

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND EDUCATION**

**Seventy-third Session
May 31, 2005**

The Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education was called to order by Chair Maurice E. Washington at 1:13 p.m. on Tuesday, May 31, 2005, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Chair
Senator Barbara A. Cegavske, Vice Chair
Senator Dennis Nolan
Senator Joe Heck
Senator Bernice Mathews
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Steven Horsford

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Assembly District No. 40

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leslie K. Hamner, Committee Counsel
Marsheilah D. Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst
Patricia Vardakis, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Anne K. Loring, Washoe County School District
Dr. Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Joyce Haldeman, Clark County School District
Lucille Lusk, Nevada Concerned Citizens
Phyllis Dryden, Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education, Department of Education

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 2

Mary Liveratti, Deputy Director, Department of Human Resources

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

The Committee needs to rescind the action taken on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 154.

ASSEMBLY BILL 154 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing statewide system of accountability for school districts and public schools. (BDR 34-484)

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO RESCIND PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN ON A.B. 154.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

On May 2, 2003, the Nevada Association of School Superintendents brought the Committee a document with every superintendent's signature stating:

We are committed to meeting the revised time lines and deadlines specified under the act as amended to spring testing with regard to federal mandated time lines, these include: distribution of accountability reports, development revision and implementation of improvement plans, planning for school choice, supplemental services or corrective action for affected schools and informing parents about their school choice option.

In this document, there was the August 15 deadline, "Districts and school report cards completed and made available to the public." This would have brought the superintendents to the August 15 deadline. They told us that this deadline was a hardship for them. There is information from April 3, 2003, when Senator Raggio asked:

We need your assurance that all parties involved will meet the deadlines specified. The Committee requests assurance that all parties will be able to meet date deadlines and requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) and in S.B. No. 191 of the 72nd Session.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

He was assured that every rural and urban school district has looked at the letter of assurance and signed their acceptance. Senator Raggio asked if that

was the same as saying, "We will meet the time lines." Senator Raggio was told, "Yes, that is correct."

We have another document dated April 29, 2003, from the Department of Education. This document specifies: "Districts will have the data to distribute accountability report cards to the public prior to the beginning of the school year after the examinations are administered." If we do not do anything with the bill, a portion of the *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 385.347, subsection 8 would revert back to, "On or before August 15 of each year the board of trustees of each school district shall" The language continued about submitting the report, then paragraph (b) stated,

... Provide for public dissemination of the annual report of accountability prepared pursuant to subsection 2 in a manner set forth in 20 U.S.C. section 6311 (h)(2)(E) to the schools in the school district, including, without limitation, each charter school in the district, the residents of the district, and the parents and guardians of pupils enrolled in schools in the district, including, without limitation, each charter school in the district.

This is all the information that came to us from all the school districts stating that they could comply with the August 15 deadline. Then the superintendents stated that they could not comply with the August 15 deadline and the deadline was extended to the September 7. Now the deadline suggested by the superintendents is September 30. This deadline does not benefit the children or the parents. We need to make sure the information is distributed; therefore, the September 7 deadline should remain or revert to the original date of August 15. I would not recommend that this Committee accept the September 30 deadline.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Based on previous testimony, it is not that the August 15 deadline will not be met; it is that the information will be readily available but, will not be in the hands of the parents until September 7 or 30. We need a clarification on this matter.

ANNE K. LORING (Washoe County School District):

The districts can meet the September 7 deadline by putting the accountability report for the schools online and have copies available at the school site as indicated by the Nevada Association of School Superintendents' letter ([Exhibit C](#)) on page 6. The mailing date was later. This same discussion took

place two years ago and recently Dr. Keith Rheault confirmed that the Department of Education has spoken to the U.S. Department of Education to verify that having accountability reports available online and copies available at the school site met the NCLB requirements for public dissemination. When the time line was originally prepared, there was a difference between the date that this information would be publicly available, meaning on the Internet or at the school site, and the later date to have them mailed and in the parents' possession. Vendors for printing the school accountability report could not meet the time lines for August 1 and getting them to the parents by the first week in September, but this could be accomplished before the end of September. There is a difference between federal requirement of publicly available and when a parent receives the accountability report in their home.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
What are the current dates?

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
The amendment was for September 7. The date to which Ms. Loring referred was August 15.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
To make this information readily available, was the date August 15?

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Yes.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
Does the amendment address when the information should be in the parents' possession.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Yes. The date is September 7 or September 30, depending on the decision of the Committee.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:
If this bill does not pass, the school district would still be required to adhere to the August 15 deadline which is currently in law.

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 5

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

The school districts meet that deadline by having it available on the Internet and copies are available at the school site. The September 7 deadline in the amendment is when the hard copy should be in the possession of the parents.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Originally, the August 15 date covered the September 7 deadline.

MS. LORING:

This is noted on page 6 of [Exhibit C](#). It shows August 15 as the date when district and school report cards are to be completed and made available to the public. It also indicates that no later than September 30 is the date report cards will be mailed to parents.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

If the information is not in the possession of the parents earlier than September 30, it is not advantageous to the parents.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

The issue before us is whether we are going to adopt September 7 or September 30.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Would you explain what the Committee did in our last meeting concerning the deadline in A.B. 154?

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We amended the bill with the proposed amendments except for the date which was September 30. We have a motion to rescind our previous action and are in the midst of discussion.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS MATHEWS AND WIENER
VOTED NO. SENATOR NOLAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 154.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I agree that the information should be in the possession of the parents as soon as possible. I am sensitive to the problems the districts face in meeting these requirements. The minimal effort is what the law requires. We need to go beyond the minimal effort to meet the needs of the parents. I would like the amendment containing the September 7 deadline.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Listed on page 6 of [Exhibit C](#) is a time line for the various dates of testing and deadlines. Senator Cegavske's amendment has the date of September 7 and the school districts want to remain at September 30. All the information should be made available on the Internet or at the school site by August 15.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Based on testimony provided by the Clark County School District at our previous meeting, there was an issue about the mechanics of having one or two additional weeks necessary to meet the September 7 time line. As a compromise, could we agree on September 15? One of the school districts stated they could not get a vendor to respond to printing the information.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The problem with late dates is that parents would not be given an opportunity to opt out of the school based on the state report card. Students would have attended school for a month. The purpose of this amendment was to have the information in the possession of the parents. Many parents may not have Internet access or may not go to the school site to review the information. Our responsibility is to make sure that parents receive this information in a timely manner. I cannot believe that the school districts could not find one printer to accommodate these time lines.

SENATOR WIENER:

I agree with Senator Horsford. Could we add language to the September 7 mandate, to exert every best effort to meet that deadline? Whatever must be done to show a good-faith effort. The purpose is to have the information in the possession of the parents. How would this be enforced?

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We must be in compliance with the federal NCLB act.

DR. KEITH RHEAULT (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

The NCLB act has a provision that the school districts will provide the reports of the school accountability as early as possible after school starts. We confirmed that posting the report on the Internet and letting parents know that copies are available at the school site is sufficient to meet the federal requirement. The problem seems to be that the notification for schools on the needs-improvement list and notification of school choice is done on July 1 and in a separate mailing to all the parents of the school.

SENATOR WIENER:

Are the parents of students attending a needs-improvement school notified in a timely manner? Are they notified by July?

DR. RHEAULT:

Yes. They are notified by July 1. It takes two years for a school to be removed from the needs-improvement list. The new schools that are added to the list will get the information to the parents that have enrolled in the school. Any new students who come to enroll would be informed of the school's status.

SENATOR NOLAN:

Is there any indication in the letter sent to the parents by July 1 of the district and school report cards?

DR. RHEAULT:

We would not have the summary report for the current year by July 1. It is a notification that the school is in need of improvement for the second year and by that designation the parents are entitled to choice options. The schools that would be available for their option would be identified.

SENATOR NOLAN:

Is there a mailing sent to parents prior to the September date where the information concerning the Internet and the availability of copies of the school report card could be included?

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 8

DR. RHEAULT:

There has been testimony that this information is included in a packet of various papers which students take home.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

You were correct about the NCLB, but what about the Nevada Education Reform Act (NERA)?

DR. RHEAULT:

Are you referring to the notification? We did encounter problems in 2003 because of the language. There were gray areas in the language of the statute concerning notification. It did not specify whether it was a written notification or e-mail. We had discussions about this issue, because the districts had difficulty getting hard copies by the date that was in the NERA. It was modified in 2003 to put the information on the Internet.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS WIENER AND HORSFORD VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 154. The Committee will hear testimony on A.B. 388.

ASSEMBLY BILL 388 (3rd Reprint): Revises provisions regarding occupational education. (BDR 34-935)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BONNIE PARNELL (Assembly District No. 40):

The purpose of Assembly Bill 388 is to keep children in school. Data from the 2002-2003 school year indicates that the dropout rate for students participating in career and technical education programs in Nevada's secondary schools is 1.7 percent which is considerably lower than Nevada's overall dropout rate of 6 percent. Many students find career and technical classes challenging which may explain the lower dropout rate. Students participate in automotive classes, drafting, welding, Web design or a culinary-arts program.

Assembly Bill 388 directs attention to these students and classes. It encourages a working relationship between our public schools and local business and industry. This relationship is becoming a necessary part of career technical

excellence. An example is an automotive class. With the sophistication of computer-based automotive systems comes the need for students to acquire skills not available in the classroom; therefore, exposure in the workplace is required. In this case, it is an automobile shop. This is an example of the term work-based experience which is addressed in the bill. The goal of this legislation is to have students ready for the workforce. An advantage for business and industry is the ability to design programs around their particular needs. Elko might develop a program around the mining industry, Clark County around the gaming industry and in Carson City this relationship has resulted in a working relationship with Adele's Restaurant and the Carson High School's culinary-arts program.

Assembly Bill 388 concerns bringing business, industry and education together, working with our students to make them workforce ready and make classes available that interest students. In this setting, students are not waiting for the class to end; they stay longer because they are interested in what they are doing. This is the reason for the lower dropout rate of students who are involved in career technical classes.

Assembly Bill 388 changes the name of the State Board for Occupational Education to the State Board of Career and Technical Education. It shall prescribe a career and technical education endorsement on their high school diploma. To the extent that money is available, the Department of Education may provide grants to school districts and charter schools to maintain and expand programs of career and technical education. If a school district has established a program for career and technical education, then the district superintendent must appoint an advisory skills committee whose members would be from local business and industry. The bill directs the Legislative Committee on Education to establish a subcommittee to study the effectiveness of career and technical high schools in Nevada. There is another bill, A.B. 48, which addresses the career and technical issue.

ASSEMBLY BILL 48 (1st Reprint): Requires State Board for Occupational Education to prescribe program of career and technical education.
(BDR 34-781)

There is a vast amount of information concerning the success of students in career and technical education programs. Assembly Bill 388 does not have an appropriation.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

I have worked with Assemblyman Holcomb on A.B. 48. If there are any conflict differences between the bills, they will be worked out.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

Assembly Bill 388 started with no appropriation, because I felt there was a need to recognize the program. Assemblyman Holcomb and I have been working on this issue since prior to this Legislative Session. We would be appreciative to have the bill in any form.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

In higher education, there is an increased interest in doing more in the career and technical area. There are many students who would excel with hands-on experience. I would hope we fund the automotive-technology program for the community college. This would be an opportunity to connect with the high schools. Bonanza High School is in my district and is across from the community college. This would be a prime place to put the nursing program. There is a high school that needs to update their chemistry and biology departments. The community college is running out of space. I am glad we are addressing these issues.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

One of the exciting new areas of occupational and technical career training is the health occupations. There are a number of students in our high schools who would be interested in getting started in the health occupations. These students want to start in high school and get their associate of arts degree in a technical field in health-care services. This is a great opportunity for many students and will provide a workforce which is needed in the community.

SENATOR WIENER:

What type of public awareness campaign will be provided?

DR. RHEAULT:

In the reprint of the bill, there was some funding placed in the bill. We already have the information and statistics. It would be limited to the funding that is available. We would ask the school districts to work with us on their Web sites so that the information about dropout, attendance and graduation rates could be used. There is an abundance of positive results for students who complete occupational programs.

SENATOR WIENER:

Will you be working with counselors to help find opportunities and choices for the students?

DR. RHEAULT:

I was considering putting together a packet of information that counselors could share with students. This would be the most effective piece of the program.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

The Career Technical Education Program is a collaboration between our community colleges and our high schools. For two semesters, I served as a coordinator through Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) and Washoe County School District. The counselors are notified of how high school students can start earning college credits if they receive a grade of B or higher in certain career and technical classes. There is a fear of losing federal funds to many of those programs. This is another reason for drawing attention to these programs.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

In addition to school districts getting the information to the public, the technical councils that are put into place by this bill should work with representatives in the various industry sectors. There are already established organizations and joint labor and management partnerships throughout the State that could invest in publicizing or they could publicize the programs to parents and students.

I would hope the outreach would focus on apprenticeship programs in addition to the community colleges. This is an area that is vital to the building trades, because there is a minimum of people applying for apprenticeship to the trades. This would be a natural progression.

In the latter part of the bill, there is a reference to a representative from an employee's association, but there is no such representative to the advisory technical-skills committee mentioned in section 3 of the bill. I am concerned that this may have been an oversight.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

The committee needs people who have knowledge and experience in career and technical education. If you look at the school district employees, what is needed on the committee is someone who has dealt with a curriculum and who knows

about career technical classes. This should be the focus when you are looking at the employees in the school district.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I am referring to page 11, lines 4 through 6. The intent of this language is different from a school district employee with knowledge in that sector. It is important if career and technical programs are going to succeed to have the perspective of those individuals who are in those industries. There should be a subsection on page 2 including employees organizations or if representatives of business and industry are inclusive of labor representatives and others who have a perspective to provide to the committee.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

I will have the Legal Division look at the language.

SENATOR HECK:

This bill complements Senate Bill (S.B.) 406.

SENATE BILL 406 (1st Reprint): Requires State Board for Occupational Education to prescribe program of career and technical education. (BDR 34-1307)

The issue of the type of diploma that is granted may be in conflict with provisions in S.B. 406.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Our legal staff will look at the diploma issue.

LESLIE K. HAMNER (Committee Counsel):

If this becomes a conflict between the bills, a conflict notice will be issued. At that time, a policy decision needs to be made in the manner in which the conflict will be resolved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

Assembly Bill 388 proposes an endorsement on a regular diploma. We did not want to be involved in a diploma issue.

MS. LORING:

Our board is in support of career and technical education. We have an advisory council in place which does not have parents and students. We think they would be a good addition.

One of the reasons we support the endorsement is that we believe more students would be motivated to pursue career and technical education. Senate Bill 406 was amended to read, "a student may receive a diploma." The reason it was changed to "may" was because of the conflict that exists. A student can get an academic diploma, an advanced academic diploma, standard diploma or an adjusted diploma. All of those students could take six occupational education classes and only receive one diploma. The amended language was included so that a student who qualified for an academic diploma could receive that diploma and not the technical diploma. This enables a student not to have to decide on which diploma to choose. A student could have an academic diploma with a career technical endorsement and an adjusted diploma with a career technical endorsement. We think this method would allow more students to be encouraged to avail themselves of this program.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Are you supporting the endorsement?

MS. LORING:

We supported the diploma concept. We think more students would avail themselves through the endorsement mechanism.

DR. RHEAULT:

The superintendents of public instruction support A.B. 388. Currently, there are some technical advisory committees in place. There are good examples of how this program works and it helps curriculum. Clark County and Elko County include representatives of business and employees. The committees that have helped the occupational programs include all levels of employees, because they know how to keep the curriculum current.

My staff would favor students receiving a diploma of their choosing. If the decision is have endorsements, we would not oppose that decision.

JOYCE HALDEMAN (Clark County School District):

The Clark County School District is in favor of A.B. 388. We are supporters of career technical endorsement. The discussions held on S.B. 406 concerned having options of diplomas and letting the student choose which they preferred.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Some of the districts indicated they have technical advisory committees. How are the members selected? Are they for specific sectors or do they give advice on all technical areas?

MS. LORING:

In the Washoe County School District, we have advisory committees that are specific to different programs. There are committees for the trades, health care and specialties that have teachers from our district, TMCC, the University of Nevada, Reno and business people from that area. The different subgroups send a representative to an oversight group. The oversight group is a multi-industry group of representatives.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Will these programs address the work-readiness and work-ethics issues of students?

MS. LORING:

When the Legislature set the requirements for the academic standards in various academic subjects, the state board did a parallel project for occupational-educational programs. The standards were taken to the business community for their input. The standards do include work ethics, habits and what is necessary to be a good employee outside of the specifics to that skill.

LUCILLE LUSK (Nevada Concerned Citizens):

I am in support of A.B. 388. Career and technical education works. I believe it is a better college-preparatory program than the others. On the endorsement and diploma questions, either will work, but I favor the endorsements. A person can have only one diploma, but they could have multiple endorsements which would indicate success and achievement in various areas. I would like to see the ability to have those endorsements in multiples included on the diploma. The problem of work ethics does not lie in the career and technical student, it is with the general-education student and with reading, writing and arithmetic. Most career and technical students do not have a problem with reading, writing and

arithmetic, because they are hands-on students and use these in their training. The problem is with the student who has a lack of interest.

PHYLLIS DRYDEN (Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education, Department of Education):

When the academic standards were put in place, we decided to have standards for career and technical education. These programs blend academic and hands-on approaches. We added a section of employability skill standards to our standards.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Is the teaching in career and technical programs in line with the proficiency examinations?

MS. DRYDEN:

Yes. We have taken all of the academic standards that are needed for the proficiency examinations and incorporated them into the career technical education. We are going to review and rewrite the original standards to keep them current. We are providing professional development for our instructors so that they will know how to use those standards.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

The additional endorsements on a student's diploma may help an employer to know what skills the district certifies the person to have.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVE TO DO PASS A.B. 388.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR NOLAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

I will open the hearing on A.B. 524

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 16

ASSEMBLY BILL 524 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning Fund for a Healthy Nevada and provision of prescription drugs and pharmaceutical services by this State. (BDR 40-169)

MARY LIVERATTI (Deputy Director, Department of Human Resources):
I will read my written testimony explaining the various changes to the Senior Rx Program and the Fund for a Healthy Nevada ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Would you explain the percentages in the bill?

MS. LIVERATTI:
The amounts will be 5 percent for the Senior Rx and 3 percent for the other provisions under the Fund for a Healthy Nevada.

There is a handout titled, "Medicare Prescription Drug Plan" ([Exhibit E](#)). Page 5 of [Exhibit E](#) shows Part D of the Medicare prescription-drug benefit.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Is this diagram depicting the out-of-pocket monies?

MS. LIVERATTI:
Yes. People will pay an estimated \$420 per year. They also pay a \$250 deductible. They continue to pay a co-payment based on their income until they reach \$2,250; that is when they jump into the "doughnut hole" as shown on page 5 of [Exhibit E](#). The person would stay in the "doughnut hole" until they reach \$5,100 in out-of-pocket benefits then would go into catastrophic coverage. There is a chart on page 1 of [Exhibit E](#) which explains that there is assistance for people who have a low income. The federal government will be helping with low-income subsidies and assistance for people who cannot pay for the deductible if they are under certain income and asset levels.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Who determines eligibility?

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 17

MS. LIVERATTI:

The Social Security Administration or the State will determine the eligibility. The Social Security Administration prefers the applications are sent to them.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

If a person is participating in the Senior Rx program and applies for the Medicare Part D coverage, will the State's program cover the person while they are in the "doughnut hole?"

MS. LIVERATTI:

That is to be determined. Assembly Bill 524 states that the Department of Human Resources will develop a plan and present it to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC). One of the considerations is to cover those individuals who are in the "doughnut hole." We are trying to eliminate out-of-pocket expenses.

SENATOR WIENER:

Would you explain the intent of the language on line 24 on page 9 of the bill?

MS. LIVERATTI:

This refers to the plan that the Department will be presenting to the IFC. Once the plan is accepted and the department is providing the wraparound coverage, we will build it into our budget for the next biennium.

SENATOR HECK:

Is any of the money currently utilized in the Senior Rx going to the federal government to pay back our share of claw-back?

MS. LIVERATTI:

No. The way the statute is written, we cannot use money for Senior Rx to pay for other prescription programs.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Would the Department of Human Resources report to this Committee regarding the developments concerning these issues?

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 524.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 18

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR NOLAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

The Committee needs to concur or not concur with an amendment to S.B. 120.

SENATE BILL 120 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes concerning treatment of trauma and centers for treatment of trauma. (BDR 40-885)

SENATOR HECK:

The amendment not only endorses the transfer of the pre-hospital portion of trauma but gives the county board of health co-jurisdiction in the designation in the future trauma centers in Clark County. It is not done solely by the Health Division but with concurrence of the local board of health.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1054 TO S.B. 120.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR NOLAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
May 31, 2005
Page 19

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

There being no other issues before us today, the Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education will adjourn at 2:38 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Patricia Vardakis,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Chair

DATE: _____