

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

**Seventy-Fourth Session
February 7, 2007**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Bonnie Parnell at 3:46 p.m., on Wednesday, February 7, 2007, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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:

Ms. Bonnie Parnell, Chair
Mrs. Debbie Smith, Vice Chair
Mr. Bob Beers
Mr. David Bobzien
Mr. Mo Denis
Dr. Joseph P. (Joe) Hardy
Mr. Ruben Kihuen
Dr. Garn Mabey
Mr. Harvey J. Munford
Mr. Tick Segerblom
Mr. Lynn D. Stewart

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kristin Roberts, Committee Counsel
Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst
Kelly Troescher, Committee Secretary
Rachel Pilliod, Committee Manager
Trisha Moore, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Craig Kadlub, Clark County School District



Chair Parnell:

[Meeting called to order. Roll called.] We have a quorum. Everyone is present. That is nice to see. I would like to welcome all of you to the first meeting. I am pleased to be returning not only as the Assemblywoman for Assembly District 40, but also to be returning as Chair of the Committee. I think we accomplished a lot in the last session, and I think we, as a committee, had a good time doing it. I hope we can do good things again this session.

I am not only pleased to be chairing this Committee again, but am also delighted to have Assemblywoman Debbie Smith as Vice Chair. We have a handful of returning members. I want to acknowledge them: Dr. Mabey, Dr. Hardy, Mr. Munford, and Mr. Denis who is new to the Committee, but is a sophomore in the Legislature. We have some new individuals joining this Committee: Mr. Segerblom, Mr. Kihuen, Mr. Beers, and Mr. Stewart are all from Southern Nevada. Joining us from Northern Nevada is Mr. Bobzien from Reno. Starting with Mr. Stewart, please introduce yourself and share with us why you wanted to be on the Education Committee.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I represent the far south end of the Las Vegas Valley. I was a high school teacher for 34 years. I wanted to be on the Committee to try to straighten up some things. I want to thank the chairwoman for providing us with this list of education acronyms. I have wondered for years what all of those meant, and now I know.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I represent District 24 in Old Northwest Reno, Northeast Reno, and parts of the North Valleys. As far as my interests in serving on this Committee, I am the son of an educator. I work in the University system. Overall, I have an interest in doing what we can to prepare our kids for jobs in the future. I work in the technology area, so I have an active interest in technology in education. I was recently appointed to the statewide council to establish academic standards. I look forward to working on this Committee and working with everyone here.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

I am a lawyer in Las Vegas and the son of an educator. My mother was a teacher in Boulder City for 20 years. I wanted to be on the committee to try and change the laws from the other side [of the bar].

Assemblyman Kihuen:

I represent District 11, East Las Vegas. I am also the son of an educator. My father teaches at Robinson Middle School, and my mother was a teacher in Mexico. I come from a strong background of education. I am also a counselor

at the Community College of Southern Nevada. I help students plan out their four years of college. This Committee was my first pick, and I want to thank Chairwoman Parnell for selecting me. I look forward to working with my Committee members, the rest of the staff, and all of the lobbyists.

Assemblyman Beers:

My District is 21, which is essentially Green Valley in the Henderson area. If I could have only taken one committee, this would have been the one I chose. My wife is entering teaching this year. I taught the Young Writers Conference for four years. The children are our legacy. If we can solve the issue of education, we have guaranteed our future.

Chair Parnell:

Thank you, all of you, for your nice comments. I would also like Mr. Denis to share why he chose, in his sophomore session, to come over to the Education Committee.

Assemblyman Denis:

I am a dad of five kids. This year my wife has gone back to school to become a teacher. She is now a guest teacher with the Clark County School District. I have a son in preschool, a daughter in middle school, two sons in high school, and a daughter who is married and taking a little time off from college. I have an interest mostly as a parent. I have been involved in educational issues as the past Chair of the Commission of Educational Technology. Education is an important thing for me. I am still involved with Nevada Parent Teacher Association (PTA) as well.

Chair Parnell:

Thank you. We are glad to have all of you. We really appreciate your being here and joining us in this endeavor.

I also want to introduce our very capable staff. I was pleased to see that we have everyone back. We all enjoyed working together last session and during the interim in the Legislative Committee on Education.

It is a real delight to introduce Carol Stonefield. She is a Principal Research Analyst with the Research Division. She has staffed this Committee since 2003. She has also staffed the Legislative Committee on Education during the past two interims. Previously, Carol worked in higher education, was a staff research analyst for the Missouri Senate, and was a high school English teacher. She has a very broad background of educational interests.

Kristin Roberts is again joining us as our Legal Counsel on this Committee. She is a Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel. She is staying very busy working on the weekends making sure all the bill drafts get done. She has been with the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) for 13 years and Education, her primary focus, for the last 10 years. We are pleased to see her back.

Taking roll today is Kelly Troescher. Kelly is going to be serving a short period of time, and then off and on as our Committee Secretary. She just graduated from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), in December with her bachelor's degree in communications. This is her first session. She will be working with both the Education Committee and the Transportation Committee. Incidentally, Kelly was in my 6th and 8th grade classes. What is really special is that one year I taught an 8th grade combination Government and Leadership class. I drilled leadership and getting involved in politics and doing what you can do. Not only was Kelly one of those students, but for those of you who go to the Ways and Means Committee, there is also a young man serving on that committee this year named Barron Brooks who was in the very same Government and Leadership class. I feel like a proud mother. What is fun is that today Kelly got to take attendance rather than watching me take attendance in class every day. Welcome, Kelly.

We also have Trisha Moore, our Committee Assistant. She has been a Nevada resident for 21 years and has decided that Session will be an easier experience than chasing three boys around. She will be staffing the Education Committee and the Elections, Procedures, and Ethics Committee.

All of you will probably recognize Rachel Pilliod. She is returning as our Committee Manager. That was not easy. Rachel spent a year in Washington, D.C., after the last session working for a very prestigious group in the city. She then decided that she would think about going to medical school. She came back and took some classes at UNR. The people at UNR saw how well she did and told her if she could take some classes and keep going through spring semester, she could probably apply for medical school a year earlier than they would normally allow students to do. I had to wrangle with the powers-that-be in the Legislative building and convince them that if she missed a couple of afternoons, she would certainly be getting as much, if not more, done than most of the people in the building. You can tell her work ethic just by the double duty she is serving during the session. We were thrilled to have her back. Welcome.

We have a great group. Please feel free to contact any of us at any time. We are here to answer your questions. Most of you have received emails and/or letters from me welcoming you to our Committee meetings and letting you

know we will be meeting Mondays and Wednesdays at 3:45 p.m. in this room [3142]. We need to hear from everyone. We need to hear all opinions. We need to be able to hash out pros and cons to really do what is best for the kids in this State. I welcome those of you in the audience today and those of you who are listening. Please share that with others.

Our next order of business is to approve the Standing Rules for the Committee ([Exhibit C](#)). For those of you returning members, we really did not change anything. There were some grammatical changes so that the plurals were correct in the language. It was overlooked in the last session, and we needed to make sure it was grammatically correct. Carol and Kristin have reviewed the rules to ensure that they are in alignment with the Standing Rules of the Assembly. The only other change from the last session is under Rule 2, the grammatical changes. In [Rule 17] Miscellaneous items, you may remember, gentlemen, I made comments about keeping your suit jacket on unless the weather was warm. I have left that out of Miscellaneous this year. Please take a moment to review the rules; they are probably very similar to the rules of the other committees you are serving on. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them. If not, I will be willing to accept a motion to adopt the rules.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE
STANDING RULES.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A few comments before I have Ms. Stonefield go over what we expect to have in this Committee: All of the committees we serve on are extremely important, but it seems to me as though I have read not only in the last campaign, but also in the press coverage in the weeks leading up to the beginning of this session and comments following the State of the State, that issues on education have become the most politicized that we hear about. We see different groups taking different positions on education issues, such as full-day kindergarten, and career and technical education. You take an issue, and you probably have different groups across the State making different statements about its worth, whether or not teachers should be paid more, or if teachers are doing their jobs. These are issues that are incredibly important to the children of this State and those who are working in our schools, and yet are often times made light of. They become something that we all become afraid to deal with because we do not want to be in the group that is "pro" when there is a group that is "con." We

get in a sort of football game where the ball is being tossed back and forth, and on the field are all the students in this State waiting for our direction.

I have decided, as Chairman of this Committee, to spend the first few weeks having presentations from experts: people who cite not just one study, but multiple studies; people who are in classrooms; and whomever we can bring to the table that can give this Committee, as the policy committee on education, the information that we need to make sound judgments and to be able to cast wise votes for those who we are serving – the students and the State. Maybe it is because I spent 27 years as an educator, but I do not want to make decisions on something that I am not educated about. I do not want to cast votes on the headline that I read in a newspaper. The way I have designed the first few weeks, on Monday [February 12], we will be hearing from the school superintendents and school boards of the State presenting the iNVEST program. Wednesday [February 14], we will have a joint committee with the Senate Human Resources and Education Committee listening to the results of the A.C.R. 10 School Adequacy Study. The following week we will be hearing from the experts who put together the "Quality Counts Report" from the national publication, Education Week. We will then have reports from higher education, from K-12, and finish up with all the available information that we have not only from our school districts, but also from outside groups that have looked to the State to ask, "Are we providing an adequate education? If not, what do we do about it, and how do we get there?" I have met with the people who are doing the iNVEST presentation, and I told them that I want them to present that page by page and stop. I want them to go over Tenet 1 in that document, and I want Committee members to ask as many questions as you can possibly come up with so that you are so comfortable in that particular area by the time they finish that we can then move on. They have 12 different areas of interest in iNVEST; they will be presenting one, then you will all have the opportunity to question what you have heard. I dedicated that day just to iNVEST because it will take a couple of hours to get through it. I am hoping that as a committee we can plow through the rhetoric, sidetrack the politicalization of it, and really get to the heart of it, then make decisions based on the information that we glean from the people coming to the table in this committee room.

I am glad you mentioned the acronyms. In your folder, you will have a blue sheet ([Exhibit D](#)) that is especially important for the new members. Educators are the worst when it comes to using acronyms. We have provided for all of you, and anyone in the audience, a list of commonly used acronym references. We lose many people when we start throwing acronyms around and do not take the time to stop and explain what they mean.

In your folder, too, you have two documents. I wanted you to have these ahead of time so that you can look at the iNVEST packet ([Exhibit E](#)) and be better prepared for Monday's presentation. You also have the summary for the A.C.R. 10 Adequacy Study Report ([Exhibit F](#)). You will all have ample opportunity to be prepared to ask some questions and get more detail from those reports. It is important to have a refresher course. As Education Committee members, both former and new members, it is always good to go over the big topics from last year – the key bills that were passed, what was not passed and why, and what we will be looking forward to as far as discussion in this session. With that, I will turn it over to Ms. Stonefield. Thank you.

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:

Thank you, Madame Chair. It is customary for our committees to start each session with a general overview of the jurisdiction, the issues, and so forth that you can expect to address during this session. The Committee Brief ([Exhibit G](#)) is designed to present a lot of that information for you.

Page 1, I, states the jurisdiction of the Committee. Title 34 relates to education. Every chapter in Title 34 falls under the purview of this Committee, with the exception of chapter 387, which is school finance. Bills that contain those sections of that chapter are referred to the Ways and Means Committee. You will also encounter, from time to time during the session, bills that are concurrently referred to both this Committee and Ways and Means. It often happens that bills related to education include an appropriation. The bill will be referred first to the policy committee for your consideration, and then if the Committee reports back to the Floor, it will be referred again to the Ways and Means Committee. Occasionally you will find a bill, perhaps if there is an amendment added, that the Committee itself will wish to rerefer to another policy committee. That would be a separate motion. Generally, the issues related to education fall within this Committee.

I would add that you will encounter, as we get close to the time when bills have to be out of the Committee and also out of the Assembly, that exempted bills are only exempt when they leave this Committee and are then rereferred to the Ways and Means Committee. That is something you can keep in mind.

Page 2, II, includes some of the highlights of the 2005 Legislative Session. This Committee considered 66 bills, 53 Assembly measures and 13 Senate measures, with 27 of them passed by both Houses and sent to the Governor. I highlighted bills that are typical of the kinds of issues that you will consider, and also bills that, although they passed in 2005, have issues that may return in legislation this year.

Under "Elementary and Secondary Education," I included some information for you on the budget. The Legislature appropriated \$3.11 billion from the State general fund for elementary, secondary, and higher education: \$1.96 billion for elementary and secondary over the biennium, and \$1.15 billion for higher education. Among the kinds of issues that were funded in 2005 was the Commission on Educational Excellence from Senate Bill 404 of the 73rd Session. This established the Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation. This included an appropriation of \$100 million that was to be distributed with \$22 million for full-day kindergarten in the 2006-2007 school year, and \$13.9 million available for middle schools and high schools. The remaining \$78 million was primarily directed toward K-6. This was distributed as a grant program. The school districts and schools were authorized to propose programs of innovation or remediation to the Commission on Educational Excellence. The Commission considered the grant proposals and awarded the money. This Committee also considered accountability measures. I have highlighted one in this brief: Senate Bill 214 of the 73rd Session. The first part of it included an investigation of significant discrepancies between the test scores on the Criterion Reference Test and the National Assessment of Educational Progress. I included it here because it also contained the educational involvement accord and the code of honor, both of which are likely to come back in this session.

Under "Personnel" I included a couple of bills that relate primarily to the teacher shortage, which has been occurring for several years and will likely continue into the future. Assembly Bill 206 of the 73rd Session, which was introduced by Dr. Mabey, established a special qualifications license for people who hold masters or doctorate degrees in particular fields and are licensed. Given that they are licensed to work in that field, they would be eligible to obtain an alternative teaching license to teach subjects related to the areas in which they are licensed. Senate Bill 485 of the 73rd Session extended a sunset that allowed retired teachers to be rehired in critical shortage areas without any loss of retirement benefits. Assembly Bill 580 of the 73rd Session was a large bill that included a number of appropriations. Specifically with regard to personnel, it included \$5 million in each fiscal year for grants to the school districts to adopt programs of performance pay and enhance compensation for teachers. Again, this was a program that allowed each district to design a program that it felt would be appropriate. They could apply to the Department of Education for funding for their proposal. The two main proposals funded from A.B. 580 of the 73rd Session included establishing mentoring programs and bonus pay for teachers whose students reached a certain achievement level.

Under "Pupils," I identified several that I thought were of interest and will also be back this year. Assembly Bill 4 of the 22nd Special Session established the funding for the full-day kindergarten program. Funded with that \$22 million are 114 schools participating in six school districts. The selection was based primarily on schools that have a large number of students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals. We typically call them "Title 1 Schools." You will encounter the terms "Title 1-eligible," which of course meets the federal definition, and "Title 1-served." We receive an allocation from the federal government that will not cover all of our Title 1-eligible schools. Those that are served receive funding when the money runs out. The rest of those schools would have received some assistance if there had been more funding. Assembly Bill 580 of the 73rd Session also provided some funding for full-day kindergarten facilities. If you will note that because the Legislature decided to appropriate \$4.7 million in the fiscal year 2006, it went into effect before the end of June 2005. The rest of it was funded for this school year for portable classrooms to assist the school districts. There was also \$175,000 for a pilot program to assist children who are Limited English Proficient (LEP) with a summer program before they start kindergarten to help them with some language development. There was also \$500,000 in each fiscal year to implement a pilot alternative program for disruptive pupils.

This Committee considered charter schools and will likely consider them again this session. The main issues that I highlighted for this section include sponsorship of the charters. Senate Bill 56 of the 73rd Session allows a new charter school committee to apply directly to the State Board of Education for sponsorship. Prior to this change in statute, the new committees were required to go through the school districts first, then apply to the State Board of Education. Assembly Bill 162 of the 73rd Session allowed the charter schools to change their sponsors. When their charter expires, they are allowed to apply to the State Board of Education for sponsorship. Senate Bill 461 of the 73rd Session established the Davidson Academy on the campus of the University of Nevada, Reno. This is the school for profoundly gifted students. A student has to be in the top less-than-1% in achievement scores in order to be eligible to participate. This bill will likely be back because at this time, although the school is considered a public school, it is not receiving any Distributive School Account (DSA) funds. It is not really a charter school, and it is not really a district school, so this Committee is probably going to be asked to consider the status of that school this session.

We also looked at Career and Technical Education (CTE). It was a major issue in 2005. There was a considerable interest in it and a number of bills. Assembly Bill 388 of the 73rd Session requires that the State Board of Education establish an endorsement on high school diplomas for CTE. We also

provided funding in each fiscal year for advisory technical skills committees to work with the CTE programs and develop curriculum and work-based experiences for students. This bill established the Subcommittee to Study the Effectiveness in Career and Technical High Schools in Nevada. Chairwoman Parnell was the Chair of that Subcommittee, and she has a presentation planned in a couple of weeks to discuss the findings and the legislation that has been recommended by that Subcommittee.

This Committee also studies postsecondary education, including both for-profit schools, as well as the Nevada System of Higher Education. I highlighted only Senate Bill 4 of the 22nd Special Session. It relates to the Millennium Scholarship that is likely to be a continuing issue this session. Last year in the 22nd Special Session, the Legislature moved to change the name of the Millennium Scholarship to honor Governor Guinn, who was the original sponsor of the idea. We made some other changes. Students can use it during the summer academic term. There had been some question about [summer session], but the Legislature established a maximum of 12 credit hours per semester. It also prohibited students from using the scholarship to pay for remedial and developmental courses. It also addressed the grade point average (GPA) students must maintain while they are enrolled in an eligible institution. Previously, the GPA was cumulative. Now it will be by semester. Students who once had an opportunity to recover from a disastrous semester will have to maintain at least a 2.6 in their freshman year, and at least a 2.75 in each semester after that. Senate Bill 4 of the 22nd Special Session also addressed some of the funding issues. The Millennium Scholarship, as it was originally enacted, has been funded by the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement. Of those revenues, 40% are to be deposited in the trust fund for the Millennium Scholarship. However, the obligations of the scholarship have exceeded the estimated revenues in part because some of the revenues have been paid into escrow accounts. The tobacco companies are challenging the settlement, and in order to avoid a shortfall, the Legislature made a one-time transfer of \$35 million from the State General Fund to the Millennium Trust Fund, and then also provided for continuing funding through the Abandoned Property Trust Fund. The first \$7.6 million in each fiscal year available in that fund is to be transferred to the Millennium Trust Fund. There are a couple of unsuccessful bills from the 2005 Session that I thought I would highlight. They are likely to be back again this year as well. Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 73rd Session proposed to amend the Constitution to allow for a lottery. The proposal would have dedicated the funds to education: textbooks, instructional supplies, and class size reduction. Senate Bill 284 of the 73rd Session contained the proposals from iNVEST 2005, and we assume that will be back this year as well. Assembly Bill 562 of the 73rd Session was a proposal to address No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which was enacted by Congress in 2001 and signed by

President Bush in early 2002. This bill would have required that school officials could eliminate or reduce programs associated with NCLB if Congress did not provide sufficient funds to pay for the costs of those programs. It also would have called for a study of the cost to implement all services associated with NCLB.

In section 3 on pages 6, 7, 8, and 9, you will find a list of statutory reports that are required to be made to the Legislature or sometimes, specifically, to the Legislative Committee on Education. I will not go through this list, but if you find any reports of interest to you and would like to receive a copy, I would be happy to get one for you. The Statutory Elementary and Secondary Reports are in subsection 1. There were new reports required that are provided in subsection 2.

On page 8 under subsection 3, I will note that Assembly Bill 580 of the 73rd Session, section 34, established the financial management reviews of the school districts. I believe that the only one that was conducted in the last interim was Clark County School District. I think the Chair plans to have a presentation from the district on that financial management review. The Nevada Association of School Boards reviewed seatbelts on school buses. The Technical Skills Advisory Committees in the school districts provided a report in December 2006. Section B provides the Higher Education Statutory Reports. Section C lists the four committees that considered issues related to education in the last interim. The Legislative Committee on Education, established in 1997, has the statutory authority to review any issues related to elementary, secondary, and higher education.

As a result of Assembly Bill 388 of the 73rd Session, the Legislative Committee itself was required to establish the subcommittee that Chairwoman Parnell chaired. The Legislative Committee to study school financing adequacy, the A.C.R 10 Committee, has another report that the Chairwoman has planned to schedule later this session. This Committee looked at what is an adequate education, and what it would cost to finance an adequate education. Finally, the Legislative Committee on Persons with Disabilities was specifically assigned by Senate Bill 134 of the 73rd Session to consider the manner by which school districts can meet the needs of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. Interpreters have been an issue. A number of years ago the Legislature established that all school interpreters would meet a certain standard by a certain date. That has raised some issues. The Persons with Disabilities Committee considered that during the interim and made some recommendations.

Chair Parnell:

I want to stop you before you go into possible issues for this session just to open the floor up to any questions. I would also like to make note that Vice Chairman Debbie Smith chaired the A.C.R. 10 Adequacy Study Report, which was quite a heavy responsibility. I thank her for doing that and doing it so wonderfully during the interim. Are there any questions regarding what has been done in the past?

Assemblyman Kihuen:

I have a quick question in regard to page 4. Under Assembly Bill 580 of the 73rd Session, it looks like the \$175,000 was allocated to certain school districts for the English Language Learners Program. Do we know which school districts received that money and how successful the program was?

Carol Stonefield:

Washoe County had a pilot program, and I am not sure if there was one in Clark County?

Chair Parnell:

Mrs. Smith, our Vice Chairman, can answer that. That was part of A.B. 580 of the 73rd Session that was proposed.

Assemblywoman Smith:

We did have several schools that participated from Washoe County, which is where the idea originally came from. We had very limited participation from Clark County and one rural school district that participated. One of the things that bill called for was matching funding. The districts were charged with finding private funding to match the funding from the State so that the program would go further. Due to some difficulties, Clark County did not get the full funding to completely match their possibilities of money. We should be getting that report any day.

Assemblyman Beers:

My question relates to A.J.R. 2 of the 73rd Session and its failure. It seems to me that for a state with the personality of Nevada, it would have been a "no brainer." Was it the casinos that brought this one down?

Carol Stonefield:

I am not sure what happened with that. We would have to take a look at the vote and the minutes to see the hearings on the bill.

Chair Parnell:

Ms. Stonefield cannot answer anything specifically like that. What I will say is that it did pass through the Assembly. It failed on the Senate side. It was not a unanimous vote out of the Assembly Chambers, but it did have the majority vote. It was sent over [to the Senate], and it failed to survive the Senate vote. There will be continuing discussion on the idea of a lottery and what we can do to shore up funding for such things as instructional supplies.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Are you saying that we will vote on all-day kindergarten, and then it will go to Ways and Means? Or we do not consider that?

Carol Stonefield:

I am not aware, yet, of a bill. When bills are assigned to committee, it is up to Leadership. If the bill were to originate in the Assembly, it would be up to Leadership to assign that bill. If it strictly has only sections from chapter 387, it would automatically go to Ways and Means. Otherwise, it would possibly be assigned here and concurrently referred to Ways and Means. If bills such as that were to originate in the Senate, it would be up to the Senate Leadership to assign the bill.

Chair Parnell:

To answer the question a little more specifically, last session it was a policy issue. It was something I wanted the Education Committee members to hear and have input as to the value of the program. The initial presentation was done in this Committee. It was supported out of this Committee, and was rereferred to Ways and Means for the financial implication of the legislation. Any other questions for Ms. Stonefield before she goes on? [There were none.] Thank you.

Carol Stonefield:

Section 4 on page 10 highlights some issues that came from the interim and also originated from issues in the 2005 Session that are likely to be back for this Committee's consideration, or at least for the Legislature's consideration. Some of them relate to funding and may not specifically come to this committee.

The bill drafts that were requested by the Legislative Committee give you an idea of the range of issues that are considered by the interim committee. One

bill draft involves parental involvement. There is P-16 coordination, truancy prevention, mentoring and induction of new teachers, revisions to the operations of the Commission on Educational Excellence, and services for deaf or hard-of-hearing pupils. I will note that while the Legislative Committee on Persons with Disabilities was specifically assigned to consider that, presentations were also made to the Legislative Committee on Education. For that reason, the Committee acted to propose a bill draft request. The Committee also recommended to the next interim committee that it consider local school governments, charter schools, and further consideration for truancy and drop-out prevention. There will likely be further revisions to the accountability provisions. When we refer to accountability provisions, we are generally referring to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session was our implementation legislation in Nevada for the provisions of NCLB. Some of the provisions of Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session are not directly tied to NCLB. Those are some ideas in areas where we can revise provisions relating to specific tests, test administration or different sorts of support services, technical assistance, et cetera.

The bill drafts that were requested from the Subcommittee to Study the Effectiveness in Career and Technical High Schools include a Career in Technical Education Academies Act, which would enable two or more school districts with partners from the community to establish joint career and technical high schools. A proposal was also requested to create a new fund that would include an appropriation of \$10 million to provide grants to assist the school districts with career and technical information programs. The Subcommittee also adopted a resolution to urge the higher education system and the school districts to work to ensure a seamless transition, more tech prep, more dual credit courses, and that sort of thing.

Under the bill drafts that have been requested for this Committee, you would find High School Reform, Charter School Operations, the University School for Profoundly Gifted Students, which is also called the Davidson Academy, and computers for underserved children and families to increase literacy. The funding issues relate to the [A.C.R. 10] Adequacy Study, the iNVEST proposal, continued funding for the Account for Programs for Innovation and Prevention of Remediation, and the teacher incentives that were contained in A.B. 580 of the 73rd Session.

The Nevada System of Higher Education office identified some issues that are of concern to them. These, more than likely, will go to the money committees, but it is something to keep in mind. They would like to discuss with the Legislature their tuition policy and enrollment projections, as well as workforce development. From the 2003 session, pursuant to Assembly Bill 203 of the

72nd Session, the Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs was established. Many of the recommendations that came from that interim committee related to workforce development and kinds of programs that this State is going to need as it attempts to diversify its economy. There is a committee report, and if anyone is interested, I would be happy to help you get a copy.

The Millennium Scholarship will continue to be an issue. There are some bills already filed. Right now, the State Treasurer is assigned some administrative duties, and has proposed to transfer those to the Board of Regents.

Potential federal issues about which the Committee should be aware include the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind Act. As you are all aware, most legislation enacted by Congress has an expiration date and must be reauthorized. This is the year to consider reauthorization of NCLB. The proposals from the administration include using a growth model to measure individual student progress, therefore authorizing the states to move specified federal funds among programs: in other words, essentially taking a number of federal appropriations and creating a block grant to the states and letting them decide what they want to spend the money on within a select number of programs. There also appears to be an interest in expanding the provisions of NCLB to high school. Most of NCLB at this time is related to the lower grades, elementary through middle school, although there is a requirement that there has to be a standardized test in one of the grades 10-12. We meet that with our High School Proficiency Exam. There appears to be some interest in expanding some of the other provisions of NCLB to the high school.

Another proposal would be to allow public schools that go into restructuring to offer school choice that would include private schools. It would also remove the limitation on teacher transfers from their collective bargaining agreements. Congress has also not reauthorized the Higher Education Act. It was first filed in the 108th Congress, and they did not reenact it in the 109th either. I do not know the number yet, and I do not believe it has been filed for the 110th. Key issues will be the student loan provisions, for-profit colleges, and the proliferation in academic earmarks that Congress has become fond of over the last couple of sessions.

The last several pages are simply for your reference. There are some key contacts in section 5, pages 13 and 14. Section 6 has some important dates on the 120-day calendar. I am sure you have heard that in a number of your committees already. Section 7, page 16 includes some useful websites. Pages 17, 18, and 19 are the glossary. I would be happy to try to answer any questions if you have them.

Chair Parnell:

I have a quick clarification. If you turn back to page 12 with the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind. I think it is important to note that when a congressional act comes up for reauthorization, it can be modified by either the Congress or recommendations by the President for modification to the original Act. Many of the suggestions here are the proposals that President Bush has put forward to modify the original Act. Many people are upset about parts of the original NCLB, and we have that to digest and decide whether or not we want to make, maybe as a committee, a statement about what we need to look at now. Additional modifications are added to that. We need to respond or maybe we do not need to respond – that is a decision we need to all make – to the original NCLB because Congress can now reauthorize it with changes. Now we have the original plus the new suggestions for revising the original Act. It is something that I feel strongly about that the Committee probably needs to make a statement on it at some point in time. We will have some discussion of this later. I wanted to point out that these are recommendations proposed by the President, and we have to consider what further difficulty this might cause the school districts, and what costs are associated with some of these additional recommendations. It is something I think the educational family needs to look at. Do we do anything with it as it is, and then do we do anything with it as changes are proposed? It is something to keep in mind. Any questions?

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Is there nothing in there about "empowerment schools?"

Carol Stonefield:

No, there is nothing in there about empowerment schools at this time.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

That would be something that would come to us, also?

Chair Parnell:

Absolutely. That will probably be heard in Ways and Means. There are two bills that will be coming our way dealing with empowerment. I know Senator Horsford has one of the bills referencing empowerment schools, and there is one other one. We will definitely be hearing some proposals on that program.

Carol Stonefield:

If I may comment, during the interim, the Legislative Committee on Education did hear testimony on empowerment schools. A professor from UCLA, William Ouchi, came and gave a presentation on them. There is something in the brief because the Legislative Committee on Education directed itself to study

local school governments in the next interim. The Committee itself thought that it needed additional information on that particular issue. They also voted to send a letter to the Clark County School District Board of Trustees asking them to keep the committee and the Legislature informed as to its progress of its four pilot empowerment schools. That is how the interim committee addressed the issue. As far as other proposals that have been made since that time, we have no bill numbers, and there is nothing yet to deal with.

Chair Parnell:

Similar to that, too, we have the Autonomy Zones, and I think Senator Horsford's bill addresses the Autonomy Zones. I am anxious to learn more about how those two models are similar and how they differ. That will be an education for all of us. Since we see them at so few schools at this point in time, not too many of us know the concept. Additional questions? [There were none.] There is certainly much to mull over. Thank you. Great presentation. Is there anyone from the public who would like to make a comment at this time? Feel free. I always encourage public comment. Any comments resulting from the presentation or anything going on in the next couple of weeks, feel free to put in your two cents.

Dr. Mabey:

I just wanted to say I am glad to be back. Finally, after three terms, I think I am starting to understand the process a little. I am grateful for the Committee and all those I worked with last session in this Committee. I found it to be very enjoyable. I appreciate all the help that I got with A.B. 206 of the 73rd Session from everyone. I hope it is helping some student somewhere with some good quality teachers. I pledge that we will work together and find solutions to help our kids and other people get educated better in the State. Thank you.

Chair Parnell:

Thank you very much. Again, both you and Dr. Hardy were really great members of this Committee last session. We were certainly pleased to see that you wanted to come back. Thank you.

Assemblyman Munford:

I just wanted to say something regarding charter schools. I did not hear too much of that mentioned. My district seems to be really inundated with charter schools all of a sudden. We already have the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Charter School, the 100 Academy of Excellence Charter School, and there is another on board. They have already started clearing the land to bring another charter school. I am thinking we would like to address that down the road. I think enrollment will impact some of our regular public schools that have been there for a long time. I do not see the value sometimes of bringing all of those

charter schools into my district. I do not think many people, especially from Southern Nevada, are aware of what is in my district and all of West Las Vegas. There is a private Christian school that is located in Doolittle Center. I do not know the status of them as far as credibility or if they are under the State Board of Education jurisdiction. I know Dr. Craig Kadlub is very informed, and at one time he held the position of being the administrator over charter schools. Are you aware of the Christian school that is in Doolittle Center?

Dr. Craig Kadlub, Director of Government Affairs, Clark County School District:

I am actually not aware of it, but you were correct when you stated that private schools are under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education. That would be the entity monitoring that school.

Assemblyman Munford:

Not many people know about it, but I was approached one day to see it. I took a tour of it. I am not saying that education is not valuable and is not needed in my district, but I am a very strong advocate of the public school system. I think down the road I would like to look deeper into the charter school situation.

Chair Parnell:

We will be discussing charter school legislation this session. Again, it was one of the recommendations for a study in the next interim from the Legislative Committee on Education. I think we are all aware that they can be absolutely phenomenal. We have some terrific charter schools out there. We also have to be rather cautious about the governance, finances, and operations of charter schools, so we can be vigilant about keeping a balance and recognizing the really terrific ones and the ones that probably have no business serving our students. Thank you for that interest. Any other comments or questions from the Committee? [There were none.] [Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kelly Troescher
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assembly Member Bonnie Parnell, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Education

Date: February 7, 2007

Time of Meeting: 3:46 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda for February 7
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Education Committee	Standing Rules of the Assembly Committee on Education
	D	Education Committee	Education Acronyms
	E	State Association of School Boards (SASB) and State Association of Superintendents (SAS)	iNVest '07 packet
	F	Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA)	A.C.R. 10 Adequacy Study
	G	Carol Stonefield, Research Analyst	Committee Brief, Assembly Committee on Education