

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

**Seventy-fourth Session
April 25, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education was called to order by Chair Maurice E. Washington at 2:08 p.m. on Wednesday, April 25, 2007, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 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 in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Chair
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske, Vice Chair
Senator Dennis Nolan
Senator Joseph J. Heck
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Steven A. Horsford
Senator Joyce Woodhouse

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Assembly District No. 40
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Assembly District No. 9
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Assembly District No. 30

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marsheilah D. Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst
Joe McCoy, Committee Policy Analyst
Sara Partida, Committee Counsel
Shauna Kirk, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Keith W. Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of
Education
Robert L. Crowell, School Board Trustee, Carson City

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
April 25, 2007
Page 2

Joyce Haldeman, Clark County School District
Joseph Enge, Education Policy Analyst, Nevada Policy Research Institute
Bill Arensdorf, Office of Fiscal Accountability, Department of Education
Jeanette K. Belz, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors
John Gwaltney, Ph.D. State Board of Education and State Board for Career and
Technical Education, Department of Education
Dr. Craig Kadlub, Clark County School District
Dr. Dotty Merrill, Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards
Anne Loring, Washoe County School District
Racquel Abowd
Julie Whitacre, Nevada State Education Association

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We will open the meeting on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 250.

ASSEMBLY BILL 250 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing private elementary and secondary educational institutions. (BDR 34-580)

KEITH W. RHEULT, Ph.D. (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

Assembly Bill 250 was brought forward by the State Department of Education and submitted to the Governor. It is a matter of issues that came up over the years with private school responsibilities that we have with the Department of Education. This year, there are over 20,000 students currently in the State that are in private schools. We have two types of private schools. There are licensed, private schools and exempt schools. There are a variety of ways to become exempt and most of the time it is religion-based. Job Corps is an exempt school and Rite of Passage is an exempt school. We have asked for a number of changes. I do not think they are critical but are for clarifying purposes. Section 1 reduces the safety drills that are required of private schools. They are required to do more than public schools and this puts it in-line. The bill will reduce drills to one a month instead of two. Section 2 has to do with the change for private, exempt schools. Over the past biennium, we had some questions whether they were included in the inspections required of schools. When I get calls from parents, they do not care about whether it is exempt or licensed, private. They want to know if anything has happened at the school and whether the State has inspected it. It was clear I was to do inspections whether they were exempt or licensed and private. Section 2, subsection 3, makes it clear that as part of the initial application before an

exempt status, we ask for the inspection records showing that it meets safety requirements. Section 3 clarifies licensed, private schools continue to be inspected and that we will ask for insurance coverage. We also clarified what we mean by insurance coverage for the licensed, private schools. The final section clarifies the fee payment for licensed schools. It did require that we consider fees for an exemption or a renewal for an exemption. We have read the statute to say that it was for licensing purposes and exempt them from licensing and have never charged exempt private schools a fee. They are technically not licensed. The other two items talk about initial license for clarification.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Will you clarify section 2, subsection 3? Are you asking that they provide you with a receipt of an exemption or a renewal of an exemption?

DR. RHEAULT:

Yes. I can provide you with the current wording that we ask for when they apply for an exempt status. They are exempt from a number of things. Even exempt schools have to agree or provide assurance that they will follow the length of the school day or meet the minimum requirements in the number of days. What we have asked for in the past is that they provide a certificate of meeting fire codes, a certificate of meeting safety codes, health and sanitation codes and provide evidence of communication for compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Is it just a certificate, or are you actually going to go out and do the inspection?

DR. RHEAULT:

That is all we ask for normally. We are asking that someone does that inspection. On a new application, I have staff do on on-site visit, not the inspection, to make sure that the facilities are in order and are ready to start. Subsection 3 is where it was believed we had authority. If you look at the initial changes, the former wording said "the Superintendent shall cause an inspection" We thought that was the authority, however, the exempt schools wanted to make sure it was clear that we did have authority. I thought it would be cleaner if clarified in statute.

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
April 25, 2007
Page 4

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Will you actually do the physical inspection?

DR. RHEAULT:
The Department of Education staff will not, but it will be asking for the certificate that someone has looked at it in the county the school is operating.

SARA PARTIDA (Committee Counsel):
The way that it reads, it does seem to assume that the inspection would be from the superintendent or that he would somehow cause that inspection.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
We could have it say a notarized certificate from the appropriate agency.

DR. RHEAULT:
I could work on the wording.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 250.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CEGAVSKE ABSTAINED FROM THE
VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
We will now open the hearing on A.B. 267.

ASSEMBLY BILL 267 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the board of trustees of certain school districts to cause each meeting of the board to be televised.
(BDR 34-1164)

ASSEMBLYMAN TICK SEGERBLOM (Assembly District No. 9):
Assembly Bill 267 originally started out as a mandate to require the Clark County School District (CCSD) to televise their board meetings. We are the only large county that does not televise meetings. Assemblyman Hardy convinced me to make it discretionary and ask that they look at the issue, come

back in the next session and let us know if it could be done. We are also asking the cities in Clark County to work with the school districts in putting meetings on the cable stations they already have. It is not mandatory and is strictly a request that they look at this issue. Carson City already does this with their school boards meetings.

ROBERT L. CROWELL (School Board Trustee, Carson City):

I am here as an individual member of the school board of trustees in Carson City. You can get the tape from the community access television provider in Carson City which is the Brewery Arts Center.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Does the public have to pay for a copy?

MR. CROWELL:

There is a charge by that entity to duplicate it and provide the tape. That entity is a 501(c)(3) code section under the Internal Revenue Service. It is a private entity funded through grants from Carson City and the cable company.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Does Clark County charge?

MR. CROWELL:

I do not know.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Can you listen on the radio or on the Internet in any of the counties?

ASSEMBLYMAN TICK SEGERBLOM:

Clark County does not have it on the Internet or televised or even recorded. There may be audio but not visual.

JOYCE HALDEMAN (Clark County School District):

We do have a visual recording of the meetings. It is a single camera from the back of the room. People used to get a cassette tape. Now, they can actually get a compact disc. The quality is not real strong. They also just started "Board Docs." This is a new program they are using that has only been in place now for about a month. It is not the same thing as watching a board meeting

online. If you are online, you can follow where they are in the action they are taking. It does not satisfy what he has in mind.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:
Can I go on and listen like people can here?

MS. HALDEMAN:
No.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:
Why does the school district not have audio?

MS. HALDEMAN:
The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) affiliate is completely different than having a government access channel.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:
If this bill were a mandate, do you know what it would cost?

MS. HALDEMAN:
If it were a mandate, we would not use the PBS affiliate as a vehicle. It would be the cable access channels that are available. We expect the costs would be approximately \$500,000 with cable.

MR. CROWELL:
The contract between Carson City and the government access provider is about \$115,000 a year. We believe that the correct amount is being negotiated to \$160,000 to \$170,000 a year. That is the hard cost, but is free to the school district. We do not pay anything for that. That is a service provided by the Internal Revenue Service section 501(c)(3) that we take advantage of as well as Carson City.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:
How many meetings do you have a month that are broadcast?

MR. CROWELL:
We have two meetings a month which are broadcast twice a week.

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
April 25, 2007
Page 7

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

How many does the school board have a month?

MR. CROWELL:

I do not know.

MS. HALDEMAN:

The CCSD has two regularly scheduled board meetings on the second and fourth Thursday of every month. They have a number of special meetings as needed, usually not more than five or six meetings in total a month.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Have you thought about the grants like Carson City.

MS. HALDEMAN:

The genesis of Assemblyman Segerblom's bill would be to have given us the same kind of access to a government access channel that Carson City and Washoe County have. People think we have access to PBS and can just use that. This bill, in its original form, would have required channel 2 and channel 4, which are currently controlled by the city and the county, to provide access time for the CCSD on the government-access channel. The costs that I mentioned would have been for the school district to get the equipment and the information to be ready for broadcast.

MR. CROWELL:

By the end of this month, your legislative meetings will be broadcast on our government-access channels.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM:

The budget is about \$2 billion a year. They could spend a \$100,000, and let us see what goes on.

JOSEPH ENGE (Education Policy Analyst, Nevada Policy Research Institute):

I individually support this in terms of transparency. Transparency is starting to engage the public. People are watching and stopping me in the community regarding the meetings.

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
April 25, 2007
Page 8

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 267.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
We will now hear A.B. 334.

ASSEMBLY BILL 334 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing charter schools. (BDR 34-413)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH (Assembly District No. 30):
Assembly Bill 334 is a charter school bill that set out to continue an ongoing effort to improve our charter school legislation. In this bill we do two things. We create a school district that is designated as the charter school district for State-sponsored charter schools. This is a technical change that is solely for the purpose of fulfilling federal law governing charter schools. I do not want everyone to think we are creating a new school district.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
I thought we did it last session, but all we did was create another sponsorship. The intent was to create that eighteenth district. I thought we had accomplished that, but I guess we just provided another opportunity to meet the federal requirement.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:
This will do the technical fix. It has become a problem complying with the federal laws.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Will this also satisfy the local education agency requirement that has always been elusive.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

This will also clarify that upon closure of a school, an administrator of the school is the trustee of certain records. A problem in the past has been who is responsible for those records.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

There is no mention of compensation should the charter school be revoked or if the charter decides to close.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

We did not discuss that. I am open to that idea. The next issue is a technical fix that would allow charter schools to receive money for homeschooled students who take a class at a charter school. That is another issue that we thought was resolved in the last session. We also have some revisions to the requirements for an administrator of a charter school. There are no provisions for any type of professional training or degree for an administrator of a charter school, currently. When we met with some of the schools and talked about what we could do to keep the charter schools moving forward and progressing, that was one of the areas that was discussed. If we increased that requirement, we really are improving the ability of the administrators to perform their work and lessen the chances of problems down the road. The last issue is one that deals with the salary or compensation of an administrator in a charter school. The provision requires that the amount of money spent from public funds for an administrator cannot be more than comparable salaries within that particular school district. That is the only issue that has drawn any interest whatsoever. In a budget discussion from another committee, it was brought to my attention that there is no provision regarding how much administrators of a charter school can make. In fact, we have one situation where the administrators' salaries for a very small staff were almost half of the entire budget of the school. We came up with the idea that a charter school's governing board still retains all their authority, because they tend to raise private funds anyway to supplement their budget. They can put in as much money as they want from private funds to be able to supplement his salary and attract any level of administrator they desire. The public funds would be capped at the comparable salary of a district or an administrator in that district. I felt that it was very important for us to look at this issue as did the entire committee.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

After speaking with you, I tend to agree with you. This provides some flexibility and opportunity for innovations for those teachers and staff that want to create learning environments for students. I did receive telephone calls and e-mails from so many administrators who were concerned it would negate some of the flexibility in hiring, promoting or contracting with certain administrators and take away the flexibility for a charter school to govern itself. We have come up with some language that would maintain the integrity of your provision and making sure that the flexibility is there. Mr. McCoy will read some of that.

JOE MCCOY (Committee Policy Analyst):

If the salary exceeds the amount specified in subsection 7 of the present bill, the sponsor is to conduct a review and audit. The sponsor may determine the salary is excessive and require the charter school reduce the salary. The sponsor may consider the justification and reasons for the salary submitted by the charter school.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We would provide the amendment. If it meets your satisfaction, we can amend and bring it back.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

I am open to ideas.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We will have staff do a mock-up.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

This is good for charter schools as it prevents them from being seen as a negative in the media or to the public.

SENATOR WIENER:

Will the amendment that you are suggesting replace the one that sets the cap on the top administrator's pay, or is it in addition?

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

It will still have subsection 7 with a few additional sentences to provide some coverage.

SENATOR WIENER:

I would be concerned about replacing it, because you would be making that salary extraordinary in charter schools and complicate it even more.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Would you include the public schools in this as well as the charter school to have the same guidelines?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

I am not sure what guidelines that you would connect that with. I am talking about administrators who are contracted for \$11,000 a month.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

This deals specifically with charter schools. This bill has been drafted by the Department of Education.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

It is a good point to be made. We are supposed to be treating charter schools the same as a public school entity. If that is true, I think that is something that needs to be answered.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

There is parity there. We are treating them the same because we are using one basic salary for a guide.

SENATOR HECK:

Is the purpose of the amendment that, if they are paid over and above the comparable public salary, there would be an audit and the ability to have that salary justified?

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

That is correct. If it is not justified, then action can be taken.

BILL ARENSDORF (Office of Fiscal Accountability, Department of Education):

I am here in support of A.B. 334. Under the current provisions for sponsorship of charters, the two eligible sponsors are either the local school district or the State Board of Education. We do not have a problem with the charter schools that are sponsored by a local school district. Under both federal and State law those public charter schools are considered schools of a local education agency

and as such they are eligible for all kinds of federal aid. The problem comes in with the charters that are sponsored by the State Board. There is no provision in current state law that says they are a local school district. By creating the framework for this district, Nevada can say that our charter schools are a local district and sponsored by the State Board which makes them eligible for federal aid. We have learned that by denying this opportunity to children who attend these schools, we may risk losing a lot of federal aid to other public schools. Currently, the charters that are sponsored by the State Board are only eligible for public charter school money, and they are excluded from all of the other kinds.

JEANETTE K. BELZ (Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors):

The Associated General Contractors are highly involved and one of the sponsors of the Academy for Career Education Charter School. We are supportive of the provision to have someone responsible for records.

JOHN GWALTNEY, Ph.D. (State Board of Education and State Board for Career and Technical Education, Department of Education):

I am here in support of A.B. 334. The State Board of Education reviewed this at the last meeting. We felt that most of these activities were logical steps that needed to be made. It was a surprise that subsection 7 dealing with compensation was in this package. There are a number of possible alternatives that might arise under that section that are not clearly identified. For example, private, for profit charter schools are making applications in the State. The question of compensation to an administrator may not be as significant as the questions of overall profit to that organization. I will convey to my colleagues on the State Board that what I have heard from both sides of this building is the responsibility of the State Board to get the most for our State dollars.

DR. CRAIG KADLUB (Clark County School District):

I would like to express the Clark County School District's support for section 3 of this bill. On a few occasions, there have been school closures and responsibility, retention and care of the records has been a problem. This should address that.

DR. DOTTY MERRILL (Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards):

The Nevada Association of School Boards supports this bill.

ANNE LORING (Washoe County School District):
The Washoe County School District is also in support of this bill.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
Can we devise language for compensation for the administrators who retain the records so they are not working on a volunteer basis?

DR. MERRILL:
That would be a decision that the governing body would need to make. The intent is that there is a real person who has the responsibility and duty to care for those records and make sure that any bills coming in for the first year get paid.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
I do not think they would be willing to retain the records for a full year for free.

KEITH W. RHEAULT, Ph.D. (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):
If they have not closed because they filed bankruptcy, they should be paid if there is funding in the school's budget. I do not know how that cost would be covered if they were bankrupt. There are usually assets that can be sold to pay the final cost.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
We can put some language in that would say, if applicable they would be compensated.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 334 and open the hearing on A.B. 512.

ASSEMBLY BILL 512 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing educational personnel and student teachers. (BDR 34-1370)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BONNIE PARNELL (Assembly District No. 40):
Assembly Bill 512 allows school districts to hire student teachers to serve as substitutes in at-risk schools and in hard-to-fill positions. The rationale for this bill stems from our growing teacher shortage. We hire short- and long-term substitute teachers who, in most cases, have not completed the same rigorous training as student teachers who are graduating from our universities.

This bill will help school districts address the need for well trained teachers and would encourage our college graduates to stay in our State. If you go to two sixth-grade classrooms side by side, in one of those classrooms you might have someone who has graduated from the university and is highly qualified in the subject and endorsed in a certain area working in a classroom getting no pay. Next door you may have a substitute teacher in the classroom who has most likely had no formal educational training getting paid on a daily basis. It is very important that we have highly qualified teachers teaching a subject they are qualified to teach. During that student-teaching semester, we are not utilizing their expertise. That is what this bill addresses.

RACQUEL ABOWD:

There was a position at Carson Middle School for a long-term substitute. While I was still attending classes at Sierra Nevada College, there was a short-term and a long-term substitute position that opened. I was able to substitute in that position while still attending classes, which gave me the experience of being at Carson Middle School. The long-term substitute position became available in the fall. I asked the principal if it would be possible for me to take that position as a long-term substitute while also fulfilling my requirements for student teaching. Sierra Nevada College was willing to work with me on this as long as I agreed to have additional evaluations since there would be no additional teacher with me full time. At the end of the first semester, I was a highly qualified teacher, and I did have my full degree.

SENATOR HECK:

How do you account for what time is on what clock?

MS. ABOWD:

I believe you are referring to when you have a student teaching, the student teacher pays the university. The student is also being paid by the school district for the substituting time within the school. There is a regulation regarding the amount of days you have to substitute before you qualify for the long-term substitute rate. Prior to that number of days, you are paid the regular substitute rate.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

The student still pays for the credit at the college. Once they become eligible and are offered a student teaching position, they would be getting paid the day rate of substitute pay.

SENATOR HECK:

If you are in the classroom, are you there as a substitute and being paid, or are you there as a student teacher and not getting paid?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

The way that it is written, it is not clear.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

When you are a long-term substitute you are being paid, but you will not be compensated for the credits that you are obtaining. Maybe the Nevada P-16 Council could be charged with untangling the mess with substitutes and bringing it back to this Committee.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

This actually directs each board of trustees to devise a policy. That would be great in the long term.

SARA PARTIDA (Committee Counsel):

The Nevada P-16 Council is not created in statute yet. It is in another bill.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We will charge the Assembly Committee on Education to look at long-term substitutes, and if the P-16 Council passes and they want to charge the P-16 Council, we can give them the task of untangling it.

MS. ABOWD:

I was substituting while getting my teaching credential. I already had my degree, and my teaching credential was separate. When it came time for my student teaching and a position was open, I had the experience from the prior semester which gave the administrators an opportunity to see me teaching.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We need to clean up subsection 4 of section 1, and make it clearer.

SENATOR HECK:

When you were doing this dual duty, is there a time you were considered a student teacher and another time you were considered a substitute, or was it all melded into one and you were a student teacher slash substitute?

Ms. ABOWD:

It was all melded into one.

SENATOR HECK:

That is where the confusion comes in and needs to be clarified.

Ms. ABOWD:

As far as the school district was concerned, I signed a time sheet just like a substitute. As far as Sierra Nevada College was concerned, I was doing my course work, paying my tuition as a student teacher.

JOYCE HALDEMAN (Clark County School District):

When a student teacher is acting as a full-time substitute, there are often requirements from the university for additional things outside of the classroom. From the school district's point of view, she is a full-time substitute. The reason for that sentence is to clarify that the district does not have to pay her compensation as she fulfills the other college responsibilities.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We just want to make that more clear.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

It does look like lines 25 and 26 are not necessary. If we stay silent on that, it may make more sense than if we try to explain our way out of it.

Ms. PARTIDA:

We can leave that last sentence in subsection 4 out, or say something similar to a student teacher who is not a substitute is not entitled to payment from the district.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

The latter.

Ms. HALDEMAN:

We are one of the school districts that already has this in practice.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Who defines "at-risk"?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

I believe it has been 65 percent of the pupils enrolled in free or reduced lunch.

DR. RHEAULT:

I believe my testimony was that there was no standard definition of "at-risk". Currently, if you are an all-day kindergarten school receiving money, that "at-risk" nature was 55.1 percent or above free and reduced lunch. You are entitled to the one-fifth retirement credit incentive if you teach at a school that is "at-risk" which is defined as 65 percent or more free and reduced lunch pupils. In other places, there is an "at-risk" definition for alternative programs. We have approximately ten definitions of "at-risk," and they are all specific to whatever program or funding they are entitled. They define them separately.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Based on that explanation, how would you administer this? If you have student teachers teaching at alternative schools, that is a different threshold than if you have them teaching them at an elementary school where 65 percent are on free or reduced lunch.

DR. RHEAULT:

I feel those sections should be deleted. If you have a need for a long-term substitute teacher and there is one available in that subject, I do not care if it is at an "at-risk" school or a regular school.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

I agree. We should leave those two sections out.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I have a problem with the fact that we keep using the term "at-risk," and it is only for a certain group of kids. We do not want long-term substitutes in classrooms where they are not prepared, and we do not want student teachers in classrooms where they are not prepared. Was there any discussion or would there be any willingness to consider the provisions dealing with appropriate placement of student teachers based on the population of the school including characteristics such as English language learner and cultural competency issues of a particular school. I am concerned about the placement of students and new educators.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

There was no specific discussion about that. I would be fine with deleting paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 1, subsection 1. The authority has been given to the board of trustees of each school district. If CCSD had a particular situation, that could be part of how they designed the program.

MS. ABOWD:

Part of that is also determined by in what that particular student teacher is getting their credential and the requirements of the university. I could not have taught in any class and have that count as my student teaching for the purpose of my degree.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I would add to it that beyond your subject competency, having the competency to work with the students that you would otherwise be assigned to teach. That is an element I would really like to add. It is being done in some of the professional practice schools in the CCSD. There are five of them, but we have more than five schools that have these issues. I would like to see us provide an incentive for it to be clear where we want the students to be placed.

MS. HALDEMAN:

We do that in more than the five professional practice schools. Karyn Wright, Director of K-12 Teacher Development Department, actively recruits people in those programs to work in the school district as long-term substitutes as they complete their student teaching. She works closely with the different institutions to identify the students, then the student has to become fully licensed as a substitute. They are assigned to a classroom that matches the degree they are seeking. They have a cooperating teacher assigned to them who works with them throughout the time of their long-term substitute assignment to make sure they have assistance, get feedback and the necessary additional development they need to help them as they become a teacher. The bill was amended from its original form to add section 1, subsection 5. It talks about giving some compensation to that supervising teacher. We want to make sure that you are aware that part of the tuition that the student is paying to the university pays for the compensation to that supervising teacher. We might want to review whether or not that addition was necessary.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Are you saying that this section is not necessary.

MS. HALDEMAN:

It is not in the Clark County School District. Those supervising teachers are already being compensated by the university that is supervising the student.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

Was this amended into the bill?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

That does not happen in every school district.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

We have schools where there is a high turnover rate in schools that are not meeting adequate yearly progress. One of the incentives that I would like to see is that if there is an appropriate placement at the front end and there are additional incentives offered to the student, there is a way to tie those incentives to getting them to stay at that school so we can reduce the amount of turnover.

MS. HALDEMAN:

That is something I would be open to a discussion about. I would like it to be recognized that sometimes those teachers are not the ones you want there.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

It is not in exchange for other experienced teachers who you also want to attract who should also be getting incentives. I believe that is the reason for the one-fifth retirement credit to attract those more experienced teachers. The Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy is doing this and it is working very effectively. Those student teachers are bringing new ideas and new teaching practices that should be replicated. I would like to add incentives for them to stay.

MS. HALDEMAN:

I am completely supportive of that.

MS. ABOWD:

I have a suggestion. If that student teacher stays at that school where they were employed for their student teaching, the year that they were a student teacher be considered as a part of their teaching career. In my situation, I also taught summer school the year after I did my long-term substituting. Although

I was a licensed teacher, I was not paid as a regular teacher and received half the pay of the other teachers teaching summer school.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We would have to add that they stay at that school for an additional period of time.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Did you get a signing bonus?

MS. ABOWD:

No. There was not a signing bonus at that time.

MS. HALDEMAN:

Sometimes long-term substitutes are there for teachers on maternity leave or other kinds of situations. I would want to make sure it was for the positions that were available.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

We are facing a critical shortage in teachers. After a year of teaching, Ms. Abowd was still not given credit for a year of teaching.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

We need to create greater incentives for them to stay in the profession once they are trained. This bill gets at some of those issues.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We will delete paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 1, subsection 1, clean up the language in subsection 4, and add a section that requires the Assembly Committee on Education to address the long-term substitute needs. We will prepare a mock-up.

DR. MERRILL:

The Nevada Association of School Boards supports this bill.

JULIE WHITACRE (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association supports this bill.

Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education
April 25, 2007
Page 21

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Can I get, in writing, the different categories for how the definition of "at-risk" is used?

DR. RHEAULT:

Yes.

CHAIR WASHINGTON:

We will now adjourn the Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education at 3:50 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Shauna Kirk,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Chair

DATE: _____