that all students benefit from this arrangement.

[Rhonda Glyman, continued.] It really is focused on all students in that classroom, raising the performance level of the largest group of students in our schools—those in the regular education classrooms. The benefits are to allow all students to learn and perform their best and to provide expanded opportunities for students to achieve academically, as well as socially. We feel it is very important to invest in this today by supporting the training of the teachers involved in co-teaching and allowing them planning time to make sure that co-teaching is implemented successfully, to meet the needs of all students, and to help those students be successful and become productive members of society in the future.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Great, concise presentation. I think you'll have another opportunity to talk about your wonderful program later on.

Scott Reynolds, Executive Director, Student Support Services, Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada:

As Mrs. Glyman had shared, we've had a tremendous collaboration between the district, parents, and district agencies. One of the things that we have been able to accomplish during this collaboration is to really enhance our inclusive efforts. Co-teaching is one method, but we have also expanded many of our methods in inclusive practices. One of the things that we've seen locally is not just an expansion of co-teaching, but in the past two years, students on IEPs [individualized education programs] have a demonstrable increase in academic achievement. We think that co-teaching and other inclusive practices are really going to be critical for meeting student needs across the district—not only students with disabilities, but all students. The district is very much in support of A.B. 335, Section 3 in particular.

Martha Sutro, Client Services Manager, The Grow Network, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York, New York:

We are going to go over in the same presentation ([Exhibit J](#)) both A.B. 335 and A.B. 336. We have sections in each. The Grow Network has been working in the state of Nevada since 2003. We were funded in the last biennium to report on standardized tests and provide reports for educators and parents. We are going to talk about the renewal of that project today. That is A.B. 336. We are also going to talk about a way in which we would like to deepen our work here, which is with the study guides, and that is A.B. 335.

[Martha Sutro, continued.] The Grow Network was founded five years ago. Last summer, we merged with the McGraw/Hill Company. The company's mission is to transform assessment into an opportunity for a meaningful action and instruction. The program consists of an integrated system of reports and instructional tools for parents and educators. You have two folders that we have handed out ([Exhibit J](#) and [Exhibit K](#)). There is a green folder and a blue folder. In the green folder ([Exhibit J](#)), if you open that up, you can see that there are sample reports and some other materials. You can see that these are the printed score reports and the class and parent report.

There are four primary elements:

- Printed score reports
- Web tools
- Instructional materials
- Professional development

Look in the green folder, and look at the Nevada Parent Report first. You can see that this is the way in which we report on individual student data for parents. The reports are designed to lay out the student's performance, inform parents about what the standards are, and connect parents immediately to actions they can take on the basis of their child's performance. On the front of the reports, you have the overall reading and math scores. On the inside of the report, there is a breakdown of the reading and math into the state standards with the customized activities that parents can do with their child based on that child's performance.

The reports are designed so they quickly and effectively communicate to parents of all education levels and backgrounds. We provide translation guides with the reports. You can see that on the inside that we direct parents to a publicly-accessible website called [<growparents.com>](http://growparents.com), which also has Spanish-language activities in it that are standards based specifically to Nevada.

The activities, both on the inside of the report as well as on the website, are age-specific and level-specific. They are custom designed for each student. If you look at the class report, you can see that this does the same type of thing. It connects an educator, in this case, to the performance of their class and directs them to meaningful action for that group of students. On the left, on the inside of the class report, there is a breakdown of the class performance into the four performance levels. This is something an educator is already familiar with, because they have gotten the reports from the test vendor. Then, moving from left to right, there is a data analysis that happens here, where the teacher sees how each student has performed in the individual standards and then gets an instructional recommendation for that group of students.

[Martha Sutro, continued.] After that, the teacher sees that they have a log-in and password that is printed on the bottom of the class report. From there, they have access to a secure website that provides them with the second component, the web tools, which are quick and give access to district, grade, class, and student level performance, depending on the level of the person using them. They show teachers how to differentiate instruction according to the needs of their class. The instructional materials build teacher understanding of the standards and suggest teaching strategies tailored to that data. I've found that in Nevada, this is the thing that excites teachers the most.

We have conducted a substantial amount of professional development in this state, and we also have recently distributed a survey that teachers and principals could take. Teachers overwhelmingly say that these standards-based tools, particularly in math, are things that they didn't feel like they had before. This is a strong component of this. There are also online lesson plans in the instructional materials that are very popular in Nevada.

The fourth component is professional development. This educates teachers, principals, and parents, and it solicits feedback for ongoing improvement. We deliver both in the printed form—the professional development in the printed form with the reports—as well as in person, when we deliver training in each school or to different parent groups. We've also trained other levels of Nevada educators. The RPDP [Regional Professional Development Program] group is one that we have worked with in particular.

Let's look at the next slide (slide 2 of [Exhibit J](#)), and look, in particular, at our work in Nevada. You can see from this map that these are a few of the places that Grow is also working in other districts and states. Not on this list, but you can see the states that they belong in, are Illinois and New York. We have been working in the Chicago public schools for the past three years and in the New York City public schools for the past five years. In Nevada, we actually have one of our most unique projects, because we essentially took the model that we had developed for these districts, Chicago and New York, and we worked for the first time at the state level in all of the districts in a particular state.

The kind of in-depth work that we developed in Chicago and New York, we've brought that to Nevada—sort of times 17, in our minds. We, in this biennium, had three distinct deliveries of printed reports and online resources. We delivered in the spring of 2004, in the fall of 2004, and we will report on the results of the 2005 exams that have mostly just been taken, but are being taken by students in this state this spring. Some of the highlights of our work here have been innovations in our parent outreach, in Clark County in particular, that

have defined our work in other states and districts. We have conducted, for the first time, bilingual parent training.

[Martha Sutro, continued.] We've conducted trainings in Spanish. One of the inserts that I've put in the green folder ([Exhibit J](#)) is a response from a Spanish-speaking parent who attended a Spanish-language training. It was the first time that we really got feedback in Spanish. We also delivered customized instructional tools, specifically for Clark County educators, that were aligned with the parent resources. The key here is that we have an ability to customize our services by the particular district needs. In the last biennium, Clark County was particularly invested in the rollout of a data tool that they were using just in their district and determined that they wanted the Grow parent reports, but they didn't want to use the Grow educator reports. What we did, instead, was work with them closely in other ways, to deepen the parent work that we were doing there and to support the teachers who were communicating with parents.

Another highlight of our work here is that we have a high educator account usage rate and very positive feedback. We have eight of the districts that are using the educator accounts currently showing over 50 percent usage. We have some districts with 80 percent and a couple of districts with 100 percent usage. It is very exciting for us. Each district has logged on at some point during the last biennium. Our Grow professional development has really grown in this project. It was really the first time that we started covering the kinds of geographical distances that we need to cover in Nevada, to reach all of the school districts.

We have reached out to each district and school. I have been to every school district at least once. We have conducted over 100 professional development sessions around the state for parents and educators. It's a very colorful and exciting project to talk to a small company in New York City about. The imagination required to understand it excites people. The whole company is very alert to the particular stories of this project. It is exciting for us to see the progress that Nevada has made in compiling its state data warehouse and all of the efforts each of the districts are making to analyze and understand their results.

In the last two years, we started to work with other state initiatives and started to educate districts that are using these district-based data tools about how to use different tools in tandem to address gaps in student achievement. For instance, some of the districts are using a data warehouse tool that sorts data for the person who is using it. We've reached out to those districts and said, "These are the different types of data tools that you have available to you. This is what you get from one tool, and this is what you get from another tool."

We've sought to partner with and educate our users, to show them how they can compile data and make the right inferences in knowing what tool to use at what time.

[Martha Sutro, continued.] In the next biennium, we will support the reports for more students, a substantially larger number of students who are taking many more diverse exams. We had a strong interest from practically everyone that I have talked to, to report on the state writing test. We are going to pick that up. We are also going to report on the grades 4, 6, and 7 Nevada CRT [Criterion Referenced Test]—which is going to be rolled out in those three grades over the next two years—the grade 10 ITBS [Iowa Test of Basic Skills] and the Norm-Referenced Test (NRT) that students take in Nevada. We currently report on the grade 4 and grade 7 tests there.

We are also going to seek to drive usage. We are going to deliver ongoing professional development to meet the diverse needs of the districts and schools of this state. We have started to work with and have hired a professional development trainer—a former Washoe County school teacher—who has been instrumental in helping us reach out to more districts. As our work deepens in the state, we will add those resources to the project. We are also going to reach out to more parents. You'll see in the green folder ([Exhibit J](#)) a sample New Mexico report that is for Spanish-speaking parents. That is something that we would seek to do in 2006-07 in Nevada. That would be full. It would be the parent report that you see in front of you, but it would be in Spanish for Spanish-speaking parents.

The other thing that we would do, and Tisha is going to elaborate on this, is to provide Nevada students and parents with a fully integrated system of online and printed study guides for the HSPE [High School Proficiency Examination]. The cost to the state is \$1.2 million per year, excluding the study guides. The study guides have a separate cost to them. The prices for the renewal would be \$1.2 million per year, or \$2.4 million for the biennium.

Tisha M. Pryor, Director of State and District Partnerships, The Grow Network, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York, New York:

I want to be succinct with my remarks, but also thorough enough to give you an appropriate understanding of the personalized study guides that we would be very interested in delivering in collaboration with the state of Nevada. Martha has laid out for you what I think is how Nevada, and the work we have doing in the state with you for the last two years, truly reflects Grow's mission, which is about the responsible use of data for all audiences to really inform action, so that teachers get data in a way that is useful for them and that they can use immediately for their classroom instruction.

[Tisha Pryor, continued.] Parents can also get data that is useful for them by speaking to their children, to help them understand what to do at home with their children, and it helps them to have conversations with educators. This is something that helps the Grow mission very deeply and very strongly. As we mentioned before, we are doing this work in a number of states across the country. This is a short list of them. All of the work reflects the core mission of Grow, but is also custom. All of the work that we do in California and Illinois has variety and has specificity to the local conditions. This is another thing that is at the heart of the work that Grow does.

You will always see there is a general look and feel to our work, which is about making data clear in a responsible way, but also being very mindful of local context, to be specific about the kind of resources that we develop, so that they are standard space and locally relevant. We have been learning a lot from our work. In the places where we work, we do a number of things, and Martha has mentioned some of the work that we've been doing in Nevada, in terms of the form of the feedback that we do, getting an understanding from the ground up of how all of our audiences are responding to our reports, and using our reports.

There is ongoing formative feedback that we do. We also have been lucky enough to be a part of third-party evaluations of our work in New York City, Chicago, and other places. In particular, there was a study recently funded by the Carnegie Foundation, which completed a 2 1/2 year evaluation of Grow's work in New York City. What was interesting about that work is that they found that teachers really saw the Grow reports as an important bridge for them—to link them to the standards, the assessments, and their instructional priorities. They used Grow reports in important ways to help them understand those three things.

In particular, there are three things that educators were using Grow reports and continue to use Grow reports for:

- Targeting instruction. Teachers overwhelmingly use Grow reports not only to understand the shape of their classroom via the class reports, but also to then understand how to differentiate their instruction for each of their students based on their students' results. This is very important for teachers, mining through data to get information in a succinct way that is particular to individual students and their classrooms.
- Shaping their own professional development. An interesting finding from this report was that many teachers didn't recognize, until they saw their Grow reports, that they thought they were teaching to the standards, but they actually were not. They used their Grow reports as an opportunity to

get a deeper and richer understanding of the standards than they thought they had. That is really interesting to us.

- A third thing, and this has led to the development of the study guides, is the way that teachers take their Grow reports and use them to have conversations directly with their students about setting learning goals, priorities, and being clear about expectations. It's interesting; just this morning, Martha received an email from a site administrator in Washoe, who talked about a math teacher who is doing exactly this. He is taking the Grow reports that he is receiving and using that as a moment to create a report to the student, to help the student understand the expectations around the standards of learning in mathematics.

[Tisha Pryor, continued.] This kind of work is what led us to develop the personalized study guides—which I'm going to talk to you about—coupled with what we know broadly around high school reform research, which is intuitive to us. When you make clear and evident to students what it is they need to know, they have a better chance at succeeding and performing well. We do that by also providing them a network of support—the resources that speak directly to them—to help them understand their learning goals.

If you open your blue folder ([Exhibit K](#)), you will see, on the right hand side, a document that has the white binder on it. This is an example of a prototype that we could develop for Nevada. It is not what would be a complete study guide, but it's going to give you a history of the kinds of resources that we could provide to all of the students in Nevada at eleventh grade and twelfth grade to help them understand the expectations around the HSPE.

Some of the core components of the study guides:

- Being clear to young people about their results.
- Letting them understand their strengths, not just their weaknesses. Not just where they perform poorly, but letting them understand where they do well.
- Giving foundation to those students who are really struggling in skills.
- Giving advanced work challenges to students who are ready to go ahead, who are doing advanced work and ready to move along.
- Provide custom professional development throughout the state and all of the 17 districts for teachers to help them understand how to use their guides with their students. Every teacher would receive a companion guide, which would include all of the complete content that is contained in the individual student guides.

This would be fully aligned to the state standards. If I point you to page 3, when you open up your sample guide, this isn't real data. This is fake data used

to give you a look and feel. You will see the results for the student are broken up by standard. In reading, you see how the student performed in forming an initial understanding, developing an interpretation, and determining a critical stance. The same goes for mathematics. With the breakdown of the scores, the student can see how close or how far they were to meeting the passing standard.

[Tisha Pryor, continued.] The guide will then provide the students a personal pathway of understanding this content based on these results. Students who perform below the passing standard in any area will get the foundational material that will help them understand core critical skills—needs that they may not have had—that they will need for understanding that standard. For those students who are performing at the standard, they will get a review of that area, but still a treatment. For those students that are working above the standard, they will get advanced challenges, preparing them for college-level work. We understand the need to meet all of the needs and challenges of students across the study guide.

The guides also contain tutor guides and a tear-out tutor sheet that a student can use with a tutor or a teacher. All teachers would get a companion guide. We could also, in this guide, provide information about course selection, graduation requirements, and links to important district and state resources that you would think would be appropriate for high school students to understand. There is also a web component to the study guide.

A student, in the event that they lost the guide, could go on to the Nevada study guide website and download a guide based on their scores. As long as they had access to their original scores from their teacher and from their school, they would be able to go to the Nevada study guide website and get a replacement guide at no cost. It would, again, be based on their scores. This is an important issue, especially around mobility, because we know that students move, but we want them to still have access to their guide.

The website would also contain professional development resources for teachers, including tutorials and PD [Professional Development] modules. It would also contain the blank forms that are included in the study guide, like the study planner. There would also be student-specific resources available on the study guide website, as well as parent-specific resources.

We understand, too, that just as it's important for students to understand the requirements around high school graduation, it is also important for parents to understand what those requirements are, so that they have clarity about what is being expected of their students. Some of what I think we are talking about is

providing a comprehensive network of support, to really help students have the opportunity early on to achieve high expectations and meet graduation early on. This is why we would want to provide the custom professional development, the resources for students, and also the resources for parents. It is just as important for parents to understand what these expectations are as it is for their students.

Martha Sutro:

Because the HSPE has a variety of administrations, and the schedules for the retests varies for the writing, reading, and math, I have laid out for you a proposal for a delivery plan for the study guides and the web resources that come with them, as well as the professional development. This is broken down into two separate years. In 2005—next fall—in preparation for the 2006 math/reading retest, Grow would deliver the printed study guides to all students who did not pass the grade 10 test in reading and/or math. In December, at the end of the year, the study guide website would be launched. At that point, twelfth graders and any students—I am aware that there are adults who are not in high school, who are taking this test as well—could log on and access their guide online at that time, when the website was launched.

Professional development would take place over the course of this time period. Then, in January 2006, printed study guides would be delivered to those who did not pass the grade 11 writing test, which is administered in December 2005. Then in the spring, because we would not be able to deliver workbooks to students, we would deliver fliers to inform them that if they did not pass the spring test, they could get a workbook on the Web. They would be out of school by the time the results came to us. We would then pick up new grade 10 and 11 students' data in the 2006-07 school year. It would be the same delivery schedule.

The cost for this is \$795,000 for the first year and \$750,000 for the second year. For the total biennium, it's \$1.545 million. There are two separate appropriations.

Assemblyman Hardy:

How long does it take for the teacher to find out the results, the student to find out the results, and adapt to what the need is?

Tisha Pryor:

After we receive the data, it would take about 3 1/2 weeks to produce a study guide. I should also add that we've developed and delivered study guides for the state of Texas. We've delivered about 100,000 guides to all eleventh graders in Texas who were taking the tests, between September and now. For the first

50,000, it was about a three-week turnaround time. That includes the web component as well.

Assemblywoman Smith:

If we could go back to the regular report—I was curious, since Clark County only chose to use part of it, were we able to divert some of that and use those funds elsewhere in the state? I probably know this from our many conversations, but it is not coming to me. How did that work when we had one district not utilizing the whole thing?

Martha Sutro:

The funds were not diverted. Grow is paid for the full amount for that year. We did decide to do this intensive parent work in Clark County and to develop and print our educator resources for teachers in Clark County, to compensate for them not having the log-ins. Operationally, we had built the entire website. There is a state level log-in that the Department of Education (DOE) uses that is capable of drilling down through all of the districts. That is one of the major costs in developing this—creating the web resources is the major cost. That state site was still up, so the state-level people could look all the way down through all of the districts, including Clark County. It's just that the log-ins and passwords were not sent to teachers and principals in Clark County.

Assemblyman Mabey:

The 3 1/2 weeks, is that from the time that they take the test and when the date is available? Do you think that is a good enough turnaround time?

Tisha Pryor:

The 3 1/2 weeks that I refer to was from receipt of data to deliver. Once we would receive the data used to develop these reports, it would be about 3 to 3 1/2 weeks to pull them together, create them, and then send them back out to the districts so that they would be available.

Assemblyman Mabey:

It could take 1, 2, or 3 weeks from the time the test was given until you would receive the data?

Martha Sutro:

This is a complex issue, because the testing calendar really defines our reporting calendar. We have a quite ambitious turnaround time. We get our assessment data from the DOE, and they do about a 60-day turnaround of data for us to give to Grow, which is pretty good. The testing calendar here is later than in many states where we work. That being said, we will receive the HSPE grade 10 data that we will use for the fall reports—for November—from the state at

some point this summer. This implementation plan allows us to meet those students in the school year, to be able to send the workbooks to them where they will be in eleventh grade. Going forward, when students log in and put in their data to get an online report, is that 3 1/2 weeks?

Tisha Pryor:

No. That would be a shorter turnaround timeframe, because the 3 1/2 weeks that I mentioned includes shipment. It includes shipping, from the time the data is received at Grow and study guides are available at a district. If we are talking just about the web launch, it's a shorter timeframe.

Assemblyman Munford:

For some seniors on the proficiency exam, they are down to the home stretch—because I've experienced it so many times—and they only have several opportunities remaining before they are eligible to graduate with their class in June. Are you able to provide for them? Going into the second semester, there are three opportunities for them. I know they can try in February, April, and then one more time. What do you do for that?

Martha Sutro:

They would use the online resources and generate a guide online. When they put their score in each time, if they didn't pass each of those administrations, the system would generate a new study guide for them.

Assemblyman Munford:

You could possibly help them overcome what their shortcoming was.

Martha Sutro:

The idea is that they would know in more defined ways what they hadn't passed, and actually one of the strong points of the guide is that they know what they did pass, too.

Assemblyman Munford:

It's a lot of stress on those kids at that time, and they need some type of encouragement or hope. Maybe you could provide them with a little hope.

Tisha Pryor:

Your question is important. At what point do you follow through on the notion of the opportunity to learn? This is one of the reasons why this proposal begins with eleventh graders. We think it is important to begin then. I will tell you that in Texas, we began at eleventh grade, and the response to that was so strong. Commissioner [Shirley] Neeley made an announcement that at this time last year, 72 percent of students had graduated the test. This year, 85 percent of

them did. She understood, based on the formative work that we were doing in the field and also the work that the Department was doing in the field, that was in part due to the fact that students had a guide that spoke directly to them about their own assessment results—to help them—as well as the professional development that teachers were getting. As a result, Texas is considering expanding the delivery of individual student study guides to all ninth and tenth graders, to recognize that it's better to begin early than to wait until the last moment. Your point is well taken. We appreciate that and understand that we really do want to give young people every opportunity to succeed and to succeed early on. It is important.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Thank you for being here, and thank you for combining the two bills into one presentation. Is there anyone at this time still that would like to speak to Section 4? I see Sections 5 and 6 have to do with the task force. What I think I'll do now is just anyone wishing to testify either, in particular, to Sections 5 through 8 or to the bill in general.

Anne K. Loring, Legislative Advocate, representing Washoe County School District (WCSD), Reno, Nevada:

We would like to speak to Sections 5 and 6. Our board of trustees actually did talk to the Legislative Committee on Education about the idea of reviewing the HSPE and using a Nevada task force. What the interest was that there has been a lot of questions about the HSPE. We don't have the luxury that Texas does of releasing all of the tests right after you give them. There is quite a bit of secrecy about it, which is necessary for security. There have been questions raised about how rigorous the test is, about how hard it is, about if our kids are having a rough time, about if it is easy, and if kids should be able to do it. Then we had questions raised during the study with the American Diploma Project and, since then, about whether you could use the HSPE score on that test as placement criteria for going into higher education.

There have been all sorts of questions about the proficiency exam, which, really, most folks can't answer because you haven't seen the test itself, unless you have been a kid that has taken it. What our board had in mind was the idea of having a Nevada task force. Our board had suggested parents, teachers, members of the Standards Council, and business folks. You have three out of those four groups in the task force as presented in the bill—Nevada folks who would have credibility when they reviewed the test and then spoke to residents of our state about it. Actually, what I'd like to speak to specifically is on page 7, Section 6, subsection (a), parts 1, 2, and 3. We appreciate the opportunity to work with your staff on some wordsmithing here.

[Anne Loring, continued.] What the concept was in Section 6, subsection 1(a), which would be lines 17 and 18, and then 19 and 20. What percentage of the test is on ninth through twelfth grade standards, and what percentage of the test is on K-8 standards? That is part of getting at the rigor. It's not that we are looking for any particular answer that is right or wrong on the percentage, because a state would be migrating toward making it more and more difficult as the students become better prepared. What is the percentage of the test that is high school standards versus pre-high school standards? That is what 1 and 2 should be. The concept didn't quite get grasped in the wording here. We'd appreciate the chance to work with you on that.

Then 3, which is the concept, then in turn, the question: what percentage of the high school standards did the Standards Council approve? They prioritized them and said that some would be tested at the local level and some would be tested at the state level. What percentages of the high school standards that are supposed to be tested at the state level actually are? Are they all tested, and does the proportion of those standards that are tested reflect what the Standards Council prioritized in terms of enduring, important, and worth knowing? There were three categories. That was our concept of what this task force should look like.

We appreciate that it did pretty much appear in the bill as we had proposed, and we would appreciate the chance to work with the staff, just to wordsmith 1 and 2. The way they came out is, "What percent of the K-8 standards are on the test? What percent of the ninth through twelfth standards are on the test?" That wasn't quite where we were headed. We do think also, in particular, that subsection (d) of Section 6—that is, having this task force look at our tests compared to the NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] test, which Nevada students also take and is what is used to say how Nevada kids are doing compared to national results—how does that compare to our own in-house HSPE? That is where we are headed. We'd appreciate the chance to work with your staff on it.

Terry L. Hickman, President, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), Las Vegas, Nevada:

We are in support of A.B. 335, but we wanted to add an amendment ([Exhibit L](#)) on Section 5. It simply states, "The teachers appointed to the task force pursuant to paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) must be selected from a list of teachers nominated for the appointment by the Nevada State Education Association." That is our only amendment to the bill.

Assemblyman Hardy:

What other kinds of teachers are there?

Terry Hickman:

Well, the ones that we are talking about would be supplied from a list from NSEA to work on this task force.

Assemblyman Hardy:

So they are supposed to be selected from the list of teachers nominated for the appointment by the NSEA? I'm not sure if I should use the union word, but that's the union. So no teachers from a non-union, or what am I looking at?

Terry Hickman:

Those who we would nominate would be those that have been part of the association and have worked directly in the high school, middle school, and also the elementary school, as is pointed out here in the task force requirements. Since we are the representatives of all K-12 educators, we would like to be part of that selection process.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Are all teachers in the public school district under the superintendent members of NSEA, or just members of NSEA? Is NSEA the union?

Terry Hickman:

NSEA is the association. You may decide to join if you wish.

Assemblyman Hardy:

What your amendment is saying is, only members of the teachers' union would be, according to your amendment, those appointed to those positions.

Terry Hickman:

What we are asking for is that NSEA would be given the opportunity to give a list of teachers for the three different areas in high school, middle school, and also elementary school. Yes, they would be members of the NSEA.

Assemblyman Hardy:

That is the way I read it, as in "must" be selected from the list.

Terry Hickman:

Yes. That is with other appointees and other things that we do. That is exactly what we do, in terms of appointing people from around the state to represent education.

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

Onto Section 7, page 8—specifically, beginning with line 34, which is subsection 1(e), and going to the beginning of line 41: we strongly support this section of the bill. I'd like to take a moment to give you an example of why we support this. Sometimes we have students—and Mr. Munford may be familiar with some students who fit this category—who have found themselves in their junior or senior year, and they are credit deficient. They have turned over a new leaf, they are working very hard to move forward, they are taking a full schedule, and they are also enrolling in distance education courses to make up credits that they have missed. We have discovered in the last couple of years that we have some students who are full-time in our own high schools, but who also are taking a number of credits through distance education prior to the beginning of our own distance education program.

The school district has been in the position of having to transfer funds to the distance education provider that exceeds the apportionment that the district receives for the student. So, in effect, the services are provided by the district free for that student, because the money is flowing to the distance education provider. We believe that is an area that needs to be examined and remedied. We are strongly supportive of the language that you have, particularly in subsections 1(e) and (f) on page 8.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Something that I wanted to mention when we were talking about the task force: I would like to request that, when the discussion begins on this section, we also look at possibly having somebody serve on that committee that represents our alternative and adult education population. I think that is a large chunk of students in this state who are choosing to go to our Pioneer High School in Carson or part of the adult education program, who are also under the same guidelines as all of our other high school students regarding the proficiency. I'd like to make note of that for the record.

Keith Rheault:

I'll give the Committee one other option. It basically is that if you look over the required list of the task force, the Department doesn't have any problem with reviewing standards or the HSPE. I'll give you an example. We have done two alignment studies on math alone in the last four years, and we have a report and have submitted it. If you look through it, we already have the Academic Standards Council, and they can pretty much ask for or do any of the first six items on the list that are supposed to be done. The State Board of Education has authority to set the graduation requirements. Any group that has an interest in this could come forward and ask the Board to discuss it.

[Keith Rheault, continued.] That, in particular, has to do with what requirements for math should be for high school graduation. I'd also add that the Department of Education and the Board of Regents have voluntarily put together the P-16 Council. We've just reorganized it. Every one of these items is an issue that is on our agenda. We had an orientation meeting two weeks ago. We have a meeting next Friday to where we are going to pick our priorities. I'll personally bring these back—they are already on our list to try to narrow down. It's alignment with the high school and the college, but also the graduation requirements and specific math requirements.

In summary, there are already two bodies that are appointed by the Governor and statutorily mandated. A third twelve-member advisory task force, to me, is overkill. Now you have three people giving reviews and recommendations on the same thing. It is already in place. The P-16 Council could serve as this advisory committee. I'm on that, as a co-chair with the chancellor. To me, it is overkill and we've done that. I might add that we've also contracted with UNLV [University of Nevada, Las Vegas] to do alignment studies for us in English and math at the high school level. Those will be out this spring. We are also working towards releasing the first high school math test. It will be the first one out. We think that will come out in late spring this year, with English to follow. I think these have long been a concern and are being addressed. Another twelve-member task force, I'm not sure, will get us beyond where we are right now. Mine is a consideration that when you consider the bill, you delete this section.

Third option, on Section 7: distance education just started getting regulated in the state in 2001. All of these are good questions. We could write that report and, two years from now, could give you the same answer I could probably write up for you tomorrow as to how to fix it. One of the problems that you heard was from Dr. Merrill on providing some additional money. Right now, we have to rob from the DSA [Distributive School Account] to make up credits. I think the second issue we've had are small rural districts who don't have the staff to implement a distance education program and don't offer the same kinds of courses that could be available.

If you look at the list of distance education courses that the program set up in Clark County alone, many of the rural districts could benefit from their AP [Advanced Placement] courses. There are specific math courses and there are science courses, but what's limiting them right now is that—similar to what Washoe County has said—if a student in Lyon County wants to take a physics course through the Clark County distance education program, I have to take 1/6 of that student's DSA allocation from Lyon County and ship it over to Clark County at the end of the school year.

[Keith Rheault, continued.] There is precedent set in the state already for charter school students and home school students. If they are taking a curriculum that is not offered in their school or their home study, they can go to a public school, take the course, and at the end of the year, the school district submits that course for payment through the DSA. We've been doing that for four years. I would be glad to write a cleanup that would allow for small rural school districts that don't provide specific distance education courses or for students that need to make up credits, because they are credit deficient, to allow funding to be provided at the end of the year. That would solve the whole problem. It's not the problem of which courses are provided. Washoe County has a good distance education program set up, Elko County does, and two other districts. Nye County—it is a matter of being able to provide it to the students who need it. Rural districts can't get to the teachers or the courses and credit-deficient students.

More students did not get a diploma the last three or four years because they were credit deficient, not because they didn't pass the HSPE. That would be an answer to solve a lot of those problems. My suggestion: if you aren't going to act on this today, I would go back and I could tell you right in statute that the distance education—I've administered it the last four years and could write it up pretty quickly to clean it up—would have a fiscal impact on the DSA the way it would have to be written up, but I think that is the only way that you would expand and benefit the students.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I really appreciate that Keith, and administering that you know everything there is to know about that.

Keith Rheault:

I've answered most questions on that.

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins:

We are in agreement with this bill. It is very exciting. I really am passionate about assessment, so it is really neat to watch the presentation. The only concern that I have is the same one that I usually have—that is, there is no representation for charter schools. I watch as a member of the audience at many of the State Board meetings and go the P-16 Councils and observe. Charter schools are not represented on any of the committees related to education, although the Department itself is very good about talking to us. I'd suggest that, not only for this bill, but as you look at bills coming up, you consider including charter schools as members of task forces and committees, simply because charter schools have unique issues that districts do not fully appreciate. I'd appreciate that consideration.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I'll close the hearing on A.B. 335, and we'll take under consideration all of your suggestions. At this point in time, I'll open the hearing on A.B. 336.

Assembly Bill 336: Revises provisions regarding education to increase parental involvement. (BDR 34-475)

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB):

Assembly Bill 336 is another recommendation from the Legislative Committee on Education. I should note, however, that there is a bill with an asterisk that is the most recent version, and I am told by the Legal Division that the only difference is that the front page did not indicate the concurrent referral to Ways and Means. The bill that you have been using is accurate for its content. There should be another pink table ([Exhibit M](#)) with section summaries, so that you can see what went in this bill. This one has to do with parental involvement proposals. The Committee considered this in August without any way of knowing how many parental involvement bills would be proposed during this session.

I will very briefly run through the sections of this bill, and some of them may have been addressed by other bills already. Section 1 amends NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 385.34691, which was added as a part of Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session, which is our compliance legislation for NCLB [No Child Left Behind Act of 2001]. This requires the State Board of Education to prepare a statewide plan to improve pupil achievement. There is an extensive list of items that must be included in that plan, and this just adds strategies to improve and increase parental involvement.

Section 2 amends NRS 385.348, which was also part of Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session. This adds to the school district plans to improve pupil achievement—the same provision—and strategies to improve and increase parental involvement. Section 3 authorizes the RPDPs [Regional Professional Development Programs] to offer training to teachers and administrators and effective methods to communicate with parents.

Section 4 is a technical change, which simply applies the definitions of the RPDPs to Section 3 of this act. Section 5 relates to the presentation that you received this evening from the Grow Network. It would include parent information, brochures, and web-based instructional strategies. Once again, this was first appropriated in Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session, in 2003. The bill is actually a reduction in the anticipated expenditure. In 2003, the

appropriation was \$1.4 million annually, and I believe that this is \$1.2 million. It also includes the writing exams in grades 4, 8, and 11.

[Carol Stonefield, continued.] Sections 6 and 7 create an advisory council on parental involvement; there are ten members. This is a request from the Committee for some assistance in determining which proposals hold the most benefit to the school districts and to improving student achievement. The Committee, during the interim, whenever the issue of parent involvement came up—and especially at the work session— comments were made by the members that if there is an advisory council, representation would include people who are not typically appointed to such task forces and committees. People who have limited English language background, those who are economically disadvantaged, those who work irregular hours, parents from single-parent households, and people whose perspective or point of view in needing the services and needing the outreach from the schools would be considered in making these appointments.

There are two questions that occurred to Committee members during the work session. One of them was, “What kind of parent involvement proposals would make our public schools more accessible to people who have limited time, resources, and language?” The other one was, “What has an impact on student learning?” The Committee, in order to make sense of a lot of these different proposals that have been made over the last couple of years, is simply asking for some assistance and some recommendations from an advisory council to the Department of Education and, eventually, to the Legislative Committee on Education, should there be suggestions for changes to the *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

**Barbara Clark, Member-at-Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association (PTA),
Carson City, Nevada:**

I will indicate that Assemblywoman Smith and I did speak before the Committee during the interim. We feel that there are a lot of studies out there. There are already in existence a lot of strategies for implementing parent involvement. Not that I would oppose having a statewide task force, but being a longtime parent advocate working in this field for a decade or more, we would really like to see action strategies implemented, having the tools to do that rather than talking about it again for another two years. Certainly anything that will get us along the path, we are supportive of.

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

We support the bill, Sections 1 and 2, on the school improvement plans. I can tell you—the ones that were finished last December—the third-highest strategy

that was identified in the school improvement plans districtwide was parental involvement strategies. That's in there, but this would just reinforce that. Surprisingly, this advisory council in Section 6 and 7, I support that. There are no other groups looking at parental involvement.

[Keith Rheault, continued.] I don't mind doing work when nobody else is doing it, and I do support that. The only thing I would need to check out—I haven't done a fiscal note on this, but you're not concerned with—it does say on subsection 8 in Section 6 that the Department shall pay for the advisory council's cost. I'd have to go back and see if we have federal money or if it's going to be built into the bill. Other than that, I support it.

Martha Sutro, Client Services Manager, The Grow Network, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York, New York:

I would like to propose an amendment to Section 5. The price that we have in the bill is \$1.2 million per year for the renewal of the current project. Clark County School District has expressed an interest in now having their educators receive the printed reports, the log-ins, and the access to the educator resources that are online. In that case, the price would go back to the price that is current, which is \$1.4 million per year. That was the cost in the 2003-05 biennium.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I'm going to ask for an opinion from Research, but I think your amendment might be more appropriate to give to the Ways and Means Committee once we send it back over and do our co-referral back to Ways and Means. Would that be all right?

Martha Sutro:

That's great. Thank you very much.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Is that an appropriate call, Ms. Stonefield?

Carol Stonefield:

This is a policy committee—although I believe that any portion of the bill is open to you—but since it does go to Ways and Means, that would be an appropriate place for the amendment to be offered.

Martha Sutro:

That is also what I was informed from LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau], that the amendment should go with the bill to Ways and Means if approved by this Committee.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I will certainly be happy to accept the amendment, and when we do a work session, that will be part of it. With that, I will close the hearing on A.B. 336. That is it, except for our work session. Ms. Stonefield has prepared a chart with quite a number of proposed amendments. What I'd like to do is open up the work session to consider A.B. 162. We will be walking through the document ([Exhibit N](#)). I know you can see that there are a lot of decisions to make.

Assembly Bill 162: Revises provisions governing charter schools and educational personnel. (BDR 34-934)

Chairwoman Parnell:

It was fairly complex and ranged from the University System becoming a sponsor to changing an additional alternative teacher route to licensure. We will take each concept one at a time. That is how we presented it when we had the initial hearing on it. If everybody could get their bills in front of them and the proposed amendments, and I'm going to let Ms. Stonefield walk you through each section and the proposed amendments that have come to our attention.

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB):

The green sheet ([Exhibit N](#)) summarizes the proposed amendments for consideration. They are divided according to issues. The first issue is sponsorship by an institution of the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN). The sections of the bill that would contain this particular provision are identified for you. The three amendments that have been proposed are those from UCCSN, which would require that all of the references to the institutions—as you may recall, the bill itself refers to a university or college, and Dr. [Trudy] Larson informed the Committee that, should this provision stay in the bill, the proper reference should be to the Board of Regents.

The Agassi Academy also proposed that the regents are the final granting authority and clarified that the system is responsible for providing the technical assistance, which is required for any school that fails to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Finally, the NSEA has proposed that all references to the University System be deleted, and all of their amendments are provided behind the green sheet (of [Exhibit N](#)), should anyone want to read the specific language that they proposed.

I assume you want to take these by section?

Chairwoman Parnell:

Yes. What I will do is first ask the members if they have a question about any one of the three proposed amendments to the section in A.B. 162, which makes reference to sponsorship by UCCSN. Is that clear for everyone, or is there discussion?

Assemblyman McCleary:

Are we taking that section out?

Chairwoman Parnell:

If you look at the far column ([Exhibit N](#)), those are the three proposed amendments to the sections on sponsorship by the UCCSN. What I would like to do—to keep it very clean—is that we will look at those three, and then, as a Committee, make the decision to pass that section without any amendment, pass the Section with amendment 1, 2, or 3; or a combination thereof. Is that the preference of the Committee? If you would rather do this another way, do not hesitate; it is a work session.

Assemblyman Hardy:

If I understand this right, if we had worries about the Board of Regents, and/or the university, or part thereof being the sponsorship that we are talking about, if we deleted—according to the proposed amendments—then we would not have the potential worry of the interaction or the constitutional conflict between the Executive Branch and another branch. I guess what I'm saying is, how do I vote if I don't want conflicts with the *Constitution* and the Board of Regents, and I don't want the Board of Regents to be the sponsor of the charter schools?

Chairwoman Parnell:

Then you would probably move to amend and do pass, with the amendment being the deletion to all references to UCCSN and the Board of Regents. That would also remove the other two amendments, because they refer as well to the Board of Regents and the institutions and, by that amendment, they would all be deleted from the current language.

Assemblyman Hardy:

So I could say that I would prefer the Julie Whitacre version of the amendments?

Chairwoman Parnell:

That would be one way to propose it, or amend and do pass with the amendments proposed by NSEA and Julie Whitacre, if you would like to make the motion. Then, we could have the discussion on the Floor.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND THE SPONSORSHIP SECTION IN ASSEMBLY BILL 162 WITH THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY JULIE WHITACRE AND THE NSEA.

ASSEMBLYMAN MABEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Do we have discussion?

Assemblyman Horne:

I think that is good. I remember the testimony at first, and a number of us had some heartburn about the regents and UCCSN getting involved in charter schools. To alleviate that and go with NSEA, I'd vote for that.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Is there any additional discussion on the motion?

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

I will let Ms. Stonefield go over the transfer of sponsorship.

Carol Stonefield:

There were some amendments proposed regarding transfer of sponsorship. The Agassi Academy's amendment specified that the transfer of an existing charter from one sponsor to another is permissible, pursuant to regulations adopted by the State Board of Education. The NSEA suggests that a charter school sponsored by a school district—which has existed for at least three years—had its charter renewed and has made AYP [Adequate Yearly Progress], be granted upon its request an automatic transfer to the sponsorship of the State Board. The Chair raised the question at one point during the hearing whether this was a transitory section applying only to the Agassi Academy or to all charters, and the suggestion would be to amend the NRS to provide the transfer of sponsorship to all charter schools.

Assemblyman Hardy:

If I were prudent, I would say that I would go along with the concerns of the Chairwoman and amend the NRS to make transfer of sponsor available to all charters, and that would capture what we want to do with Agassi, as well as figure anything else out. Is that where the Chair was going with that?

Chairwoman Parnell:

Yes, exactly.

Assemblyman Hardy:

That is where I would make the motion, if you are ready.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Then would you tie that in with a part of the Agassi proposed amendment for the sponsor to another permissible pursuant to regulations adopted by the State Board of Education, or the NSEA, where you have the automatic transfer to sponsorship?

Assemblyman Hardy:

With the Agassi, but I'm flexible.

Assemblyman Munford:

That means that any charter school would go to the Board of Regents for sponsorship?

Chairwoman Parnell:

No, it means that at some point in time—depending on which of these two amendments is accepted—say after the first renewal, which is 3 years, if you wanted to transfer your sponsorship then...

Assemblyman Munford:

Give it to the Board of Regents then?

Chairwoman Parnell:

It could be, or it could be vice versa. It is just a transfer of right now—either the State Board of Education or the school district, not the Board of Regents. They are now the two sponsoring agencies. It would be within that shuffle.

Assemblyman Munford:

We haven't gotten to the Board of Regents then?

Chairwoman Parnell:

We just took them out of the bill.

Assemblyman Munford:

You sort of confused me. The last one was about the Board of Regents, and we voted against that?

Chairwoman Parnell:

Right.

Assemblyman Horne:

I'm interested in the difference in exactly the NSEA suggestion here on this transfer of sponsorship, where it talks about at least three years, had its charter renewed, make AYP, and that. How is that different? Could someone delineate those differences for me on the two?

Chairwoman Parnell:

Keith [Rheault], would you like to address that? I see the difference as being the regulations being adopted by the State Board of Education concerning any kind of transfer.

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

I don't see any problem with that language, as far as—have they made AYP—putting some conditions before a charter can switch sponsorship. Right now, as you mentioned, there is only the local board of trustees or the State Board of Education. There is not a lot of switching. The ones that we are sponsoring have already been denied by the local districts, so I'm not sure they will go back the other way. I would see the others coming to us.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Wouldn't it be quite possible, in the Agassi amendment, giving the State Board of Education the authority to adopt regulations concerning the transfer? Those regulations, in fact, could end up looking like the NSEA language.

Keith Rheault:

Correct. They could be identical.

Chairwoman Parnell:

That's true. The automatic transfer might not be.

Keith Rheault:

Either one would work. The Board would still want to develop regulations, even if it's outlined probably in the statute.

Chairwoman Parnell:

I have a question between the two. If you look at the Agassi [amendment] and the State Board is adopting regulations, I would think that the transfer could then be either from the State Board to a school district, or vice versa. The language proposed by NSEA is automatic transfer to sponsorship of the State

Board. It's not that the reverse from one governing body to another governing body. One is a one-way and one is a two-way.

Keith Rheault:

The Agassi wording gives more flexibility for the regulations to be developed by the State Board. NSEA is probably correct in that it is never going to go back the other way, because they have already been rejected by the district twice. That is how they got to the State Board in the first place. It probably is accurate, but the Agassi wording would then identify that as a responsibility of the Board to develop those regulations.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Are there any additional questions while we have Dr. Rheault at the table? Does anyone have a question regarding the three proposals? We just want to make sure whichever we adopt, that this is open to all charter schools and it is not specific.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO AMEND THE SECTION OF
ASSEMBLY BILL 162 REFERRING TO TRANSFER OF
SPONSORSHIP WITH THE AGASSI AMENDMENT.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

The next one is the number of charters sponsored, which I guess becomes irrelevant based on the action of sponsorship. That brings us down to district employees on leave of absence, and there is just one amendment. That, I know, was when we were all working on this clean-up language; there was a section that was very difficult for both the Teachers' Association and the charter school to know exactly what it meant. I would entertain a motion to accept the Agassi amendment, regarding district employees on leave of absence.

ASSEMBLYMAN ATKINSON MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AGASSI
AMENDMENT TO SECTION 20 OF ASSEMBLY BILL 162,
REGARDING DISTRICT EMPLOYEES ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

Carol Stonefield:

Section 25, as it appears in the bill, would authorize the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide for the issuance of licenses to teach to those individuals who hold a graduate degree from an accredited college, are not licensed to teach in another public school in another state, and have had at least five years of experience teaching at a school that is accredited by a national or regional accrediting agency. The Agassi amendment proposes that the Commission on Professional Standards would promulgate regulations for issuance of the license by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. It would add satisfactory evaluations to the teaching experience and add that a person applying for the license must show proof of student-teaching or mentoring, or participate in a mentoring program. The NSEA's proposal is to delete this section from the bill entirely.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Would it be possible—as we had everybody up here saying that alternative licensing was the Mabey amendment—to put that in and make this even better? Or would that help us? I'm asking that question of anybody who, obviously, knows more than I do.

Keith Rheault:

I think they've put in the amendment that it should go to the Commission on Professional Standards. If you look at the genesis of how the alternative route came, it was through the Legislature giving authority to the Commission to develop alternative route regulations. Something similar to that—if you refer back to Dr. Mabey's bill—you gave some parameters to establish a special qualifications license with a few parameters on experience, but the rest is up to the Commission. If they wanted to get to the intent, this one is a little bit different, in that I think the audience they are trying to get are private school teachers who do not qualify for a license, many times, in the state, because they've never student-taught. It's not on a transcript. That's usually what gets them when they try to get a license in Nevada. That is who I think this bill is aimed at. It's a little different than Dr. Mabey's, because we look at five years of experienced teaching, which is different than five years of experience. The Commission has always interpreted, when they say they want experience, it is work experience, other than teaching that subject. It is a little different audience.

I think it could be spelled out cleaner by just referring that the Commission promulgates the regulations for the two parameters at the top, that they have at least five years of teaching at an accredited national school somewhere. It would probably be enough, because I can tell you it will be the same requirements that they'll be looking for. If they have some teaching experience,

they might be a little more lenient on some of the regulation requirements; it just depends. They suggest mentoring, and they suggested other things to show. I would leave that up to the Commission to develop those.

Chairwoman Parnell:

This is where I need you to help me out. If we were to align A.B. 206 on licensure up next to the licensure part on A.B. 162, how do we make it so the particulars will end up in NAC [*Nevada Administrative Code*]*—as NSEA says that is where they belong—but then in NRS you have that same direction to make sure that is done, which is what the Agassi school wants to make sure that will appear? It seems like the two should probably have exactly the same language in who has the authority and then, eventually, where that specific language will end up. That is what we need to be able to understand.*

Keith Rheault:

If I had the authority, I would take this little requirement for the five years of experience, and if Dr. Mabey would agree, tack it under as a third “or.” Two years of college teaching; three years of experience; five years of experience, because they are both calling for graduate degrees; or five years of teaching in a private school. Those would all be special qualifications licenses, and you’d solve the problem; you could delete it out of this bill. The rest of it is identical; you’re right.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Either way?

Keith Rheault:

Either add all of Dr. Mabey’s language to this section so that they are identical when they get implemented, or just take the subsection 1(c) requirement that they have five years of teaching at a school that is accredited and plug that as the third “or” under the experience requirements to issue a specialist qualifications license. To me, you could add one line to that, accomplish this under Dr. Mabey’s bill, and keep them all the same under the special qualifications license.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Dana, would you like to come up and address that? I want to make sure you are comfortable since yours is the other proposed amendment.

Dana R. Bennett, Legislative Advocate, representing Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy (AACPA):

The question that I had as Dr. Rheault was talking about that, is that I understand Dr. Mabey’s bill provides for a special qualifications license, which is

a different category, and I think what we are talking about is a traditional teacher's license and a route to get to that.

Keith Rheault:

They'd be one and the same. When we issue a three-year provisional license, which is probably what they would get, it doesn't make any difference if we call it an alternative route, an elementary, or a special. They are legal and eligible to teach in the state of Nevada. It wouldn't make a bit of difference.

Dana Bennett:

I think that was the most important part to us.

Chairwoman Parnell:

So, where do we want to go with this? We've taken a lot of time working on this. I want everyone to feel really comfortable. I know part of the concern was where it's going to end up. I think that is going to happen in the right place, because the Commission is given the obligation to create this new language and the specifics will probably be in NAC. The direction will be given in NRS. Is everybody comfortable with that?

Dana Bennett:

Yes, Madam Chair.

Keith Rheault:

It makes the testing requirements consistent as well, if you match them.

Chairwoman Parnell:

As long as we are okay on who has the authority to create these new regulations and where that will end up. I think this early in the game, I think I might feel a little more comfortable leaving Dr. Mabey's like it is, leaving some language in A.B. 162 and then, by the time we get them through the Senate, if we are all a little more comfortable with merging, I think I'd rather see it go that way. I think it's a little too soon to assume that is all going to merge together successfully.

Keith Rheault:

That could easily be done. Just take Dr. Mabey's language and insert this with the requirements that are already in the bill for the five years of teaching experience. Then, at least, they are both consistent when they get merged together.

Dana Bennett:

We would, of course, prefer that our language go forward in A.B. 162, and understanding as the bills get processed towards the end, the Legislative Counsel makes sure that everything reads correctly and is consistent.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Okay, great. Julie [Whitacre], I'm not sure if you want to address this, but since yours deletes this section from the bill—asserts that alternative licensing belongs in NAC—and we are hearing that this is going to end up in NAC, does that take care of it? That is what I've been trying to get at for you. Could you just come to the table and give us a comfort level here with what we are talking about?

Julie Whitacre, Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA):

I believe we would feel most comfortable deleting the entire amendment. We are afraid that it sets a precedent that, in the future, other language will be in NRS regulating or forcing the Commission to do something when bodies already have the opportunity to go to them and petition, that something be added to NAC when it comes to alternative routes to licensure. The vehicle is already there. People are just choosing to use other ways or find other ways to have the Commission do things when they could go straight to the Commission and ask for these changes—just they are coming here to ask for the changes. The avenue is already there for them to address their concerns or to find their alternative routes to licensure. We feel it doesn't need to be done through the Legislature, through NRS. The Legislature has developed the Commission to address these issues, and we felt that the Commission should be used for the experts that they are.

Chairwoman Parnell:

When (I), "Proposes of the Commission on Professional Standards promulgate regulations for issuance of license," isn't that still giving the Commission on Professional Standards the final authority in doing these regulations, regarding either Dr. Mabey's bill or language in the Agassi bill?

Julie Whitacre:

No, it does. We understand that, and we are comfortable with that language. I guess that is a compromise. We feel that there is already an avenue for these issues to be addressed, and they don't need to be anywhere in NRS. If you wanted to develop a new alternative route to licensure, then you need to go the Commission on Professional Standards and address it at the body where it is appropriate to address it, not in NRS.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Thank you; we needed to hear all of that from you. Are there any questions? Again, we are on teacher licensure. I think we need to remember that this is an area where Dr. Mabey has a bill already that has passed out of Committee today, and I think there are a couple of other things coming down the pipe that might deal with teacher licensure. Do we want to not accept either amendment, do we want to accept the Agassi amendment that gives the regulations to the Commission on Professional Standards, or do we want to accept the NSEA amendment that would delete this section from the bill and then assume that those wanting this particular form of licensing would go straight to the Commission on Professional Standards to voice their concerns?

Assemblyman McCleary:

If I could just express my opinion on this, I would rather delete the section completely. I don't know how the other members of this Body feels, but that is where I'm falling on this, to let you know.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I look at the presentation that we had by the Agassi group, and they made a good, valid argument, I thought. I think one of the problems that we have with commissions is they work on what we call "legislative intent." In NRS we give the ultimate legislative intent, and that is where I would come down to the Agassi amendment and, in some way, melding the Mabey concept to that, however easy that may be. That is where I would be coming down from.

Assemblyman Horne:

I have to admit that I'm a little confused now—I wasn't here for A.B. 206, so I didn't get that. From what I'm gathering, this Committee has passed out a bill with certain language. Now, we are likely to reject having that same language here. It doesn't seem consistent to me. It seems that it sends a mixed message, particularly when you talk about later reviewing stuff and legislative intent.

Assemblyman Mabey:

I would echo the comments of Assemblyman Horne.

Assemblywoman Smith:

I agree with the previous two comments. I think, based on our action on A.B. 206, that we need to remain consistent.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AGASSI
AMENDMENT REGARDING TEACHER LICENSURE FOR
ASSEMBLY BILL 162.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairwoman Parnell:

Is there discussion?

Assemblyman McCleary:

I want to express my frustration with what happened with A.B. 206 earlier. We moved on that pretty quickly, and I thought I must have misunderstood something from the concept, because I thought it was the Chair's desire to move that. I saw no opposition, so I thought, well, I had better support this. It went against my gut, and it still does. My problem with it is that I don't like that we make the teachers go through all of these hoops and then we create a shortcut for somebody else, and that was my issue. I shouldn't have gone with the gang, and I apologize for my conduct on A.B. 206, because I really didn't understand it. I apologize, that is why—to answer Mr. Horne's question—I am backtracking now. I won't support this portion, but I will support the bill if it ends up with the Senate.

THE MOTION CARRIED, WITH ASSEMBLYMAN McCLEARY VOTING NO. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present for the vote.)

Carol Stonefield:

The last proposal from the Agassi Academy refers to Section 19, which gives preference to siblings of students already in the school and students who live in a particular geographic area surrounding the school. The amendment goes to the enactment dates in the final section of the bill. It would simply make Section 19 effective upon passage and approval.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT FOR SECTION 28, REGARDING PREFERENCE TO SIBLINGS AND AREA STUDENTS EFFECTIVE UPON PASSAGE, IN ASSEMBLY BILL 162.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

At this point in time, I would entertain a motion for an amend with the amendments that we have voted on separately this evening, an amend and do pass on A. B. 162.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 162.

ASSEMBLYMAN ATKINSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

We have one BDR, number 34-935.

- BDR 34-935—Revises provisions regarding occupational education.
(Assembly Bill 388)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR 34-935.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

Chairwoman Parnell:

The meeting is adjourned [at 7:01 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Paul Partida
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chairwoman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Education

Date: March 23, 2005

Time of Meeting: 3:49 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A	*****	Agenda
	B	Paula Berkley / Food Bank of Northern Nevada	Proposed amendment
	C	Barbara Clark / Nevada PTA	Research
	D	Dotty Merrill / WCSD	Prepared testimony from Steve Mulvenon
	E	Assemblyman Mabey	Proposed amendment and handouts
	F	Carol Stonefield / LCB	<u>A.B. 335</u> Section outline
	G	Mark Knudson / DOE	Charts
	H	Sara Jones / Nevada State Library	Information packet
	I	Rhonda Glyman / Nevada PIE	Nevada PIE information packet
	J	Martha Sutro and Tisha Pryor / The Grow Network	Green folder with information and PowerPoint presentation
	K	Martha Sutro and Tisha Pryor / The Grow Network	Blue folder with information and sample guides
	L	Terry Hickman / NSEA	Proposed amendment to <u>A.B. 335</u>
	M	Carol Stonefield / LCB	<u>A.B. 336</u> Section outline
	N	Chairwoman Parnell	Work session document