

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

**Seventy-Fifth Session  
April 29, 2009**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Bonnie Parnell at 3:54 p.m. on Wednesday, April 29, 2009, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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/75th2009/committees/](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/75th2009/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](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair  
Assemblyman Mo Denis, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien  
Assemblyman Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy  
Assemblyman Ruben J. Kihuen  
Assemblywoman April Mastroluca  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford  
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator John Lee, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kristin Roberts, Committee Counsel  
Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst  
Danny Peltier, Committee Manager  
Scarlett Smith, Committee Secretary  
Sherwood Howard, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Reba Coombs, Executive Director, Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program, Office of the State Treasurer  
Crystal Abba, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Director of Public Policy, Nevada System of Higher Education  
Ben Sayeski, Chief Education Officer, Andre Agassi Foundation, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Francisco V. Aguilar, Chief Policy Officer and Associate General Counsel, Andre Agassi Foundation, Las Vegas, Nevada

**Chair Parnell:**

[Roll called.] I would like to open the hearing on Senate Bill 209 (1st Reprint) and welcome Senator Lee to our Committee.

**Senate Bill 209 (1st Reprint):** Revises provisions governing the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program. (BDR 34-1097)

**Senator John Lee, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1:**

I appreciate your hearing Senate Bill 209 (1st Reprint). A young friend of my son's had a baseball dream. He had a scholarship to go to California to play baseball. After one year, he decided not to continue to play baseball and came back to Nevada. He had completed one year of education in California, came back to Nevada, and served his church on a mission for two years. My sons have also participated in volunteer work. There is a call right now to youth that you do not need to have an educational agenda to be involved in community service. We are doing what we can to see that young people have opportunities to involve themselves in our community.

Currently, someone who graduates from high school would have to apply for the Millennium Scholarship and graduate within six years if they wish to use that money. This bill would allow the Board of Regents to make an exception for someone who has served in one of these charitable or public capacities, just

as someone who serves in the military has an exemption. If you look at the new language on page 3, paragraph (f) of the bill, it is similar to what the Board of Regents has done with the armed services.

This young man went to California for a year and then went on a mission for his church for two years; that is three of the six years that he had. He then went to school for another three years, but during his last year, he lost out on the scholarship because he took four years to graduate from college. My children, at times, have not known what they wanted to do and took a year off to intern for Senator Reid. When they return to college, they have an example of what is in the real world, and they get excited about coming back to college. These students need one extra year to graduate. The Millennium Scholarship is what they would like to continue to use.

In closing, I am trying to put an exclusion in the bill to establish criteria for people who want to participate in charitable, religious, or public service assignments. A lot of young kids go serve in the Peace Corps. This would allow a young person who graduates from a Nevada high school to have an avenue to apply for a waiver, provide the documentation to prove that they actually participated in service, and if money was available after the current enrolled students' needs were met, get that one year. This is a very minute group of people. I have people here that can attest to that. I would thank you for helping this limited group of students complete their college dream. With that, I will turn the time over to these two people who can tell you how the programs work and how this may interact with their associations. I have a letter I would like to give you from Kate Marshall ([Exhibit C](#)) who was a former Peace Corps volunteer.

**Chair Parnell:**

On the cover of the bill, it shows no fiscal note either for local government or for the state. So even though it is a Millennium Scholarship bill, it would not have to go to the money committee.

**Reba Coombs, Executive Director, Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program, Office of the State Treasurer:**

We are here in support of Senator Lee's bill. We do not believe there is going to be any fiscal impact due to this extension of time. In fact, as the letter from Treasurer Marshall ([Exhibit C](#)) says, we believe that there may be a certain benefit to our trust fund because it would allow the state to hold and invest the funds for a longer period of time. The students are already going to be eligible for this benefit, so it is just a matter of extending the time for them to use it.

**Chair Parnell:**

That does make sense.

**Crystal Abba, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs,  
Director of Public Policy, Nevada System of Higher Education:**

As Senator Lee indicated, there is currently a similar provision in state law and board policy that provides an exemption for active duty members of the armed forces. The way that provision is applied, which would be similar to how this most likely would be applied, is that for an active duty member of the armed forces, the period of time that they are away does not apply to the six-year limitation. In the example that Senator Lee provided, the three-year period would not apply to the six years.

**Chair Parnell:**

I imagine you have criteria for what you need to have presented to the registrar or admissions office which shows that students are doing A, B, or C for that amount of time. Could you explain that?

**Crystal Abba:**

This bill does give us authority to draft the policy that would be necessary for that interpretation. To that extent, the student would be required to provide something in the same way as active duty members of the military provide a copy of their orders.

**Chair Parnell:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? Last session, Assemblywoman Gansert and I tried to work out something to address high school students' involvement in public service and how that could help them qualify for a Millennium Scholarship. But, when we came down to the end game, it turned out to be something that could actually prevent them from getting it if they did not get X amount of time. We did not feel the negative side was the way to go, nor would that balance a grade point average or anything else they need to qualify. I am glad you were able to come up with a way to recognize these students, especially now. We are in a period where we have a President who is telling young people to go do public service before continuing on with higher education. This is a proactive, progressive piece of legislation.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

I would just like to welcome Senator Lee back to his House of origin.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I need some clarification on the language. The bill states "applies for" the Millennium Scholarship for six years. Does "applies for" mean when you first start to apply, or that you have to graduate in six years?

**Crystal Abba:**

It is "apply."

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

So, you have six years to apply; then you have another four, five, or six years to actually graduate? You can apply within six years, and that is the way it is now?

**Crystal Abba:**

Policy is very specific in using the term "apply." It is apply for the scholarship within the six-year time frame. If you apply at the sixth year, you are allowed to use the scholarship. The limitation on the scholarship is not contingent on time; it is contingent on the dollar value. There is a \$10,000 lifetime limitation.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

It looks like six years would cover everyone's military and religious service, so why do we need more than six years to start the application?

**Crystal Abba:**

In theory, six years should be sufficient; however, there are always circumstances which are unexpected. In the case that Senator Lee described, if a student goes away for two years and is not involved in a charitable or religious mission, after two years they may decide they want to go on a mission. Within that time period, because it would not apply to the six years, they could be away on that mission for as long as six years and then come back. It gives them additional flexibility. As the Chair indicated, one thing that is nice about this provision is that it does encourage public service, without requiring it.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

It says we are exempting such students from the six-year limitation. Does that mean we will have absolutely no limitation?

**Crystal Abba:**

If you look on the prior page, there is the exemption in here for armed forces: "establish criteria with respect to students . . . on active duty . . . in the Armed Forces." Currently, if a student is away and on active duty for three years, that three-year time period does not apply to the six-year limitation. In this

case, it would be applied the same way. While a student is away on a mission for three years, that three-year period would not apply to the six-year limitation. Basically, the clock stops while the student is away and starts up when the student returns. Does that make sense?

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

Not exactly, because we are exempting the six-year limitation, so it does not look like there is any clock starting at all.

**Crystal Abba:**

The provision provides the Board of Regents with the authority to provide those criteria for that exemption. To the extent they do it the same way they do it for active duty military, it would exempt a student for the time period he was away. However, you have the authority, if you want to be more specific, to say the student is exempted for a specific time period. That issue was discussed in the House of origin, and they decided not to go that way. You have that option. Again, it is only the time the student is away.

**Chair Parnell:**

It is important to read the criteria set forth in subparagraph (2), paragraph (b), subsection 1. I would imagine in your regulations you would make sure that is clearly defined. I see the concern if you just look at the exemption; it looks like you could come back in 40 years. We just want to make sure the language is tight enough that it is clearly understood there was still a six-year limitation, but that did not count while the student was away.

**Crystal Abba:**

Absolutely.

**Chair Parnell:**

Does that help clarify?

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

Yes.

**Chair Parnell:**

Are there any additional questions? Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of S.B. 209 (R1)? Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition? Is there anyone neutral? There are no further questions so I will close the hearing on S.B. 209 (R1). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 391, which revises provisions relating to charter schools.

**Senate Bill 391: Revises provisions relating to charter schools. (BDR 34-1221)**

**Ben Sayeski, Chief Education Officer, Andre Agassi Foundation, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are here today in strong support of S.B. 391. As you are aware, the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy was specifically designed to serve the west Las Vegas community and children who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. The provisions of S.B. 391 allow us to keep our commitment to you and the families of the children who attend the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy.

**Chair Parnell:**

Can either of you explain the new language in the bill? I think it will be helpful. It is referring to at-risk students, so I think it would help to give a little bit of background as to why this bill is necessary.

**Francisco V. Aguilar, Chief Policy Officer and Associate General Counsel, Andre Agassi Foundation, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

In section 1, on page 3 of the bill, the new language allows a school, within its charter, to classify itself as an at-risk school. Currently, there is no charter that is classified as at-risk, and this will allow us to adopt some of the provisions that are being amended into this bill and other prescriptive amendments within the chapter for charter schools.

In section 3, subsection 2, at page 7, the bill allows a school to choose or look at the definition of at-risk students and signify, in its charter, which populations of at-risk students it plans to serve.

**Chair Parnell:**

The Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy and other charters in the state go through a lottery process. If there are 100 spots, they could have 1,000 people enter the lottery to get one of the spots to attend the school. From its inception, the Agassi Academy has served the two-mile radius around the site of the school because of the at-risk population that is in that perimeter. In the last few years, we had to address this issue because they were finding people were making up addresses in that two-mile area and putting their names in the lottery. They were getting people's names in the lottery who lived outside of the zone and wanted to stay true to serving that very at-risk population directly around the Academy. That is why they have had to come back and tighten up the language the last two or three sessions. Is that accurate?

**Francisco Aguilar:**

That is correct. There has also been a change in demographics within that neighborhood, and we want to make sure we are keeping our intent of serving the community of west Las Vegas. This would also help us adjust to those changes. We want to make sure we are serving the children in the two-mile area before we look at any other location.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

Currently, what percentage of the kids in the two-mile radius are enrolled in the Academy?

**Ben Sayeski:**

It is hard to tell. We know that we are currently represented by 42 zip codes. Of the zip codes that crisscross the two-mile radius, 52 percent of the student body comes from those zip codes. It would vary at each grade level, based upon how many come from within a two-mile radius. As a matter of fact, we have not checked that specific question for a number of reasons—one being that we have a number of cohorts that went through when the two-mile radius was not in play, and in order to obtain that information we would have to go back and "MapQuest" 600 students.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

Are any diversity figures included?

**Francisco Aguilar:**

The diversity in the school is currently 94 percent African-American, 4 percent Hispanic, and 2 percent other. The demographics in the area, including elementary schools around Agassi Preparatory, have changed throughout the last years, so we need to match that, according to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), and are making an effort to do that. With those changes, we are looking at ways to make sure that we are serving English language learners (ELL) students, in addition to our student population. I can tell you specific populations of the elementary schools around Agassi Preparatory, and they are not as high in concentration in one specific population.

**Assemblywoman Mastroluca:**

Could you tell me how this is going to affect other charter schools that will fall within these provisions?

**Francisco Aguilar:**

These provisions will impact other charter schools if they have a lottery system and designate themselves as an at-risk school. If they do not designate



themselves as an at-risk school, these prescriptions will not impact them or their admissions process.

**Assemblywoman Mastroluca:**

Do you know how many schools have those provisions?

**Francisco Aguilar:**

I do not think any school has a designation as at-risk with its charter school to fall under these prescriptions. We would be the first with the Department of Education to amend our charter school in the Clark County School District. As far as the number of schools having the lottery, I am not sure.

**Chair Parnell:**

I want everyone to feel comfortable because this has been an issue for the past few sessions. I understand what the need is, but I want to make sure that the Committee is comfortable with being true to the challenge that Andre Agassi made, which was to serve the most at-risk students who live in that neighborhood. When he let it be known where he wanted to build the facility, he was told that he was crazy, and it would be destroyed by graffiti, and the windows would be shot out. He stuck to his guns, and I do not think the school has ever experienced a problem.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

We are very much impressed with the school and the community, and we believe it adds another dimension, even with the parents. We do applaud and commend Andre Agassi for his efforts in choosing that community. I hear mostly positive things, and I hope you can continue in that direction.

**Chair Parnell:**

Is there anyone else wishing to speak in support of S.B. 391? Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition or neutral? I will close the hearing on S.B. 391.

We do have a work session document which contains some bills we have heard in the last week which I believe we are all comfortable with. I would be happy to tackle the bills in the work session that we are all comfortable with.

Mr. Munford has made the request to do pass S.B. 391, which is the bill we just heard from the Agassi Foundation.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUNFORD MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 391.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DENIS, DONDERO LOOP, HARDY, AND KIHUEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mrs. Mastroluca would like to make a motion to do pass Senate Bill 209 (1st Reprint).

[Senate Bill 209 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program. (BDR 34-1097)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MASTROLUCA MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 209 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

Are you going to have someone amend this to tighten up that time frame, or is it remaining as it is?

**Chair Parnell:**

Ms. Roberts would like to speak about the language in the bill that actually does give regulating authority and also references back to existing wording about the military exemption.

**Kristen Roberts, Committee Counsel:**

I believe the testimony from Crystal Abba was that because the bill pattern is similar to students who are serving in the armed forces, they would adopt similar regulations in their eligibility criteria to restrict that time frame.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

So, no one is going to amend this; we are just assuming they are going to adopt some future ideas?

**Assemblywoman Mastroluca:**

I believe that it is the duty of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to create those regulations for the military exemption. Those are not regulations that we put in place; those are regulations that NSHE put in themselves. So, this would be the same criteria they would use. We are not extending the time; we are just exempting more people to allow them to use the time. It is the same amount of time it would be for the military.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I am not comfortable. I will probably vote no on this.

**Chair Parnell:**

I understand the confusion, but I think the important thing to know is when it says "exempt," it does not mean you can come back 40 years later. The University will not allow a procedure like that.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I certainly appreciate the intent of this bill, but I will probably vote no.

**Assemblywoman Mastroluca:**

The reality is: in 20 years this money will not be there anyway.

**Chair Parnell:**

Is there anyone else who has a concern? We do have a motion.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MCARTHUR VOTED NO.  
ASSEMBLYMEN DENIS, DONDERO LOOP, HARDY, AND KIHUEN  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

**Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The members should have their work session documents in front of them ([Exhibit D](#)). The first bill for consideration is Senate Bill 12.

**Senate Bill 12: Revises provisions governing the Commission on Educational Excellence. (BDR 34-299)**

Senate Bill 12 proposes to require applicants for funds from the Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation, which is the account that distributes grants made by the Commission on Educational Excellence, to include a statement indicating whether the funds will support a new program or continue an existing program and to identify all other sources of money requested or received for the same or a similar program.

The bill proposes to prohibit the Commission from awarding the money for a program of remedial study that is available commercially, if such a program has not been adopted by the Department of Education and placed on the list of effective remedial programs. Finally, S.B. 12 would require the Legislative Auditor to review the amount of time it takes for an applicant to receive approved funding from the Commission, to determine whether the applicant utilized the approved funding for purposes approved by the

Commission, and to recommend the most efficient and economical use of the grant money by schools.

There were no amendments offered, and this bill was originally requested by the Legislative Committee on Education.

**Chair Parnell:**

This is one of the three bills I presented on Monday. This was the bill that I said adds transparency and an additional level of accountability to schools with their requests for funds and also additional transparency and accountability for the Commission on what programs they choose to give grant money to. It was a tightening up from both ends. If we ever get grant money again for the programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation, it will be much tighter and take care of things we have had concerns about. With that, I will be happy to accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 12.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUNFORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments?

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

In the second portion, where it states that it would not pay or give money for remedial study if the program has not been adopted by the Department of Education, is that counterintuitive to innovation?

**Chair Parnell:**

Those are the very commercial and least innovative programs. An example would be READ 180. In my comments, I was trying to be clear these are more the remedial programs and not so much the things a school might do to create innovative change. Everyone was comfortable with it. Are there any additional questions? We will now take a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We will now move on to Senate Bill 19 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 19 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the award of grants of money by the Commission on Educational Excellence. (BDR 34-302)

**Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 19 (1st Reprint) is also a bill that was requested on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Education, and it also relates to the Commission on Educational Excellence. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).]

The last section refers to a list of priorities based on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status and also Title I eligible schools. Those are schools that would meet federal criteria, but there is not enough federal Title I money to serve them, so those would also be on the priority list. There were no amendments offered.

**Chair Parnell:**

Ms. Haldeman came to the table and was concerned that it would be a priority to look at remediation and innovation issues that help a student transfer from eighth to ninth grade and help with credit recovery. I happen to think that should be a priority. Ms. Stonefield would like to make a correction concerning your possible interpretation of the comments from Monday's meeting.

**Carol Stonefield:**

In the bill before you, in subsection 2 of NRS 385.3785, the language appears: "To the extent money is available . . . for . . . programs for grades 7 through 12." As Senate Bill No. 404 of the 73rd Session passed, priority was given to programs in kindergarten to grade 6, and if any extra funding was available, grants would be made to grades 7 through 12. The Legislative Committee on Education requested that if there was any money specifically designated for grades 7 through 12, the priority in awarding grants would be programs for seventh and eighth grades and the bridge programs between eighth and ninth.

**Chair Parnell:**

They are separate pots of money. In no way would any request for this money affect money set aside for the primary grades. I want to clarify that it would not be a competition; it would just be a priority out of the secondary pot.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

The priority issue implies that there are other priorities so there is a list of priorities. Are we saying that the money only goes to seventh- and eighth-grade programs, or are we saying it is a priority instead of the first priority?

**Chair Parnell:**

If the Commission had a request for creating a Link Crew at Eureka High School, which would be eighth- to ninth-grade transition, versus a seventh-grade program, the priority would be given to the Link program.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

That implies two choices, and the priority would be the seventh and eighth grades. Hopefully, we will get in a position where we have more than one program. If you have 12 programs for seventh and eighth grades and 22 for ninth through twelfth, do the seventh and eighth grades get all of theirs and the ninth through twelfth do not get any?

**Chair Parnell:**

Would it help if we got rid of the word "first" in front of priority?

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

Yes.

**Chair Parnell:**

So it is a priority, but it is not a mandate. I think that makes everyone else more comfortable.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I would just like some clarification. I understand the intent and do not have any problem with it; I just want to clarify. At the top of page 4 of the bill it says it is basically a program for pupils who have not completed the courses of study or credits. What are these programs? Are they tutoring-type programs?

**Chair Parnell:**

We are talking specifically about students who are credit-deficient. Typically, when a student finishes his "first" year of ninth grade, he is supposed to have a certain number of credits showing that he has passed his classes. If he is short, that references his program of studies during that year.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

We are talking about seventh- and eighth-graders here, so I was just wondering whether we are giving them more classes or tutoring. Is it up to the school?

**Carol Stonefield:**

In 2007, the Legislature passed a bill that allowed students to be promoted from eighth grade to ninth grade on probation, with the assumption that they would make up the eighth-grade courses, in which they were credit-deficient, sometime during summer school or during ninth grade. The Legislative Committee on Education received testimony from the school districts that it creates a conflict for these students. The school districts would like to keep these students with their age cohort, but it is also difficult for a student to take both ninth-grade courses and eighth-grade courses at the same time and accomplish all of them. This would suggest that those students who are

beginning to appear credit-deficient in seventh and eighth grade would be eligible for certain types of remedial programs, which may include summer school, so that they could make up these courses and not get behind by the time they reach ninth grade.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I understand that; I was just curious about what type of programs these are; whether it was tutoring or actually offering the classes again?

**Chair Parnell:**

I would say most are like tutoring programs. Carson High School has a program called MASH, and students in the MASH program spend their lunch period having the opportunity to make up those credits. They do have tutors there helping them get through their coursework. That is one example of the intent. We heard discussion from the multitudes of people during the two days we had the hearing on high school graduation, and numerous times we said that once a student gets behind, his chances increase greatly that he will not become a high school graduate. The intent of this bill is to give priority to programs that will help our students stay ahead of the game with the credits and coursework they need to be promoted from grade to grade to graduate.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

I appreciate this amendment that would delete "first" priority; however, I still have some concern about flexibility. If I were using the funds, I would use them in this manner, but in some cases, others might deem it necessary to do otherwise. I will vote no and reserve my right to change my vote.

**Chair Parnell:**

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 19 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Bill 19 (1st Reprint) is an amend and do pass, and the amendment is to delete the word "first" found in any reference before the word priority.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

I think that gives some implicit flexibility, maybe not enough for Assemblyman Stewart, but I think it allows some priority, while still allowing some flexibility.

**Chair Parnell:**

We do have a motion on the floor, so I will take a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART VOTED NO BUT RESERVED THE RIGHT TO CHANGE HIS VOTE ON THE FLOOR. ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We will now move on to Senate Bill 161 (1st Reprint).

[Senate Bill 161 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing the Nevada Youth Legislative Issues Forum. (BDR 34-91)

**Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 161 (1st Reprint) relates to the Nevada Youth Legislative Issues Forum. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chair Parnell:**

Was anyone here able to attend any of the Nevada Youth Legislature meetings?

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Yes.

**Chair Parnell:**

It is a great thing that is happening. I have been getting emails from people I know who have heard about the program and want to get involved.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

On Saturday I met with Senator Woodhouse and Senator Breeden, and we interviewed seven amazing young people. It is a great program, and we are attracting some amazing people.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 161 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Chair Parnell:**

Are there any comments?



**Assemblyman Denis:**

I was just curious about the relative aspect. If there is a child of a Senator who wants to participate, they could be appointed by a different Senator if their school is in that Senate district, correct?

**Chair Parnell:**

Does the language prohibit that?

**Assemblyman Denis:**

It says that if a member of the Senate does not make an appointment, the Assembly members whose districts are located wholly or partially within that Senate district must collaborate to appoint a member. The language also allows a student to apply to the Senator who represents the district in which the student resides or in which the student attends school.

**Chair Parnell:**

So, you think we are covered?

**Assemblyman Denis:**

Yes.

**Chair Parnell:**

Are there any additional questions on the bill?

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

The final bill we will cover today will be Senate Bill 164 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 164 (1st Reprint):** Revises provisions governing charter schools and university schools for profoundly gifted pupils. (BDR 34-298)

**Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 164 (1st Reprint) is also a bill that was requested by the Legislative Committee on Education and relates to charter schools ([Exhibit G](#)). It proposes to change the deadline by which a charter school must submit an application for renewal of its charter to its sponsor from 90 days to 120 days. This was also considered by this Committee earlier in the session in Assembly Bill 26. The bill provides that the governing body may request that the sponsor nominate one person to serve on the governing body. The bill would change the reimbursement schedule so that a sponsor could request reimbursement at the end of a school quarter. That provision was also considered by this Committee in Assembly Bill 100.

Senate Bill 164 (1st Reprint) requires the governing body of each regional professional development program (RPDP) to assess the training needs of teachers and administrators in charter schools and the university school in the same manner as it assesses the professional development needs of personnel in the schools of the school districts. It also authorizes the charter schools and university school to request training or participate in programs. An RPDP may contract with the charter school or university school to provide professional development services that are in addition to the training required by statute.

There is an amendment behind the bill page, which was requested by Assemblywoman Parnell ([Exhibit H](#)). The amendment proposes to revise the membership of the governing body to provide that the sponsor may appoint a member. The mock-up that is before you shows only the affected section, which is section 2 of the bill. This amendment would return the language of section 2 to what was requested by the interim committee. The committee had received a recommendation to permit a sponsor to appoint a member to the governing body if the sponsor thought that the governing body had a need for assistance. Particular examples were given, such as a charter school governing body may need assistance with its business model or in developing its special education curriculum. The request was made that the sponsor be permitted to appoint someone, as a need would arise. There is no obligation on the part of the sponsor.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

I think the amendment, in subsection 4, page 2, line 5, which states that no two members of a "governing body of a charter school may represent the same organization or business," does not mean that they cannot both be in an unrelated organization or business together, correct? I believe it applies to the organization or business from which the person is appointed. For example, there may be three people who are involved in the same organization, yet only two people are appointed to represent that organization, and the other person is representing another organization he is involved in. Sometimes there is an overlapping of public service organizations, and I would not want people who do good to be prohibited from participating.

**Chair Parnell:**

You could have two members of a Rotary club, one who is actually representing Rotary, and one who happens to be a member of Rotary but is on the committee because of his financial expertise. Is that what you are referring to?

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

Yes.

**Chair Parnell:**

The intent is to include no more than two members who represent the same interest. Are there any additional questions? I will be happy to accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 164 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP  
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

I will give floor assignments: Assemblywoman Mastroluca to present S.B. 209 (1st Reprint), Assemblyman Munford to present S.B. 391, Assemblyman Denis to present S.B. 12, Assemblyman Hardy to present S.B. 19 (1st Reprint), I will do S.B. 161 (1st Reprint), and Assemblyman Kihuen to present S.B. 164 (1st Reprint).

Is there any public comment? [There was no response. Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Scarlett Smith  
Committee Secretary

---

---

Cheryl Williams  
Editing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Education

**Date:** April 29, 2009

**Time of Meeting:** 3:54 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 209 (R1)	C	Senator John Lee	Letter from Kate Marshall, State Treasurer
S.B. 12	D	Carol Stonefield	Work Session document on Senate Bill 12
S.B. 19 (R1)	E	Carol Stonefield	Work Session document on <u>Senate Bill 19 (1st Reprint)</u>
S.B. 161 (R1)	F	Carol Stonefield	Work Session document on <u>Senate Bill 161 (1st Reprint)</u>
S.B. 164 (R1)	G	Carol Stonefield	Work Session document on <u>Senate Bill 164 (1st Reprint)</u>
S.B. 164 (R1)	H	Chair Parnell	Proposed Amendment to <u>Senate Bill 164 (1st Reprint)</u>