MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE

Seventy-Third Session
April 12, 2005

The Committee on Education Subcommittee was called to order at 5:40 p.m., on Tuesday, April 12, 2005. Chairman William Horne presided in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. William Horne, Chairman
Mr. Kelvin Atkinson
Mr. Brooks Holcomb

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman David Parks, Assembly District No. 41, Clark County
Assemblyman Joe Hardy, Assembly District No. 20, Clark County

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst
Rachel Pilliod, Committee Manager
Joe Bushek, Committee Attaché

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lucille Lusk, Legislative Advocate, representing Nevada Concerned Citizens
Lynn Chapman, Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum
Laura Mijanovich, Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada American Civil Liberties Union

Jan Gilbert, Legislative Advocate, representing the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Dr. Craig Kadlub, Director, Government Affairs, representing the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada
Michael Pennington, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Anne Loring, Legislative Advocate, representing Washoe County School District
Bobbie Gang, Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada Women's Lobby

Chairman Horne:
[Called the meeting to order and roll called.] Since both bills are very similar, we're not going to hold two different hearings. We're going to have one hearing. We'll have the sponsors present their bills since they didn't have a hearing in the Education Committee. We'll start with A.B. 202.

Assembly Bill 202: Revises provisions governing safe and respectful learning environment in public schools. (BDR 34-561)

Assemblyman David Parks, Assembly District No. 41, Clark County:
I'm here to speak in favor of A.B. 202. In 2001, the Legislature passed A.B. 459, which was a bill I requested. In that bill, two definitions were created, "harassment" and "intimidation." There was also the approval of a declaration of legislative intent and the prohibition on harassment and intimidation.

Assembly Bill 202 takes existing statute to the next step. In Section 2 of A.B. 202, the Department of Education is required to adopt a policy statement and a model program in consultation with the various school districts, its boards of trustees, educational personnel, and local school associations and organizations. The policy must include the development of a model program that would be used by the school districts to train administrators, principals, teachers, and other personnel. The Department must also review the policy and model program on an annual basis.

In Section 3, the board of each school district shall adopt a policy that complies with the State's policy, provide training to its employees, and submit a report annually.

In Section 4, the superintendent of public instruction is required to compile an annual report from all of the counties and submit the report on or before September 1 of each year, to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

In Section 5, a school official shall not directly or indirectly use his or her authority to intimidate, threaten, or coerce another official in an effort to interfere or prevent the disclosure of information.

[Assemblyman Parks, continued.] In Section 6, no cause of action may be brought against a person who does report a violation.

There are portions of the bill that I do not feel strongly about, but I think the question we want to ask at this point is, when we look at both of the bills, what are we trying to remedy? To answer that as easily as I can, what I've been told at various levels is that there is no consistency; some schools aggressively deal with the issue of harassment and intimidation and other schools tend to be very lax, and they try to keep as much of it swept under the carpet as possible, hoping that it doesn't escalate. To answer the question of what we are trying to remedy here: we want to put something in place that would necessitate compilation of data for reporting. We want the administrators, teachers, and support personnel in all schools, to be trained to know what harassment and intimidation are, and how best to handle it.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
Do we have a policy now, or other bills that deal with harassment? I have something here that says Policy 104, which is a document that was submitted. I'm not familiar with Policy 104.

Assemblyman Parks:
It would probably be best for the people from the various school districts to respond. I am aware that there are different policies and different circumstances at the school districts. At this point, I believe that they are all individual. My plan and hope was that we would develop on overall program. There are numerous programs that have been developed across the country. My thought was, that you simply borrow from those and then the Department of Education can create one policy—one very broad policy—that could easily be adopted by the individual school districts, rather than the individual school districts going out in seventeen different directions looking for their own policy. They might go to great extent and expense—more so than what the Department of Education might incur—to develop a policy.

I know that there have been situations, especially in the Washoe County School District, where lawsuits were brought against the school district. There was a consent decree where the Washoe County School District agreed to develop a policy and put a training program in place; however, to what extent they have

implemented that training, I do not know. I do know that since that consent decree, a subsequent major charge was brought against the school district.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
My wife has been a schoolteacher for 30 years. They had a character education program introduced into her elementary school. I'm wondering if different school districts have programs dealing with behavior policies.

Assemblyman Parks:
I believe that all school districts have policies of some sort. I don't know how extensive they are, and how well they are enforced, followed, and promoted.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
So, you want one overall, uniform policy that would apply to all the districts?

Assemblyman Parks:
It would be more efficient and effective to have one uniform policy.

Chairman Horne:
In thinking of a more uniform policy, there is the argument of home rule. Each school district has their environment and area. They might want some autonomy in their district on certain policies.

Assemblyman Parks:
That's right.

Chairman Horne:
Opponents would say that having one policy that is applied statewide, would take away that autonomy.

Assemblyman Parks:
That is correct, but I think there are numerous other reporting requirements that are uniformly applied to all school districts. I think it would be very difficult for us to review a report that would be compiled in seventeen different formats. I'm thinking of a uniform reporting process, as well as a uniform policy and model program. I'm not thinking of it as being a tightened down program, but that might come later. I'm thinking of something that is more general, that each individual school district can take and reshape to meet their primary needs. Obviously, when you compare Esmeralda County to Clark County, with the number of school children they have, they probably have vastly different needs.

Chairman Horne:
You mentioned in your testimony that there were provisions in the bill that you weren't necessarily married to. Did you want to disclose those now, or wait until later?

Assemblyman Parks:
I'm presuming that we will try to meld the two bills into one bill, and go forward with that. As we go through the various sections, maybe we can pick those out.

Chairman Horne:
Let's move to A.B. 132.

Assembly Bill 132: Revises provisions governing provision of safe and respectful learning environment in public schools. (BDR 34-68)

Assemblyman Joe Hardy, Assembly District No. 20, Clark County:
Assemblyman Parks and I are going to the same place, with a little different viewpoint. Basically, we both want to protect all children. Those children need to be protected from those who harass, bully, coerce, or require a change in their beliefs. They need to be able to allow disagreements without violence, and to exist in a safe and respectful environment free from intimidation.

We already have programs in place at some school districts. We can allow for the local supervision of those models already in place. To answer, in advance, Assemblyman Holcomb's question, in NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 388.132, we have statements already in statute that use the words "safe and respectful learning environment." It also uses the words, "All administrators, principals, teachers, and other personnel of the school districts and public schools in this state, demonstrate appropriate behavior on the premises of any public school by treating other persons, including, without limitations, pupils, with civility and respect, and by refusing to tolerate harassment or intimidation."

It might work better if we added to that section of the statute instead of rewriting the whole statute. Should the Attorney General's Office wish, A.B. 132 will allow a way for the Attorney General's Office to consider the issues of a safe learning environment.

I concur with the proposed amendments that you will hear from Dotty Merrill and Anne Loring with the Washoe County School District, and I am not offended by the good points that Craig Kadlub will make, as he has apprised me

in advance. I am very accepting of the amendments that I've seen from Lucille Lusk. She has used the present statute that we have in law and amplified that with a simple sentence, "Persons in a public school setting are entitled to maintain their own beliefs, and to respectfully disagree without resorting to violence, harassment, or intimidation."

[Assemblyman Hardy, continued.] I want to protect children from other children's bullying, as well as from the intimidation that can exist from a person in a position of power. That's a little different wording than Assemblyman Parks has. If we look at our bills, the report that I'm looking at is for significant events. It's portrayed well in the language that Dotty Merrill and Anne Loring have given that will allow a school district to report significant events, instead of every little thing.

I would like to point out that next week, April 17 through April 23, is Bullying Awareness Week.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
I had a chance to read A.B. 202 by Assemblyman Parks. Does your bill contain a model program provision?

Assemblyman Hardy:
Assembly Bill 132 does not include a model program, recognizing that model programs already exist in the school districts. As Assemblyman Parks alluded to earlier, two years ago, when we went through this very issue, there was a fiscal note attached to this. We got rid of the fiscal note by allowing a CD [compact disc] to be copied and distributed to all of the school districts, either from Washoe County or Clark County School Districts, who were willing to share what they were already doing.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
Are you more in favor of local autonomy, as far as model programs within the respective school districts?

Assemblyman Hardy:
Yes. I am in favor of the local people who are already doing local programs that appear to be working. I had a conversation today with the principal of Reed High School about what they were doing. The Washoe County School District has been very proactive with this particular issue. They have been helpful with appropriate funding and helping teachers get trained. There are programs that are in existence now.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
Do you see any downside to a statewide model program, versus individual autonomous programs in the school districts?

Assemblyman Hardy:
There aren't many downsides, but you are now doing something different than what is already being done, and we are doing things right now. The local jurisdiction is more responsive to the people that elect them, for instance, the school boards. I feel confident and comfortable with the people who are doing that in their jurisdictions.

Chairman Horne:
Mr. Hardy, I'd like to address the question of whether we have one single policy or individual policies in the districts. From your position, what about the districts that don't have a good policy? Wouldn't it be the case that if we said all of you find a policy that works, we wouldn't necessarily get compliance when we wanted to, or as fast as we wanted to? Some would say that they are already there, and others may be dragging their feet, versus one plan that everybody needs to implement.

Assemblyman Hardy:
It depends on what you want to get in your report. If in the report you want to know if they adhere to a program, then there are programs already in existence that can be shared. If your intent, and this is where I'm coming from, is to get at the problem of bullying and what we can do about it, then you don't need to have a uniform plan, as much as a uniform result. The uniform result would be less bullying. You don't really need to have the same plan to do that. You just need the same result. I don't think you need the same program to decrease violence, bullying, irritation, and harassment, and at the same time, allow the children to maintain their own belief system.

Chairman Horne:
If the intent of these bills is to prevent bullying, harassment, and intimidation in schools, one of the things that concerns me, and through emails that I have received from different sources, is that both bills contain similar language, "entitled to maintain his own beliefs and to respectfully disagree…" That, to me, if we're speaking strictly of bullying, doesn't seem to address bullying. I'm not saying that isn't good language. In A.B. 202 there is similar language, "…to provide a safe and respectful learning environment that is free of harassment and intimidation." The point I am trying to make is, perhaps some of this language might be better in a preamble to a melded bill.

[Chairman Horne, continued.] Due to some of the emails I'm receiving—and I read both bills—and I don't see where they are going. Some of the emails say, "I teach morals in my house and I tell my kids what to believe." Even the programs that you would develop will be teaching you what to believe and what not to believe. It seems like we want it to say that when you're on our campus, you're going to treat everyone with respect, and you're not going to intimidate. I don't care what you believe. If I'm a teacher or an administrator, I could care less why you are bullying or intimidating someone. I do not want it happening on my campus to my students, or to my staff. We need to get away from the language about maintaining their beliefs. That presupposes that we are trying to put in a different belief. Perhaps it could be put into a preamble to let people know the intent.

Assemblyman Hardy:
I am with you on that. If you look at NRS 388.132, that's exactly where that language is, in the preamble. The Section starts, "Legislative declaration concerning safe and respectful learning environment. The Legislature declares that…" And then it goes through the preamble that you are talking about. I would suggest that we insert Section 3(c) that states, "Persons in the public school setting are entitled to maintain their own beliefs and to respectfully disagree without resorting to violence, harassment, or intimidation." That allows them to learn the behaviors that allow conflict resolution, without worrying about intimidation or harassment. That is reality, we have disagreements, but we need to learn how to work through them. I concur with what you are saying.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
I liked your comment that the trustees be answerable to the parents, because it is within the community, and they are more responsive. Chairman Horne mentioned his concern about different school districts having different policies, but in your bill you mentioned the reporting of incidences to the Department of Education. What about, to answer his concern, having the various school districts report what their program is? Since they are reporting incidences, they could also report about their program.

Assemblyman Hardy:
The reporting can be done in many ways. There isn't a wrong or right way to report. It is more about what you want to get out of it. I would focus on what we can do to prevent, heal, and help, instead of what box we checked or what program we have.

Assemblyman Parks:
While I brought this bill forward, I have to admit that I am not an education specialist. I would defer to those individuals who are working in this area on a daily basis.

Lucille Lusk, Legislative Advocate, representing Nevada Concerned Citizens:
The question was asked: what we are trying to remedy? I would like to give you two incidences that express, from my point of view, what we're trying to remedy with A.B. 132. We are in support of A.B. 132, although you will see that we're suggesting an amendment (Exhibit B). The two incidences that I'm going to mention touch on sensitive topics. I'll try to do that with a light touch.

A young girl in a Biology class was taught the theory of evolution as if it were fact. She didn't have a problem with that. She learned everything that she was taught and everything that was in the book. When it came time for the semester test, the questions were asked in a form that she felt required her to commit to those, and she didn't feel she could. She answered every question accurately, saying, "The book says, or the teacher taught…" Every question was answered correctly. The teacher chose to give her an F on that semester test, because he felt that she did not have the right to qualify it in that way. He felt that he had taught it as fact, and she should accept it as fact.

As many of you know, the semester test is often a great portion of the grade. This girl's grades were A prior to the semester test. She had the choice of accepting that or going to administration. She chose to go to administration and show them the test and the answers. In this case, the administration chose to intervene, and to require the teacher to give her the grade that she had earned. He did not. He gave her a B for the semester. That didn't end the situation. The teacher was angry, and for the rest of the year harassed that young woman.

The second incident took place in a United States history class where the teacher taught, and I think sincerely, things about a particular religion that were not correct. The high school student involved in this case raised her hand and respectfully disagreed. The teacher in this instance was very kind, so a conflict didn't really exist. He let her express her opinion and treated her courteously the rest of the year.

It is these kinds of incidences that create a need for recognition of the fact that a pupil has the right to respectfully disagree. I will turn to the bill itself and the amendment that I brought (Exhibit B). We noticed that the way A.B. 132 was written, almost creates a legal obligation with regard to maintaining one's own beliefs. Many of these things are very subjective. It is difficult to put a school district in the position of a precise legal obligation.

[Lucille Lusk, continued.] We are suggesting, and I think it is very similar to what you were suggesting, Mr. Horne, that it be removed from here and placed in NRS 388.132, which Mr. Hardy explained is actually a statement of legislative intent. Section 1, subsection 3 states (Exhibit B), "The intended goal of the Legislature is to ensure that..." It is more of a preamble to that section of the law. We are suggesting that be placed there without the "ensure that" language, and instead, be a part of the legislatively stated goals, saying, "Persons in the public school setting are entitled to maintain their own beliefs and to respectfully disagree without resorting to violence, harassment, or intimidation."

I will move to A.B. 202. We have tremendous concerns with the model programs of education that are referred to in this section. It is easy to miss in this bill that Section 9 includes prescribed punishments and procedures to be followed in imposing punishments related to that model program of education. That language is not in bold, it is transitory language, but it is new language attached specifically to this bill.

Chairman Horne:
Where exactly is that, Ms. Lusk?

Lucille Lusk:
It is in Section 9 of A.B. 202, on page 5. I would like to give you a couple of brief incidents that caused us concern. Where these programs are actually used, we find the programs themselves to sometimes be harassing or bullying.

A teacher had situations listed on separate pieces of paper, and the children were required to take a slip of paper and answer those questions. One child picked a paper that said, "What would you do if your parents divorced?" She pleaded with the teacher not to have to respond to that. Her parents had recently been divorced, and it was horrible for her to have to stand in front of the class and respond. The teacher refused and said, "It is the one you took, it's the one you have to respond to." Several of the other children received papers saying they had to sing in front of the class. One girl, who was not confident in her singing, did her best. On her way back to her seat, many of the boys in the class flung snide remarks at her about how poorly she had done. That was personally hurtful.

When you use role play to present the parts of bully and bullied, theoretically, the purpose is to teach people how to respond. In carrying out that role play, they paired a girl with a boy who had been harassing her and calling her stupid, and had written things all over her books, materials, and locker. He also has

thrown things at her. In the classroom, it gave him permission to say all of the things to her that he said in his bullying behavior outside the classroom. She was devastated. It was to her as though the authority had been given to him to justify his behavior.

[Lucille Lusk, continued.] You will see an amendment that we have offered (Exhibit C) with regard to A.B. 202. We are suggesting a direct melding of the bills. The same thing that we suggested for A.B. 132, we are suggesting be inserted into A.B. 202. We are leaving in both bills, the data gathering and reporting. When Assemblyman Parks spoke, he referred to the model policy as a model policy for reporting. We don't see that in his bill. What we see in his bill, is a model policy for a program of education. With regard to the data gathering—clearly data gathering, in order to be able to compile it, has to be collected from all of the school districts through a central source. Both of the bills have those reports going through the Department of Education. Mr. Hardy's bill has it going to the Attorney General. Mr. Parks' bill has it going to the Legislative Counsel Bureau, for transmission to the Legislature. We have no particular preference as to which place they go. The Attorney General may want it, the Legislature may want it, and the parents may want it. We see that data, once collected, as being made available generally, as with other reporting.

In A.B. 202, we are suggesting the deletion of all of the language that deals with the model program of education, and leaving in only the data gathering portions. We are suggesting that Sections 7 through 10 be deleted, because they relate directly to the model program of education. And obvious things, such as correcting the effective date and things like that.

Chairman Horne:
I have a question about the model program of education. In A.B. 202 it calls for participation with parents, parents' organizations, and teachers in developing this program, as well as an annual review. Wouldn't that solve some of your problems, having this type of oversight? The scenarios that you described in your testimony, of an education plan to make sure that certain things aren't placed into it that aren't supposed to be and make sure we educate teachers on role playing situations, et cetera.

Lucille Lusk:
It has been our experience that the Department of Education is too far removed. When you say involve parents and such, you are talking about a very small number who can attend Board of Education meetings. I respect the Department of Education, and I don't want this to be misinterpreted, but the vast majority of people don't even know that the Department of Education exists. They work

with their local school district and their local school board, not with the Department of Education.

Chairman Horne:
If we did a true meld like Assemblyman Hardy suggested at the local level, but had the model program of education that called for educational personnel, local associations, and organizations of parents whose children are enrolled in the school districts to participate at those local levels, wouldn't we accomplish both of those?

Lucille Lusk:
Then you wouldn't have the model program that he is referring to, because each individual district would have a program.

Chairman Horne:
That's the point of doing this exercise.

Lucille Lusk:
I understand. We have no objection to teachers and other personnel being trained to properly handle these things. We want parents involved at the local level. We do not want it to be a model program of education, which implies a curriculum for children with penalties and punishments for children. That's what we object to. The districts work with their curriculum all the time. We prefer to leave that in their hands. We prefer to leave behavioral policies in their hands as well. If what you are talking about is a locally directed establishment of a policy and training for their personnel, and working with the community in developing that; we have never had a problem with that. The moment you spread it to a model policy of education, and it includes punishments and discipline for children, that's where we have a problem.

Chairman Horne:
Our interpretations of Section 2, subsection 2(b) are different.

Lucille Lusk:
I understand what you're saying about the difference of opinion, but if you look at page 5, where it talks about prescribed punishments, that helps explain why that's a concern.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
I think you answered the questions I was going to ask you. You deleted the model program, and if I understand you correctly, you said that the State as a whole should not be dictating to the various communities the model behavior program. It is handled better at the local level, where the trustees are more

receptive to the concerns of parents in that particular school district. Is that correct? That's why you're opposed to this?

Lucille Lusk:
That's correct.

Lynn Chapman, Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum:
Ms. [Lucille] Lusk has touched on just about everything that we wanted to say. The only other thing I would like to bring out is in A.B. 132, in Section 2, subsection 1, "...ensure that a person is entitled to maintain his own beliefs and to respectfully disagree without resorting to violence or harassment..." In the Nevada *Constitution*, under the ordinances it says, "...a perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured and no inhabitant of this said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship." We just wanted to put that on the record. I like seeing something like the safe and respectful environment for our children, I think it's important.

Laura Mijanovich, Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU):
I am anxious to see something come from the Legislature, because it is really needed. As coordinator for the Nevada ACLU, I would say that in the last two years, I have been a witness to a myriad of claims coming to the ACLU for situations where there has been harassment, particularly victims and minorities. Whether we want to deal with it or not, I will give you testimony that there are more cases that we should be dealing with. That's why I think there should be a policy sanctioned by the Legislature, to deal with this issue.

As far as the two bills, we express no opinion for A.B. 132. We express great support for A.B. 202, particularly for reasons that are opposite to Ms. [Lucille] Lusk's point of view. I think it's an error to leave behavior policies to the school districts.

I would like to give you a brief summary of the cases that I have dealt with, so that you can make your own conclusions about whether we need or don't need a comprehensive approach to training and education component in this bill, and whether we need uniform reporting and guidance from the State.

I will start with a case that happened in 2002. Derek Henkle, a homosexual student, after suffering harassment at the Washoe County School District, entered into a settlement following a lawsuit, that involved a large amount of money and a promise by the Washoe County School District to develop specific policies to prevent harassment of students. That hasn't happened. I have

spoken with the plaintiff in this case, and these policies have not been put into place. There have been efforts by different school districts to come up with something, but nothing comprehensive that makes enough sense to stop the behavior.

[Laura Mijanovich, continued.] At Galena High School, there was a group of Latino parents that organized, because they could not take it any longer. There were situations of harassment, equal access to educational opportunities, equal treatment, and selective enforcement of the disciplinary rules, which happen over and over again in different districts. They end up organizing and demanding from the school district that there be changes. The school district is working on it and giving it a good faith approach, but I think we still need the sanctioning of the Legislature, stating what the rules should be.

In Carson City, there was a roundup. There were 13 to 15 students minding their own business in a class on how to get jobs after school, and they got rounded up for no reason. This has been documented to the point that a member of the school board in Carson City had to apologize to the Native-American students. They were singled out because of their ethnicity. Their records were sent to the gang units. They had to be returned with apologies, but the harassment happened. It didn't happen from other students, it was from the members of the school. Why does that happen? Is there accountability and measures to curtail that kind of behavior? I don't believe so.

At Hug High School, the most recent situation, several African-American students were being harassed by school police. Measures are being taken by the district, but hardly any of them are really meaningful. That is my opinion after speaking with the attorney that is fighting the five lawsuits. We are considering how the ACLU will be involved in that.

I want to stress that the reporting process is very necessary, because you need accountability. You need a system through which someone who feels they are being harassed—it could be a white kid, an African-American kid, or any other kid—has a method to report it, without being afraid of doing so.

The training component is fundamental. The Carson City School District had a pilot program that worked very well with Carson Middle School. They had to stop every class and every activity. It was reported by Mary Pierczynski, the superintendent, that it was a great success.

A comprehensive approach to breaking these patterns of bias and stereotype is very effective and something should be implemented; I can provide some models later. There are cultural competency programs that deal in a very

professional way with students and staff to break stereotypes and deal with others in an atmosphere that has no harassment.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
In A.B. 132 it states, "On or before July 1 of each year, the board of trustees of the school district shall submit a report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction that includes a description of each violation of NRS 388.135, if any, occurring in the immediately preceding school year." What about requesting that the various school districts provide a report on the incidents, as well as the program that they are using within their respective community, rather than a statewide policy?

Laura Mijanovich:
I believe that reporting would be acceptable, but I think it would be most beneficial and most effective to have a clear policy coming from the Legislature as to what a student can rely on when a situation like that arises. I am a little concerned about leaving it up to the school districts. School districts have a myriad of issues that they are dealing with. I am not attacking the validity of their efforts and their intentions, but I believe that it is up to the Legislature, because this is an issue of civil rights. Kids' rights are being violated. This is important public policy and it should be left up to the Legislature in light of the case of Derek Henkle, where the school district has failed to give consideration to such an important incident. Nothing has been done, and we are talking about 2002 and 2003.

Jan Gilbert, Legislative Advocate, representing the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:
We support A.B. 202. The Department of Education has a responsibility to create standards. Each school implements those standards and can use different programs to achieve those standards. This is very acceptable. It is what we do in education. There are standards that we are creating at the State level and then the local level implements those programs to achieve the standards. That is what we would do with this program.

The only piece of A.B. 132 that I do not feel is defensible, and I had a long talk with Ms. [Lucille] Lusk about respectfully disagreeing, and I do not think that term can be defined. It's not a legal term. I taught school and I tried to think of all the incidences where children respectfully disagreed, but had hurtful and bullying tendencies even though they were being respectful. It would be very hard to define what is "respectfully disagreeing." I think NRS 388.132 as it exists, is quite explicit. It talks about harassment and intimidation. I don't think we need to expand it any more by adding "respectfully disagreeing."

[Jan Gilbert, continued.] There are so many things that go on in a classroom that can be hurtful to children. There can be a discussion going on where everyone is discussing their opinions and no one feels attacked, but you go out to the playground and one child is respectfully disagreeing with another child one-on-one, and it can damage them. They can say, "You are stupid," or whatever the attack is, whether it's about their intelligence or their look, and it can be very hurtful even though it's very respectful. I don't think that should be added to the language. I know that you will come up with a compromise between these two bills. We need to expand what we did in 2001, which is where this came from. I would like to see a model program. For a teacher, it is not easy dealing with these kinds of problems, so it is helpful to have training. It is very sensitive, and you have to be very sensitive. Not just teachers, but the aides, librarian, and the secretary. The secretary deals with the children more than anyone on a day-to-day basis. All school personnel must be involved in the training. I would rather it be on a state level.

Chairman Horne:
Either of the bills will not be able to shield all children from all the bad things that can happen to them when they leave their homes.

Dr. Craig Kadlub, Director, Government Affairs, representing the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada:
To briefly answer a couple of previously asked questions, I have a copy of the district's harassment policy, if anyone wants to look at it. We also have one that pertains to staff.

We agree with the intent. Anything that we can do to make school a safer, more peaceful, more wholesome environment, is a good thing. Just the same, we have some concerns. Some have been articulated by just about everybody who has come to the table. It was asked earlier if we teach anything. The answer is, yes, we do. Unlike some of the examples that have been given, we don't try to create a laundry list of concerns such as ethnic concerns or weight concerns. We prefer to have a program in our district wherein we model the behaviors we want, rather than create a laundry list of things to put before kids that we don't want. If there is an opportunity to capitalize on a moment and say, no, this is how you should conduct yourself in this situation. We would rather do that than come up with things that we don't want kids to be doing.

Dr. [Dotty] Merrill and I worked together on the amendments that have been proposed (Exhibit D and Exhibit E). For certain sections, the amendments are applicable to both A.B. 132 and A.B. 202. Some of these may be moot, as the sponsors have indicated that they are not especially married to certain portions of the bill, but I will let you know what our concerns were to begin with.

[Craig Kadlub, continued.] If you're looking at the A.B. 132 proposed amendment (Exhibit D), it says, "On or before July 1…" I would point out that if there is a reporting requirement after all is said and done, we still have year-round schools in progress and principals are consumed with the AYP [adequate yearly progress] designation. So, if there is a reporting date in the end, perhaps September 1 would be more workable. We also suggest that, because as has been alluded to, there are some statutory definitions of harassment and intimidation. If you have had a chance to look at those, they are extremely broad. That could be anything from name calling on a playground to common teasing. We feel that at the very least, we need to restrict what goes into the report. Our suggestion was that the results be limited to any offense that rises to the level of requiring some administrative action, such as an expulsion or a suspension for harassment. That way, we don't have to report so many of the things that kids say to each other on practically an hourly basis.

In Section 1, subsection 2, we would add the words "strive to" ensure. It says, "All school districts and public schools must ensure…" We would say, "…must strive to ensure…" because no one can ensure what anyone else is going to do under any given circumstance. That is really out of our control, but we agree we should strive to create a respectful learning environment.

In Section 3, there is some language stricken. We made that suggestion because we feel that a school official should not prevent disclosure by an employee or student concerning information of a violation, but we felt that under subsection 3, where it defines "official authority or influence," that basically covers just about everything that a school official can do in a personnel sense. We felt that might be license for some people to contest every personnel decision, on the basis of some harassment or intimidation. Not that we couldn't perhaps prevail in the end, but it does invite unnecessary arbitration.

Chairman Horne:
You are talking about Section 3, subsection 1 (Exhibit D), where it states, "A school official shall not directly or indirectly," and then you struck all that language until "…interfere with or prevent disclosure by an employee or a student…"

Craig Kadlub:
Correct. By adding "student" to that section, it negates the need for identical language in subsection 2.

Chairman Horne:
What is your reasoning behind striking the language "...use or attempt to use his official authority or influence to intimidate, threaten, coerce, command, influence, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, coerce, command or influence...?

Craig Kadlub:
Our problem with the language "use official authority or influence," is that it is such vague language. In the attempt to define the vague language under subsection 3, our feeling is that it opens you up to any sort of personnel action if you can't use your influence in approving a personnel action, appointment, promotion, transfer, assignment, or a reassignment, and everything becomes contestable as intimidation or harassment. That is the basis for our objection to that language.

Chairman Horne:
Official authority to me is not vague at all. You are at school from 7:00 a.m. until you leave school at 5:00 p.m. During that time, you are in your official capacity, whether you are the teacher, vice principal, principal, dean, or the janitor. If you take action in the course and scope of your job, it is official authority, and I don't think that is vague at all. If I see Principal Kadlub in the grocery store on a Saturday afternoon, then I think that's different.

Craig Kadlub:
That goes to what I am talking to, because while you and I may have that common sense definition, in Section 3, subsection 2, it goes on to say that a school official shall not use that authority to threaten, coerce, command, or influence, and then below where it defines "official authority or influence," which then gets into all sorts of personnel actions. I may never convince you of that, but I just have to explain the District's position on that. We feel it creates an unnecessary vulnerability, and does not add to improving the teaching and learning environment for students.

There are some nearly identical passages in A.B. 202. The one difference that has come to the forefront of the discussion is the fact that A.B. 132 does not require the creation of a program, whereas A.B. 202 does.

With respect to the creation of a policy and a program, Section 2, subsection 1 of A.B. 202 says that the Department shall, in consultation with the boards of trustees, prescribe by regulation a policy to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. To a great degree, the local autonomy concern is addressed there, because, obviously, if the Department does it in consultation with the boards, then that is where the boards give their input. We don't strenuously object to that. The following subsection 2, states "the policy must

include requirements and methods for reporting." I think I have addressed that by saying that we would like to define the violations as those that rise to the level of some administrative action. We have the same concerns that have been voiced by others about the model program of education, with respect to it being a program of education. It has been stated that, yes, there is a body that creates standards that go into the curriculum, but that also means that then suddenly there has to be a class that has to be plugged into the curriculum, and it is going to take time. We are concerned about that becoming a program of education, which is what it says. Beyond that, obviously, if you are going to implement a model program of education, that requires training of all staff members. We see that as an expense to the district for which no funds are provided in this legislation.

Chairman Horne:
Is that in your recommendations on A.B. 202?

Craig Kadlub:
If not delete the language about the model program of education, then we would have to at a minimum say, perhaps under Section 3, subsection 2, "To the extent that funding is provided," we would provide the appropriate training, but we see it as an unfunded mandate, as it exists.

Assemblyman Holcomb:
I am a little confused. This is an amendment by Dotty Merrill and Anne Loring, but you represent Clark County.

Craig Kadlub:
As I stated, Dr. [Dotty] Merrill and I worked on these amendments (Exhibit D and Exhibit E) together.

Michael Pennington, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am at this hearing today to ensure that we look at the big picture and observe the fact that there is a lot of intimidation and harassment in our public schools, and on the streets as I walk home. When I was in first and second grade, I was the child that both these bills were created to help protect.

What brings me to the table from a professional advocacy standpoint, is the fact that prior to joining the Reno Sparks Chamber—and by disclosure, they have allowed me to come to the table and testify as a personal individual on this issue—is I served for the Attorney General under Frankie Sue Del Papa. In that capacity, we had the Bully-Free for Me Task Force. The task force has continued, I believe, under current Attorney General Brian Sandoval. I don't believe he has dissolved that Task Force.

[Michael Pennington, continued.] People became aware of us and the many issues impacting education and children. One of the drivers relative to the creation of that task force was the Columbine incident, where there were many individuals, attorneys, or investigators—the Attorney General herself felt the need to work with the superintendent to bring a partnership between law enforcement and the education community. A result of that, which I believe has been passively referenced in testimony today, is this model program. I don't believe that the model program was meant to be some specific outlying area relative to what you specifically teach.

Through the task force, and consultation with Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, law enforcement officials, parent organizations, individual citizens of concern, and specialists in this area that worked with the Department of Education, there was a program, which is on the Bully-Free for Me website that was put together. That was done during a period of open meetings and facilities. Assemblyman Hardy referenced that there was a fiscal note on that. We had agreed to provide those electronically so the school districts, teachers, education professionals, parents and the students could do that.

I share the testimony that Ms. [Jan] Gilbert brought forth during her presentation. The issues she brought up are critical. I want to address this concept of being able to respectfully disagree. Ms. Lusk and I, while we were waiting for the hearing, had a very honest conversation on our points of view relative to this. I understand her concern. My concern, from a personal perspective, is that the older you become the more you have the ability to respectfully disagree. In the studies through that task force, we were finding out that the initiation of the bullying activities was happening at the second, third, and fourth grade levels. Think about how old your kids are in those grades. When someone comes up and says something to them at that point, are they going to be able to understand what to "respectfully disagree" means?

Anne Loring, Legislative Advocate, representing Washoe County School District: I am speaking on behalf of Dotty Merrill. Mr. [Craig] Kadlub did an excellent job with the amendments that he and Dr. [Dotty] Merrill worked on together. I would like to make a couple of comments about those amendments.

If you look at one of the amendments for A.B. 132 (Exhibit D), I want to point out our concern in Section 2, subsection 2, that the limitation of the reporting that is suggested by Craig Kadlub and Dotty Merrill also applies to personnel actions. So, we are talking about both adult behavior and student behavior here. I wanted to be sure that you were aware of that.

[Anne Loring, continued.] At the bottom of that page of (Exhibit D), there is the amendment to Section 3, and the questions about why the language is being condensed. I think it goes to the issue of what we are trying to accomplish in Section 3, subsections 1 and 2, and that is, we do not want officials to directly or indirectly interfere with preventing disclosure of these incidents. The reason for deleting some of that language, specifically under subsection 3(a), is that it is getting into broader definitions that could be used by someone who might want to try to apply this language to a personnel action that districts are designed to take.

Chairman Horne:
Give me one example of how that could be abused.

Anne Loring:
If you look at the description under Section 3, subsection 3(a) defining "official authority." Taking or directing others to take personnel actions by an appointment, promotion, transfer, or assignment, that is the kind of activity that goes on every day when a principal, for instance, is doing an evaluation of a teacher.

Chairman Horne:
You think that could be used to say they violated this bully bill?

Anne Loring:
I think the concern was going in this direction, instead of simply limiting it to what I think the intention here is, which is to say that no school official will directly or indirectly interfere with anyone disclosing an incident. That is what we are really trying to get at. This other language muddies the water instead of enhancing what you are trying to do here, which is what we are all trying to do, and that is to ensure that no one interferes with the disclosure of this information.

The Washoe County School District, as was alluded to by a previous speaker, was involved in court action over a very unfortunate incident. Policies were enacted as a result of that incident. Policies were strengthened regarding harassment and intimidation, including both staff and students. Training was conducted throughout the district and we do, as Mr. Hardy alluded to, have programs in our schools right now. This is a very important issue, and we appreciate the opportunity to provide amendments and to testify on this bill.

Bobbie Gang, Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada Women's Lobby:
I would like to refer back to 2001 and what went into creating NRS 388.121 through 388.139. It was around the time of Columbine, and here we are, only

three weeks after the Red Lake High School incident. Both of those have been said to have been caused by children who were harassed and bullied in those schools I think it is just as important now that we work on this issue as it was back then.

[Bobbie Gang, continued.] At the time, I worked across the table from Lucille Lusk with Senator Wiener and Senator Rawson. We worked on the language that is in NRS 388.132. We struggled a lot with the wording and came up with what my group thinks is very satisfactory language. We realize that it is now time to add to the language here, to require training and reporting, which are encompassed in these two bills.

I have one comment with regard to each of the bills. Based on things that I have heard today, with regard to A.B. 132, we feel the language in the amendment that Ms. [Lucille] Lusk proposed is unnecessary, because it is inherent in subsection 4 of Section 1, which follows her amendment. The end of subsection 4 says, "...the Legislature is not advocating or requiring the acceptance of differing beliefs in a manner that would inhibit the freedom of expression, but is requiring that pupils with differing beliefs be free from abuse and harassment." In my mind, that says it all, so the proposed amendment of subsection 3(c) is not necessary.

Chairman Horne:
Was that in A.B. 132?

Bobbie Gang:
It is in NRS 388.132. If you look at Ms. Lusk's amendment (Exhibit B), it states the original language in the bill. We feel that what is in subsection 4 of Section 1 is comprehensive, and that the amendment that is being suggested is redundant and unnecessary.

With regard to A.B. 202, there seems to be some confusion on page 2, Section 2, subsection 2(b), "A model program of education for use by school districts to train administrators, principals, teachers, and all other personnel..." There was a disagreement, misunderstanding, or misconception between the Chair and Ms. Lusk about whether this applied to students, as far as a model program of education. I believe Ms. Lusk was concerned that this applied to students, whereas the Chair thought this just applied to the personnel. If you go to pages 4 and 5 of the bill, at the bottom of page 4 it says, "The written rules of behavior must be consistent with the policy adopted by the Department pursuant to Section 2 of this act..." I think what you want is "pursuant to subsection 2.1 of Section 2," because it would clarify what the rules would refer to, and that the rules do not refer to a model program of education for

personnel. In other words, rules for students should not refer to a model program of education for teachers and administrators, but should refer to Section 2.1 on page 2, which talks about prohibiting harassment and intimidation in the schools. I want you to look at that, and I hope I've been clear. Other than that, we support the bills and their concepts.

Chairman Horne:
I am going to ask that Assemblyman Hardy and Assemblyman Parks come back to the table. Have you seen the proposed amendments that have been suggested, and do you see any wiggle room where we can get together and meld these two bills, before the three of us do it?

Assemblyman Parks:
As I indicated earlier, I am not an educational professional, and I will defer to those who are. The recommendations put forth by Dr. Dotty Merrill, Anne Loring, and Craig Kadlub are worthy of consideration. I am still of the opinion that one of problems that we need to address is that we can put in any policy that we want, and we can do training, but I think there has to be something at the end where it is impressed on the students, so that the students know that intimidation and harassment are not going to be accepted, and there are consequences for that. I would hope that in the end there would be some kind of a follow through. In order to get there, it is necessary to have both a well-defined policy—well beyond the legislative intent that was crafted in 2001—as well as having some form of model program. There are a lot of programs out there that could easily be adopted. I am sure that the Department of Education would be willing to put a number of different programs in front of the school districts and ask them what they like and don't like, and have them select one of those particular programs and then work from there.

I still think it is necessary to have some sort of a policy. Maybe one of the school districts in the State already has a policy that the other school districts would be willing to accept. As far as the two bills go, I would have to say that I think there is a lot of commonality, but there is also a fair amount of difference. I have to admit that I am having some difficulty fully understanding the recommended language by Ms. Lusk and how it would apply.

Assemblyman Hardy:
I appreciate the words from Assemblyman Parks. One of the joys of this particular body, is working together. I like the concept that he has of looking at the model that may already be in place here in Nevada. We could have a menu of models from those that are already in place, so somebody wouldn't have to reinvent their own wheel or adopt somebody else's lug nuts to their wheel. We do have model programs in place. One or two of those, an urban, a semi-urban,

and a rural may be a reasonable thing. With the menu concept, you can still report significant events through the Attorney General, or through the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Looking at doing something more on the intent in the preamble is probably the place to have the protection of beliefs.

[Assemblyman Hardy, continued.] I am interested in the testimony that dealt with disagreements and how we respectfully disagree. The reality is we will disagree, and one of the things we try to do is teach how to respectfully disagree, because there will be disagreements. If we do not address the concept of respectfully disagreeing, then the options are that we never disagree, or we disagree disrespectfully. I would like to go on the record that we need to learn how to—whatever that is—respectfully disagree. I like the language that we heard on Ms. Lusk's amendment (Exhibit B), and I would like to recommend that we look at what we have already been doing in Nevada and refine it, using either the Clark County model or the Washoe County model, or some other program that is in place. I have been very impressed in talking with Principal Mary Vesco at Reed High School.

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:
The Committee is working from a table that compares the two bills side by side (Exhibit F). Assembly Bill 202 authorizes the Department to prescribe a policy to provide a safe and respectful learning environment. A.B. 132, in Section 2, subsection 1, states that "all districts must ensure a safe and respectful learning environment that is free of harassment and intimidation, and ensure that a person is entitled to maintain his own beliefs and to respectfully disagree without resorting to violence." The principle difference here is whether the Department sets a policy, or each district takes steps to ensure that environments in its schools are safe.

Chairman Horne:
I agree that there should be a policy created for them to follow, as Mr. Parks stated. Mr. Hardy stated that we have districts that already have policies, and I have not seen Washoe County's policy. I would assume that the Department could borrow Washoe County's policy and direct that to others. Are there any comments?

Assemblyman Atkinson:
I would like to see the policy that Craig Kadlub had.

Chairman Horne:
It is the policy for the procedural rules that you had, but did not have copies of it. We could adopt the portion in A.B. 202 that deals with the policy language.

Carol Stonefield:
Then we would probably want to adopt Section 3 of A.B. 202 with regard to each district board of trustees adopting a policy. Subsection 3 also includes the reporting of progress. Would you be interested in that?

Chairman Horne:
Yes. In Section 3, subsections 1 and 2, where it deals with the training, Ms. Lusk had concerns. Ms. [Bobbie] Gang pointed out that the training applied to teachers and school personnel, and not students. I read it to say that this gives teachers and personnel the tools to go back to their schools and work with the students and the various scenarios that can arise. To relieve Ms. Lusk's concerns and others, is there a way to clarify that this education training applies to teachers and school personnel, and not to students? I am looking at Section 2, subsection 2(b)(3), "Methods to teach skills so that pupils are able to replace inappropriate behavior with positive behavior." To me, that is just saying that we are going to train them to communicate.

Craig Kadlub:
I am not suggesting which way you should go on this, but I do want to emphasize the point that in Section 9, it says the written rules of behavior must be consistent with the policy pursuant to Section 2 of this act. If you go back to Section 2, it talks about training of pupils. The reference you made, if I understand correctly, was to Section 3. So, there is a need for some clarification. Section 9 must clearly refer to Section 3. If it refers to Section 2, it does in fact deal with pupils. For example, at the bottom of page 2 it says, "Methods to teach skills to pupils so that pupils are able to replace..." As Ms. Lusk pointed out, the transitory language in Section 9 specifically addresses appropriate punishments and violations of the rules by pupils.

Chairman Horne:
She mentioned that it was transitory language, but this statutory language already exists.

Craig Kadlub:
Subsection 2 is already in statute?

Chairman Horne:
Subsection 2, with the exception of the bolded language.

Craig Kadlub:
Then I guess it doesn't really make any difference, because if you read subsection 2, it is relevant to pupils, not staff. Whichever way you go is up to

you, I just think it does need to be clarified in one place or the other that we are talking about either staff or pupils, because I think there is some confusion.

Chairman Horne:
In Section 2, subsection 2(b)(3), Mr. Kadlub and Ms. Lusk, you interpret that to mean that the model program is to teach the student?

Craig Kadlub:
If Section 9 did not refer to consequences being administered to pupils, I probably would not have interpreted it that way. But because Section 9 prescribes punishments for pupils who violate the rules, there is almost no other way to interpret it, because it directly refers to Section 2 of the act.

Lucille Lusk:
That is my point of view as well. In subsection 3, I don't know how it could be current language when it is referring to subsection 1 and subsection 2 of this bill, which is new language. I guess I am not really following what you are saying there. Regardless, the entirety of Section 9 refers to material that is to be put in pupil handbooks, et cetera. The connection is very clear that it is the pupil. The term "model program of education," in and of itself, makes it implicit that pupils would be involved.

Chairman Horne:
Are there any recommendations from the Committee?

Bobbie Gang:
I guess I confused it. On page 5, at the top of the page it refers to rules for students and punishment for violation of rules for students. I think the rules for students would be based on Section 2.1, which is on page 2—that is what I was trying to say before—and not to all of Section 2.

Chairman Horne:
Just 2.1.

Bobbie Gang:
Then you would not get involved with the training component.

[Committee conducts a side-bar discussion.]

Chairman Horne:
I would like some clarification from Mr. Hardy on your reasoning for reporting to the Attorney General.

Assemblyman Hardy:
The reasoning came from last session when this was out of the Attorney General's Office. The Attorney General was in my office and said that this is one of the things that we would like to do through the Attorney General's Office. They requested that the reporting come through them. It wasn't because the LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] asked for anything else, it was at the request of the Attorney General's Office that it come to them. They were interested in the statistics.

Chairman Horne:
Does the Committee have a comment on that? I don't have a problem with it going to the Attorney General's Office.

[Committee conducts a side-bar discussion.]

Chairman Horne:
Assemblyman Parks, did you see Ms. Lusk's proposed amendment (Exhibit C), to add paragraph (c) to NRS 388.132, Section 1, subsection 3, which says "Persons in the public school setting are entitled to maintain their own beliefs and to respectfully disagree without resorting to violence, harassment, or intimidation."

Assemblyman Parks:
Somehow, the way that is worded, it leads me to think that it opens it up to additional argument, and for people to look at these words and see them differently. It doesn't really contribute to the overall wording that is currently within NRS 388.132.

Chairman Horne:
If we took it out, the statute would remain as is. It gives me heartburn for it to be in there, but I don't have a problem with it, if it will help move the bill. Subsection 4 already addresses that.

[Committee conducts a side-bar discussion.]

Carol Stonefield:
[Explained what the Committee would be proposing.]

Chairman Horne:
The Chair will entertain a motion.

> ASSEMBLYMAN ATKINSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 202 WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS.

- Add Section 388.132, which includes the provision about persons in the public school setting who are entitled to maintain their own beliefs.
- Take Section 2, and Section 3, subsections 1, 2, and 3 from A.B. 202.
- Include Section 2, subsections 2 and 3 from A.B. 132.
- Section 4 of A.B. 202 would not be included.
- Use A.B. 202 as the foundation.
- Section 5 of A.B. 202 would be amended with the amendment proposed by Washoe County School District and Clark County School District (Exhibit E).
- Include Sections 6, 7, and 8 of A.B. 202.
- Include Section 9 of A.B. 202 with the amendment to specify that it refers to subsection 2, paragraph (1), on the top of page 5 of the bill.
- Include Section 10 of A.B. 202.
- Include Section 11 of A.B. 202 regarding the effective dates, and the Legal Division will adjust that section.
- Include the amendment to change the reporting requirement from July 1 to September 1, in Section 3, subsection 3, of A.B. 202.

CHAIRMAN HORNE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Horne:
Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Holcomb:
I do have a problem with the bill. I have received numerous emails opposing the bill. I like the language that was added to this. I'm a believer in local autonomy to allow the school districts to make that decision. What I had suggested before was that the superintendent of instruction not only report harassment, because harassment and intimidation are unacceptable, but the language in A.B. 132 about submitting programs. I will have to respectfully decline the bill the way it's worded.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman Horne:
I, too, am a man who as a child was bullied for many, many years. I received beatings on the school grounds and suspensions for fighting back. I appreciate your efforts. The meeting is adjourned [at 7:52 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Jane Oliver
Transcribing Attaché

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman William Horne, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee on Education

Date: April 12, 2005 **Time of Meeting: 5:40 p.m.**

Bill	Exhibit	Witness/Agency	Description
	A	********	Agenda
AB 132	B	Lucille Lusk/NCC	Proposed amendment to A.B. 132
AB 202	C	Lucille Lusk/NCC	Proposed amendment to A.B. 202
AB 132	D	Craig Kadlub/CCSD and Dotty Merrill/WCSD	Proposed amendment to A.B. 132
AB 202	E	Craig Kadlub/CCSD and Dotty Merrill/WCSD	Proposed amendment to A.B. 202
AB 132 AB 202	F	Carol Stonefield/LCB	Comparisons of A.B. 132 and A.B. 202 provisions section by section