

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

**Seventy-Fourth Session
May 9, 2007**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Vice Chair Debbie Smith at 3:45 p.m., on Wednesday, May 9, 2007, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Bob Beers
Assemblyman David Bobzien
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblyman Garn Mabey
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Mo Denis (excused)
Assemblyman Joseph P. (Joe) Hardy (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Bob Beers, Senatorial District No. 6
Senator Valerie Wiener, Senatorial District No. 3

Minutes ID: 1223



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kristin Roberts, Committee Counsel
Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst
Denise Dunning, Committee Secretary
Rachel Pilliod, Committee Manager

OTHERS PRESENT:

Julie Whitacre, representing the Nevada State Education Association
Donna Anspach, Representative, Nevadans for Quality Education
Alison Turner, Representative, Nevada parent Teacher Association
Lonnie Shields, Assistant Executive Director, Clark County
Association of School Administrators and Professional-
Technical Employees
Anne Loring, Representative, Washoe County School District
Dotty Merrill, Representative, Nevada Association of School Boards
Joyce Haldeman, Representative, Clark County School District
Gloria Dopf, Deputy Superintendent for Instructional Research and
Evaluative Services, Department of Education
Mary Jo Parise-Malloy, Representative, Nevadans for Quality Education
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of
School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Hillary Gant, Director, Clark County School District
Craig Kadlub, Representative, Clark County School District
Jane Nichols, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada
System of Higher Education
Ron Sparks, Executive Director, Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education
William Anderson, Chief Economist, Nevada Department of Employment,
Training, and Rehabilitation

Vice Chair Smith:

[Meeting called to order at 3:53 p.m. Roll called. Quorum present.
Chair Parnell is absent.] I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 110
(1st Reprint) and ask Senator Beers to come to the table.

Senate Bill 110 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the administration of
examinations to pupils enrolled in the public schools. (BDR 34-474)

Senator Bob Beers:

Senate Bill 110 (R1) is my attempt to limit the amount of testing that goes on in
our public schools. I sat with the Vice Chair on the Education Adequacy

Committee over the interim and we saw a chart of the various tests given and the various school grades. The fourth-grade column was black. Apparently they give the fourth graders numerous tests. In response to a frequent parental and teacher complaint that we are over-testing our children, this legislation was born. Through the process of discussion and amendment, the bill has been reduced to requiring that districts start documenting their testing requirements and limit the tests that are not beneficial.

Assemblyman Munford:

Are you talking strictly about standardized tests?

Senator Beers:

Correct. Tests that students decide to take would not be a problem.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

What does Section 1 of the bill do?

Senator Beers:

Section 1, subsection 1 really does nothing. Section 1, subsection 2 says that generally standardized testing must be limited to tests which can be demonstrated to provide a direct benefit. Section 1, subsection 3 instructs the school board to periodically review the tests that are given to ensure that the time taken from instruction to conduct the test, examination, or assessment is warranted and accomplishing its original purpose. As it was originally drafted, the bill limited the number of tests per year to two. This was an attempt to push school boards to focus in on those most effective. It was amended to require school districts to hold to the number of tests that they were giving in the 2005-2006 school year, and then was amended to back that up to the 2004-2005 school year with an eventual goal to reduce it even further.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Do you know how many hours of the school year are spent on testing right now?

Senator Beers:

There are some studies out there that attempt to quantify that. I am sure some folks here could offer that as testimony.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Are you saying that you would like the bill to state the number of tests that could be given each school year?

Senator Beers:

There are probably very few improvements to this bill that I would not be tickled over.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Would three tests a year be a good number?

Senator Beers:

There are a number of circumstances that would make it difficult to put a number on the amount of tests given each year. Something needs to be done to prioritize the amount of standardized testing. This Body started it off with the proficiency exam for high school students. We have seen some stunning results and a long history of dismal statistics. Last week the Clark County School District reported that they have seen an increase in the percentage of their ninth-graders that make it to graduation—about a third of the way to the national average. In the newspaper, they attributed that to the existence of the high school proficiency exam and the things that they are doing differently because of the high school proficiency exam. The Clark County School Board in the last two years has increased the requirements for graduation from three years of math which could be satisfied by taking three years of addition, to three years of math to include one year of algebra.

[Chair Parnell entered the meeting room at 4:04 p.m.]

Chair Parnell:

One of the charges to the Legislative Committee on Education for the next interim is to study the whole issue of testing. The other issue that is not talked about very often is the overuse of counselors counting test booklets. This takes away from their jobs as counselors.

Senator Beers:

I am also the Vice Chair of our Legislative Operations Committee, which is the equivalent of Elections, Procedures, and Ethics in the Assembly. I just saw that we got a bill considering doing an interim study on testing. Is this what you are referring to?

Chair Parnell:

I believe that is the one the Legislative Committee on Education will be appointing a sub-committee to in order to study testing.

Assemblyman Beers:

The original bill is 20 pages and the new amended bill is 3 pages. I find that interesting when a bill comes here and 9/10 of it is stripped away. I would like

to see something put back into this. As written, it suggests we may or may not want to do a study. Do you have any suggestions?

Senator Beers:

The amendment from the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) is the one I liked the best. They are here today to propose a similar amendment with some slight modifications.

Julie Whitacre, Representative, Nevada State Education Association:

I am here in support of S.B. 110 (R1), but would propose an amendment that is currently being passed out ([Exhibit C](#)). This amendment is very similar to what we proposed on the Senate side and asks the Legislature to ask the school districts to limit testing to what was done in the 2005-2006 school year until the issue can be studied through A.B. 484 and recommendations can be taken back to the districts.

Vice Chair Smith:

Can you walk us through your amendment?

Julie Whitacre:

I would be glad to. We did a presentation at the beginning talking about the instructional time lost to testing, as well as the monetary cost involved. There is a huge fiscal impact to the State and the districts as far as the costs that go into testing. We have some school districts that offered up to 20 tests in the 2005-2006 school year—20 tests beyond what was mandated by the State and the federal government. Section 2 has the current language regarding these points. We did not take that out. Section 3 is new language asking school districts to stop testing except for what was administered in the 2005-2006 school year or what is mandated at the state or federal level. Section 4 talks about studying the testing issue and offers some suggestions.

Chair Parnell:

On the last "whereas" on the first page, it uses the test dates of the 2005-2006 school year. Is there a reason that you did not use the 2006-2007 school year?

Julie Whitacre:

Information for the 2006-2007 school year has not been reported yet, so we only had 2005-2006 to work with.

Chair Parnell:

The reason I ask is because it would seem that during this time in the school year districts have already set money aside or ordered the tests for the

upcoming school year. Is there a way to compromise on that or to make those years work?

Julie Whitacre:

It is my understanding that the reporting data for the 2006-2007 school year will not be available until after the summer. If there is a way to compromise on the date, we are willing to do that. We just think that the testing is out of control and has to end somewhere. It needs to be looked at.

Donna Anspach, Representative, Nevadans for Quality Education:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Alison Turner, Representative, Nevada parent Teacher Association:

Nevada Parent Teacher Association (PTA) does support this bill as it is written now.

Lonnie Shields, Assistant Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees:

We constantly hear from our administrators about the amount of time that is put into testing and how it is taking away from instruction. We support this bill.

Anne Loring, Representative, Washoe County School District:

We could have supported S.B. 110 (R1) in the revised form that you have before you. We have just seen the amendment. We had proposed that the 2006-2007 school year be used. Washoe County School District (WCSD) has criterion reference testing that the State began using in the late 1990s. As we looked at districts that were performing well, we wanted to identify best practices. One of the things that we are hearing is that if a state has end-of-the-course exams and a school is not tracking how its students are doing throughout the year on a district-wide basis, it probably is not going to see improved achievement as dramatically as what many districts will see. Clark County calls them formative assessments: if you have an end-of-the-year exam in 6th grade math, you do a period test throughout the year to see if the kids are on track to perform well on that end-of-the-year test. What we have found is that a district that has a high turnover rate with students and a lot of transferring among schools, then an assessment on a district-wide basis needs to be done. Our district began doing formative assessments, and I think Clark County is doing those also ([Exhibit E](#)). We feel that is the best practice, and we want to continue doing that. The original version of the bill was going to limit it to one district-wide test other than what is required by the State.

Middle schools give credit-by-exam for students who take foreign language, computer, and algebra classes, so they can get high school credits while

attending the middle school. At high school, our district began administering the PSAT exam district-wide to tenth-graders. The concept was that this exam gives detailed information on how the student actually did, giving them a chance to view themselves as potentially going to college and seeing what classes they need to take. We think it also helps them with their performance on the proficiency test. We are a district that requires all students taking advanced placement classes to take the exam at the end of the year. Not all school districts require that, but we have done that for a number of years.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Approximately how many tests are required by Washoe County School District at the high-school level?

Anne Loring:

I have a chart which shows that eleventh-graders take the high school proficiency exam in reading, math, and writing. They also take an end-of-the-semester test in math, Advanced Placement (AP) tests for each class students choose, and various other tests: two in math, a test for as many AP classes as the student takes, and the proficiency test.

Assemblyman Beers:

How many hours are the teachers taking to administer these tests?

Anne Loring:

I will have to get those numbers for you.

Senator Beers:

On page 2 of the proposed amendment, in Section 4, there is underlying language regarding the hours teachers and administrators spend on testing and issues related to testing. A suggested amendment to this amendment is in Section 3. We say that no test shall be given unless it is required or was administered during the prior school year. We might want to add a third piece that says "or is optional and a student volunteers to take the class, test, or assessment." This would get to the issues such as the AP tests and vocational tests.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

In Section 4, under 2(b), it states how many hours teachers and educational support staff spend on tests and I do not know if that includes the issues with counselors. We may want to include teachers, other licensed staff, and education support staff to make sure we capture that population.

Anne Loring:

I noticed in Section 3 where it talks about the timeline to stop administering so many tests until we get a chance to study it, what is new was not in the original versions. Here, the issue of district-wide testing specifies a public school or district, essentially saying that teachers cannot do any more testing than they did last year or whatever year we put on it. That will be difficult to quantify with 400 schools reporting state-wide. Also, there are grants like the Reading First Grant that requires testing. If a school applies for this grant funding, they have to agree to administer that test. It was originally district-wide and now the wording has been changed. It may be difficult to get your arms around this.

Senator Beers:

In Section 1, subsection 3, we could include grants along with the specific provision of state or federal law. I would be supportive of taking "public school" out of the bill if that makes sense to the Committee. It probably would make sense to change the year to 2006-2007.

Dotty Merrill, Representative, Nevada Association of School Boards:

We have talked to Senator Beers about this bill on numerous occasions and were prepared to support what came before you. Looking at the amendment, we are concerned with the dates used. We would prefer that the 2006-2007 school year be used.

Joyce Haldeman, Representative, Clark County School District:

When this bill was heard on the Senate side, we did not take a position for or against it. We agree with Senator Beers that an undue amount of time is spent on testing, and we certainly do not like giving up instructional time. Some of the assessments are vital tools for teachers to guide the course of their instruction. I would encourage you to move this to a study.

Vice Chair Smith:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 110 (R1) and turn the gavel over to Chair Parnell.

Chair Parnell:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint) and ask Senator Beers to discuss this bill with us.

Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing educational personnel. (BDR 34-473)

Senator Beers, Senatorial District No. 6:

The concepts in this bill are pretty much recycled. The first portion of the bill, on page 2, addressed the concept of the term "principal" as being derived from "principal teacher." The concept is that the principal is not so much an administrator, a paper shuffler, or the fixer of problems, but the best teacher in the building. This bill requires administrators to teach one day a semester. A couple of exceptions are listed. Lines 10-12 discuss having a licensed teacher teach four core academic subjects which are defined there. In Section 1, subsection 1(b), administrators who are not coming from a licensed background have to watch the teaching of a class for at least one day a semester. My concern is that the two larger school districts lose focus on the point—the child in the classroom. This is an attempt to keep them fresh, current, empathetic, and enhance the relationship between the administrator and the instructor.

The second section starts on page 3 and is language that both Houses passed in the 1999 Session and was vetoed by our Governor. This would require administrators to observe teachers for one hour before they prepare the evaluation of that teacher.

Assemblyman Munford:

Does the administrator have to spend time in a classroom that fits with his background?

Senator Beers:

The bill does not say that. It just says that it would be in a core academic subject.

Assemblyman Munford:

I think you are right in terms of focus. Administrators can be bogged down with their administrative duties and evaluate teachers quicker than they should.

Assemblyman Beers:

I like the definition of principal. That applies to other areas of the real world.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I like the bill except Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b). I think we are letting these principals off the hook. If they do not have a teaching license, they can come in as a guest speaker. This happens all the time. They should all have to teach and not just sit there and observe. I think we should get rid of paragraph (b).

Senator Beers:

That was a request of the school districts' administration.

Assemblywoman Smith:

Would they need to be licensed to be a substitute teacher?

Gloria Dopf, Deputy Superintendent, Instructional Research and Evaluative Services, Department of Education:

When you have a guest speaker, whether it be for a short period of time or for the day, there is a licensed teacher in the room with the guest speaker. We cannot turn a class over to a nonlicensed person if there is no licensed teacher in the room.

Assemblywoman Smith:

I can kind of understand the concept, but if the person is not licensed to teach and does not have the background, then I may not want my kids to lose a whole day of instruction. I would rather have that person observing.

Chair Parnell:

I want to clarify two things. One is, opposite of what the bill last session said, —they had to substitute—you envision the teacher being in the classroom when this other person is in there, correct?

Senator Beers:

The Senate committee made that change. I believe subsection 3 of Section 1 gets to what you are referring to.

Chair Parnell:

So, someone who is licensed could substitute and if not licensed, he would be in with a classroom teacher. I think that clarifies it. Either way there is a licensed teacher in the classroom that day.

Senator Beers:

That would be the intent. The teacher would not necessarily have to be there. The principal could teach on a day when a teacher is out for the day.

Chair Parnell:

I think that the language in Section 1 is important for everyone to see. I do not get the impression that the person has to be in front of the class providing instruction because it says "procedures and conditions for a program to engage administrators in annual classroom instruction and observation." That is a little contradictory to the substitute language.

Senator Beers:

One of the objections the administrators gave in the Senate is that if you make us go without an administrator for a day, then we would have to have a

substitute administrator for that day. The Committee found that to be a little over the top. It was found that the administrator could put down his duties for one day and do the teaching.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Administrators are gone probably one or two days every week with meetings and conferences. They can do this for a day.

Assemblywoman Smith:

What is the intent with the licensed administrator being in the classroom? Was it your intent that they would be instructing?

Senator Beers:

If they have a background, yes. The principal is the principal teacher.

Assemblyman Munford:

The word we are looking for here is morale. Teacher morale is so vital. The teachers need to want to go to work in the morning.

Senator Beers:

I had a similar bill two years ago, and it ended up not being processed.

Assemblyman Munford:

Is the assistant principal included in this?

Senator Beers:

Yes, they qualify as administrators. On page 2, line 26 and 27, principal is defined.

Julie Whitacre, Representative, Nevada State Education Association:

The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) is in support of this bill.

Dotty Merrill, Representative, Nevada Association of School Boards:

We appreciate the amendment to Section 1, subsection 1, which will provide the opportunity for local boards of trustees to develop the policy that will be in use in that district, recognizing that circumstances vary from one district to another. We have some concerns with lines 21 through 24 regarding the administrator being assigned as a substitute teacher. Our primary concern is how this works at the local level.

Mary Jo Parise-Malloy, Representative, Nevadans for Quality Education:

We are not in support of this bill. We are only going to address Section 1 because that directly affects the child in the classroom. We fail to see anything

in this section that would enhance student learning. Who is better suited to teach than a classroom teacher? Our students have much to learn and little time to do it in. We do not have time to waste on individuals coming into the classroom and wasting instruction time.

Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees:

We, too, are opposed to this bill. I would preface my remarks by saying that I want to do it with no offense intended. I am concerned about building teams and respect for what I perceive to be a lack of respect and sensitivity to the role and important work that all administrators do. I think we minimize their work, and this bill makes it appear that the work they do is simply unimportant. The fact of the matter is everyone involved in an educational institution from the ground up has more on his plate than he could ever get done in a single day. I think that this will be a break in instructional continuity that we can ill afford in a time when high-stakes testing are what school districts are all about.

In terms of cost efficiencies, it is absolutely ridiculous to say to administrators that they need to give up a day out of their busy schedule to come and observe a classroom. What will happen when that administrator is sitting in a classroom and a fight breaks out or an angry parent comes in and wants to be addressed? Administration and teaching are very different functions, and I think that with the emphasis placed on meeting the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements and other requirements, the administrators clearly understand what good instruction is. It is not necessary for them to take that day to spend it in the classroom. We are absolutely opposed to this bill. We have too many people leaving. Teachers are not just leaving because of the way that they are treated by their administrator. That is a very small percentage. We are seeing with our administrators over the last two years a 10 percent turnover rate. This bill will do nothing to improve the skill set of the administrator. This will only serve to drive administrators out of the profession.

We have a serious concern with Section 5. We are supportive of administrators observing in the classroom, but it is problematic when there is a statement in the evaluation that specifies the number of minutes that they were there. Who is going to be the timekeeper? We strongly encourage you not to pass this bill.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Are you saying that a principal is going to quit because he has to teach one day a year?

Stephen Augspurger:

I do not believe that is what I said. What I am saying is that when we continue to add these kinds of requirements to jobs that are already far too complicated and difficult, we will drive people from the profession.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Maybe they do not belong in the profession if they cannot teach once a year.

Stephen Augspurger:

That is the kind of comment I have listened to for the last hour that I find very disrespectful to a profession of people dedicating their lives to working with kids and teachers. I find it odd that I would hear this from someone coming from that profession.

Hillary Gant, Director, Clark County School District:

I want to speak specifically to the nonlicensed individuals spending the day in the classroom. I am failing to draw the parallel between the nonlicensed administrators spending time in a class and an improvement in the environment. I thought I heard that there was a possibility of the administrators being out of touch with the classrooms. I am challenged in the areas of facilities management, technology, budget, or finance. How would these administrative professionals spending an hour in a classroom benefit the students? This is not directly related to the education of the children.

Assemblyman Beers:

The understanding of the Committee is that the administrator would be the principal of the school, not any of the other people whom you are referring to. They were not involved in the intent of this bill.

Hillary Gant:

I thought that one of the sections said that a nonlicensed administrator had to spend the day observing the classroom.

Assemblyman Beers:

I believe it says that occasionally a school principal may not be licensed. This bill refers to them.

Hillary Gant:

I thought I heard differently from Senator Beers.

Stephen Augspurger:

In the State of Nevada, every principal is a licensed employee. It is not possible to become a principal without a license.

Chair Parnell:

I have been a little offended by some of the comments made—if you are a Human Resources Director in a school district, you are dealing with teacher issues day in and day out. I do not see how it could hurt for that person to go into the classroom one day to see what these teachers are experiencing, especially since they are dealing with sensitive issues with the personnel and school staff. I think we all need to be a bit more open-minded. We have had a number of bills in this Committee this session because of how teachers all over this State feel. They feel like nobody really understands anymore. We have districts growing, especially in Clark County. We have people who might teach a few years and go into administration. We need to do everything we can this legislative session to attempt to bridge that kind of misunderstanding between teachers and administrators, whether it is at the school level or at the district level.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

There are aspects of this bill I think are very positive and which get to teacher morale issues, but I really think that there are some unintended consequences of Section 1 we have to be careful of. If a teacher knows that an administrator is coming to the classroom because it is mandated by state law, the value of that visit has just been diminished. If they take it upon themselves to do this, it would mean a whole lot more.

Craig Kadlub, Representative, Clark County School District:

The bill did pass out of the Senate, and based on the comments made here, there is a lot of support for the bill. I would ask that you temper your decisions with some ideas to meet all purposes and to address the concerns that have been expressed. First, on behalf of the school district, we believe that school-level administrators should be exempt from the bill. The reason behind that is because they are already fully immersed in curricula issues, parent issues, student issues, and so forth. There is no question that they are very familiar with what is happening in the classrooms. In regard to the central office staff teaching classes, we did not think that it was a bad idea for them to go into the classroom and teach once a year. As far as nonlicensed administrators, we can see the value of them getting into the classroom periodically. We do not see the value of having them sit there for six hours. We would ask that you reduce that to half a day or just change it to say that they have to engage with the kids in some manner.

Chair Parnell:

We are encouraging Career Day involvement. They could go and talk to the students about their career and maybe how they interact with the other school staff.

Assemblyman Munford:

What you are trying to say is the administrator should have the choice of what he wants to do to interact with the class?

Craig Kadlub:

Our reading of the bill is that the principal, the vice principal, and the dean would all be expected to go in with no teacher present and assume the role of a substitute teacher. Initially I said that we believe that the side-level administrator should be exempted from this bill altogether, but another thoughtful compromise has been introduced: Do something to engage them in instruction with students, but does not necessarily take a whole work day and does not have to happen with a teacher present.

Chair Parnell:

I think we know the issues before us.

Lonnie Shields, Assistant Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees:

The question is whether administrators can teach. We can. We have shown that. So, where is our time better spent? I do not believe that our time would be well spent doing substitute teaching in the classroom.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Teachers want to know if you can teach. In some cases the administrators have never taught. It is a morale boost to teachers to see that this person can not only talk the talk, but walk the walk. I think that transmits respect from the teacher to the administrator. One day out of 180 days is not going to cause a problem with the administrator's schedule.

Lonnie Shields:

I do not know how to respond but to say that that is your opinion, and we have our opinion.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

I think it is important to remind yourself of what you do. It would not hurt to spend a day in the teacher's shoes.

Lonnie Shields:

We do not just wander around all day. When we are wandering around, we are going into the classrooms and observing. I will restate that if your purpose is to prove that we can teach and you feel that this is going to be a morale lifter for the district, then we could do that. We just think it overlaps the other important aspects of our positions.

Chair Parnell:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 328 (R1). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 357 (1st Reprint) and welcome Senator Wiener to the table.

Senate Bill 357 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to student loans administered by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education for students enrolled in certain educational programs. (BDR 34-72)

Senator Wiener, Senatorial District No. 3:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Parnell:

In Section 8, where it says that the Board of Regents may receive, invest, disburse, and account for all monies received for the programs. Is that typical?

Senator Wiener:

The reprint is not worded that way. This is just a modest change in law.

Chair Parnell:

I thought I was looking at the reprint—my mistake.

Jane Nichols, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education:

I am one of three Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) commissioners appointed by the Governor. I am here to speak in favor of this bill. The WICHE loan program is the model. It is very carefully constructed and has had a very high success rate in making these loans. We are very committed to working with the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation (DETR) and looking closer at the workforce needs. This bill has our support. We need these changes in the language for the student loans administered by WICHE and hope that this bill will pass.

Ron Sparks, Executive Director, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education:

I am here to support this bill. This gives us the authority and the ability to do our job better.

Chair Parnell:

I really like the language that requires a good look at exactly where our shortages are. We always assume that they are in nursing and teaching but really do not know that for sure. We do not know if there are other areas that are underrepresented.

Assemblyman Mabey:

Who applies for these loans now? Our tuition for out-of-state students is so low. Are these loans for out-of-state students also?

Jane Nichols:

These are for Nevada students only.

Chair Parnell:

This is more of an attempt to have Nevada students stay in school in Nevada and then stay in Nevada to work.

Senator Wiener:

When I went to law school, WICHE provided the opportunity for Nevada students to attend University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law since there was no law school in Nevada.

Assemblyman Smith:

I realize that the rates would be established by the commissioners, but could you give me an idea of what a competitive rate would look like as opposed to what is in the current bill?

Jane Nichols:

As commissioners we would have to take a look at that. We find that if the rate is too high—8 percent is very high—we cannot be competitive with even bank loans. We want to set it at a rate just high enough to be realistic, but low enough to be competitive. We want students to see an incentive to taking out this loan.

Assemblywoman Smith:

Why does this not have a fiscal note? Would it change our revenue?

Ron Sparks:

It will not be a significant change. There is no fiscal note.

Jane Nichols:

I believe that there was a time in the WICHE budget when this would have needed a fiscal note. WICHE was originally set up with an account using state money, and it was kept in a revolving account that we could relend. That ability was taken away from WICHE a few years ago, and now that money automatically goes back to the State and is reallocated each session. So what we are given is independent of the payback each biennium.

Ron Sparks:

If in fact this does happen and we are able to adjust, all it is going to do is change the way we build our budget.

William Anderson, Chief Economist, Nevada Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation:

Throughout S.B. 357 (R1) the higher education community is urged to utilize the resources of the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation (DETR) as it relates to assessing the State's workforce needs. I am here to pledge our cooperation with this effort. I have a handout called "Nevada's Hot 50," which shows the top 50 high-demand occupations in the State that we expect to see over the next decade ([Exhibit G](#)).

Chair Parnell:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 357 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN MABEY MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 357 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will open the work session on S.B. 115 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 115 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the rights of parents of pupils with disabilities. (BDR 34-737)

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).]

Chair Parnell:

The sponsor of this bill, Senator Coffin, was approving of the recommended amendments as they were presented that day.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 115 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Parnell:

I will open the work session on Senate Bill 534.

Senate Bill 534: Revises provisions governing the jurisdiction of school police officers. (BDR 34-410)

Carol Stonefield:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).]

Assemblywoman Smith:

We had a discussion on this bill when it was heard, and some of the concerns were noted. I just heard in Assembly Judiciary that there is a Senate bill similar to this but a little broader. So if both bills pass, there may be some conflict and some talk to sort those things out. In the end those concerns should be resolved between these two bills.

Chair Parnell:

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 534.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

[Meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Denise Dunning
Recording Secretary

Rachelle Myrick
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Education

Date: May 9, 2007

Time of Meeting: 3:45 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A	Assembly Committee on Education	Agenda
	B	Assembly Committee on Education	Attendance roster
SB 110	C	Julie Whitacre, Representative, Nevada State Education Association	Proposed amendment
SB 110	D	Donna Anspach, Representative, Nevadans for Quality Education	Prepared testimony
SB 110	E	Anne Loring, Representative, Washoe County School District	Standardized tests by Grade Level
SB 357	F	Senator Wiener	Prepared testimony
SB 110	G	William Anderson, Chief Economist, Nevada Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation	Nevada's Jobs - Hot 50
SB 115	H	Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
SB 534	I	Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document