

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

**Seventy-Fifth Session  
May 4, 2009**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Bonnie Parnell at 3:47 p.m. on Monday, May 4, 2009, 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/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  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop  
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:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Allison Copening, Clark County Senatorial District No. 6

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sara Partida, Committee Counsel  
Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst  
Danny Peltier, Committee Manager  
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary  
Sherwood Howard, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Allen Biaggi, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Gloria Dopf, Deputy Superintendent for Instructional, Research and Evaluative Services, Department of Education  
Bill Uffelman, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Bankers Association, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Lesley Pittman, Reno, Nevada, representing United Way of Southern Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Cheryl Blomstrom, Carson City, Nevada, representing the Nevada Consumer Finance Association, Topeka, Kansas  
Barry Gold, Director, Government Relations, AARP Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Heather Dye, Gardnerville, Nevada, representing Nevada Association for Career Technical Education, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Bart Mangino, Las Vegas, Nevada, representing Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Bryn Lapenta, Senior Director, Public Policy, Accountability and Assessment, Washoe County School District, Reno, Nevada  
Frankie McCabe, Director, Office of Special Education, Elementary and Secondary Education and School Improvement Programs, Department of Education

**Chair Parnell:**

[Roll called.] Please mark Mr. Munford present when he arrives. We will be losing Mr. Denis and Dr. Hardy to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means shortly.

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint) and welcome Senator Copening to our Committee on Education.

**Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint):** Requires school districts to use certain environmentally sensitive cleaning and maintenance products. (BDR 34-742)

**Senator Allison Copening, Clark County Senatorial District No. 6:**  
[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit C](#)).]

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

The school district or the Department of Education will determine the list?

**Senator Copening:**

Yes. They will be the ones responsible for providing the list. However, they will work in conjunction with any stakeholder that wishes to participate, including parents. There are also environmental organizations that would like to have input and make suggestions for what products they deem to be appropriate.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

Do these products, in general, cost more, cost less, or cost the same?

**Senator Copening:**

One of the things that made me want to do this is when I was employed by the water district, they went completely green with their materials. As such, I asked the water district to get back to me when we were putting this all together with an evaluation of whether they saved money or if it cost money. They ended up saving quite a bit in their costs because they went down to using only four different products from what they had been using, one of them being vinegar. That is an example of how they saved.

This is a new concept for the schools. Neither the school districts nor the Department of Education have investigated this subject, so to ease their concerns we put a provision in the bill that said should they find this to be more expensive or not economically feasible for them to use, they can apply for a waiver. That was the fiscal note that was originally attached to it. What I think will happen when they begin to develop these lists is that they are going to find that these products are competitive with what they are using, or possibly cost less.

**Chair Parnell:**

I, for one, use vinegar. It is very inexpensive.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

There is probably some literature in the medical world regarding these products. I would be curious to see if someone has done a study that shows we have fewer health problems.

**Senator Copenig:**

For clarification, are you asking for a study that shows whether people's health systems improve through the use of environmentally sensitive products? Or are you asking whether there is proof that chemically based products are more damaging?

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

Yes, and yes, and even more than one study.

**Senator Copenig:**

Okay. I know we have the studies that show they are damaging. I will have to research and get back to you on that.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

Even natural products have problems for some people. Where is it we are going with this? There probably are studies out there.

**Assemblywoman Mastroluca:**

How did you come to the idea of floor products when you had to tone it back down from all cleaning products?

**Senator Copenig:**

That is a very good question. When we worked with the stakeholders in the school district and the Department of Education, and being that it was a massive undertaking to include all of the cleaning materials, they wanted to whittle it down, and I was open to doing that. I believe a start somewhere is better than nothing. I took a look at surfaces that we know every single person will touch, and we all walk on the floor. I know that everyone could be impacted if we just changed floor cleaning as opposed to counter tops.

**Chair Parnell:**

Are there additional questions? If you will stay there, I will invite Dr. Rheault and Kyle Davis to the table.

**Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

I am here to support Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint) in its amended version. We did have concerns with the original bill in that we were not aware of how much

work it might be to put together a list of every cleaning product a school uses that would be green-sensitive. By limiting it to floors, we thought it would be a good way to get started with this process. I do know the State of New York adopted similar legislation a couple of years ago, and there are lists already available that will help speed up this process. I have a commitment from other agencies in the state to help us put the list together. The bill does specify that it is a sample list. My worry was that with all of the vendors out there, everyone would be competing to meet with the Department of Education to get on the list. If I can say it is just a sample list, it will help. We can accomplish the requirements of the bill as stated.

**Chair Parnell:**

You do not believe there will be a fiscal note?

**Keith Rheault:**

It may take a little staff time. We do not have an individual who works in environmentally sensitive products, so it is a matter of having a couple of meetings with the agencies involved and getting public input. We would probably bring it forward under normal processes and put a few of these things in regulation through the State Board of Education.

**Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are in support of the bill and want to thank Senator Copening for bringing the issue forward. It is something often overlooked in terms of how we are going to get things done on a day-to-day basis and what the impact is on both environmental health and human health. This bill is a good step forward in trying to move toward more environmentally sensitive cleaning products.

**Chair Parnell:**

Is there anyone else here or in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint)?

**Allen Biaggi, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**  
[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit D](#)).]

**Chair Parnell:**

Do we use environmentally sensitive products in our state buildings? Is that an issue you have discussed on a broader scale?

**Allen Biaggi:**

As far as I know, we do not use environmentally sensitive cleaning or maintenance products in state buildings. This is probably a good first step because we should protect our children and those that are potentially the most

susceptible to those chemicals first. With the success of this program, we can move forward and expand it into a wider spectrum of state government.

**Chair Parnell:**

Is there any information out there that shows sometimes when you use environmentally sensitive or green products, there actually could be young people even more sensitive to those? Do we have any information on that?

**Allen Biaggi:**

I believe that is what Dr. Hardy was referring to. Just because a compound or material is considered green or environmentally sensitive does not mean there will not be potential implications and health concerns. The suggestion he made is well-founded. Chemicals are chemicals, and all of them can have implications to public health. It is something we need to look at.

**Chair Parnell:**

I guess we really need to look at the big picture, and I would say the vast majority would tend to be more sensitive to, for instance, a chlorine-based substance. It is important for us to keep that in mind.

We will close the hearing on S.B. 185 (1st Reprint). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 317 (1st Reprint).

[Senate Bill 317 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Requires instruction on financial literacy in the public high schools. (BDR 34-II09)

**Senator Allison Copening, Clark County Senatorial District No. 6:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit E](#)).]

**Chair Parnell:**

I could not agree more. It is time to say this has to be taught within an existing curriculum. As you know there are choices with that, so it can happen.

I see one difference between the two bills. I am sure this Committee remembers the high school graduation bill concerning financial literacy, Assembly Bill 505, section 6. In A. B. 505, it requires the school districts to ensure this is happening. In S. B. 317 (R1), section 1, it is the Department of Education that shall ensure. That is the only difference I can see in the two bills. They are defined in the same manner, and they both say, "The instruction required . . . may be included within a course or program of instruction that pupils enrolled in high school are otherwise required to complete . . . ." My suggestion to the Committee is that it would be wise to keep

S. B. 317 (R1) alive and move it on, because A. B. 505 has a lot more in it. There is always the chance it may not get out of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. I would hate to see that happen. Senator Copenig, please share with us what you think would be the best course of action.

**Senator Copenig:**

I realize that our two bills are so similar. I would look to you for the best thing to do.

**Chair Parnell:**

I think we will act on this and, again, keep it going so that we know we have this bill if something is derailed in the larger bill. The only thing we would have to reconcile, and the only thing I might ask of the districts and the Department, is that if both bills continued and both passed, who would be the person to ensure this happens? We would have to either choose the Department of Education or give that responsibility to the local school districts. As people come up to testify, keep that thought in the back of your mind and how we might come to a resolution on that difference. Is that agreeable?

**Senator Copenig:**

It sounds perfect.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

With regard to the bill, paragraph (d), lines 35 to 39, I am not sure anyone really understands the methods of investing—how to buy and sell investments. If we did we would not be in the situation we are today. I am very much in support of the bill as a whole. We need financial instruction in our schools. As I understand it, we do have it now on an elective basis—economics classes and government classes. I would be interested to hear from the school districts to see where we are going to put this. Will it be flexible? We cannot be too flexible because it is required.

**Senator Copenig:**

You are exactly right. It is up to the school districts how they want to accomplish that. I heard Ms. Parnell mention social studies. For example, the Clark County School District does mix financial literacy in with other courses, even art. It is difficult to understand how to apply finance curriculum with art. Elective financial literacy is not quite as concentrated, and this might be one of the areas in which we are lacking.

As far as lines 35 to 39 go, yes, it is perhaps over the level of a high school student, but this curriculum was actually taken from the JumpStart Coalition, which is a national organization. They designed this specifically for high school students. They would probably not spend a lot of time in these areas, but teach

more as an overview—this is what you are going to be facing when you are out in the real world as an adult. I will let the school districts address the best way to implement it.

**Chair Parnell:**

Mr. Bobzien can clarify for Mr. Stewart where that is located in the state curriculum.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

With regard to how the proposal would dovetail with existing standards, it is my understanding that it will dovetail nicely with what is already in the standards for economics in social studies. Can someone from the Department of Education weigh in on that?

**Chair Parnell:**

I do know that economics is part of the social studies curriculum, which seems a little odd.

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

I believe that Dr. Rheault participated in the discussion on this bill in the Senate, and his testimony was that he felt the economics standards would indeed accommodate this. Once adopted, if it needs minor modifications for inclusion, that would be doable with the cooperation of the Standards Council.

Since this can be done in other courses, the districts could take this content and infuse it into any other course, since not all youngsters are taking economics per se as part of their social studies offerings.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Thank you. I wanted to get that clarification because I have a little bit of a reputation this session as being the strict guy on the standards process. Also, Mr. Stewart, I will let you ask your question.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

My concern is, if this is going to be put in the economics curriculum, which is not required, then it should be put in the U.S. history or U.S. government curriculum so that everyone would be taking it.

**Chair Parnell:**

I think it is obvious that it could also be part of the math curriculum. What you are really doing is percentages and other math-based processes. Even with the



math department or social studies department or the conjunction of the two of them working together, it would be a great idea for cross curriculum.

**Gloria Dopf:**

Regarding the enforcement aspect, since this bill provides that the districts can incorporate it in many different courses, the districts should be the ones to have the responsibility to match this to the course. We can certainly do it for economics, as I stated previously, because that is the closest fit with the existing standards. For any other programs such as math or life skills, which many districts have, maybe the appropriate venue would be the districts if the bill passes. I would suggest seeing which courses it works with and then creating some kind of assurance that the youngsters fulfilled that content. The districts match the students to the courses; the Department does not.

**Chair Parnell:**

We will see if the districts feel the same way as the Department. There may be a little reversal there.

**Bill Uffelman, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Bankers Association, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

This is something I have been working on for three sessions. As was mentioned, the Nevada Bankers Association (NBA) in conjunction with the American Bankers Association (ABA) and the United Way has multiple curriculums. "Banking Is" is available to every school teacher in the State of Nevada who wants it. It is free. "Teach Children to Save", which is K-12, we feature in the spring, and then in the fall we teach "Get Smart About Credit" which homes in on high school juniors and seniors. I wish some college kids would take it as well. "Teach Children to Save" is available on the Internet. Anyone can access it; homeschoolers and parents can sit down with their kids and go through it. There are plenty of curriculums out there; it is a question of just doing it. In Illinois, where my children went to high school, as part of their life program they had to take a test that included a lot of the banking issues we are dealing with.

In response to Assemblyman Stewart's question earlier regarding buying and selling and methods of investment, that is the place you can talk about U.S. Savings Bonds and the difference between a money market fund and a money market account which used to be different until the Treasury Secretary got involved back in the fall. It is the place you can talk about 401(k) plans, health savings accounts, and all the kinds of financial decisions that young people are going to be required to confront. If their high school diploma is their terminal degree, they do not have as long to learn about it as someone who goes through college.

This is a great bill, whether it is this one or your bill, and I urge you to pass one of these this time.

**Chair Parnell:**

While giving testimony on section 6 in A.B. 505, I mentioned one of my real and great concerns is the payday loans that are around college campuses and places where there are young people. I see the 18-year-old who is away from home and does not have the money to go out and do things on the weekend. They have no idea what that 400 percent interest is, or whatever is being charged. That is frightening. I shudder to think what kind of financial difficulty some of these young people are getting into as a result of access to payday loans. In the programs you offer, are the payday loans, the exorbitant interest rates, and the turn-around-time addressed? Is any of that in your curriculum?

**Bill Uffelman:**

I am not intimately involved in the curriculum at the level you are asking. I suspect that it is not there, but the notion of interest is. It is one thing to pay 18 percent or 29 percent on a credit card and another thing to sign on to have \$50 for the weekend and have to pay back something much higher a week later. I would question whether the net salary they might earn that week would even cover it. Then they are on the treadmill. That is something the teacher teaching the curriculum has to be in tune with. A regular paycheck is probably not a regular part of the average college student's life. If it is, ten hours at minimum wage does not make a very big check. If you take a payday loan a couple of times, you will never get out from under.

**Chair Parnell:**

If you could check for me and anyone else in the room who is involved with that curriculum, I think there needs to be a special note. In 2001 when I was involved in that legislation, I had a copy of the initial information on what a person received when they got a payday loan, and the interest rate was 532 percent.

**Bill Uffelman:**

That is a low one. I have seen 1,000 percent. Actually, on page 2 of the bill, line 20, "Identifying the costs and benefits of various types of credit" certainly speaks to the notion....

**Chair Parnell:**

This is a new phenomenon we do need to capture. There has been legislation passed since, but it is certainly worth a red flag.

**Lesley Pittman, Reno, Nevada, representing United Way of Southern Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are in support of Senate Bill 317 (1st Reprint) and Assembly Bill 505. We would like to commend Senator Copening and you, Madam Chair, on your efforts to advance financial literacy in the classroom this legislative session.

As you may be aware, the United Way of Southern Nevada's community-based agenda utilizes the resources of an income council whose vision and charge is to promote financial literacy and stability so that we may improve the financial success of individuals and families and build long-term economic independence. One primary component of helping to build this independence, we believe, is in instruction and development of skills necessary to develop financial responsibility. Requiring financial literacy in the classroom helps us achieve that goal.

**Chair Parnell:**

Thank you for your long-time support in this. When Bill mentioned college freshmen, it reminded me of another bill I had a long time ago which was to not allow the University System to sell names and information to credit card companies. When the college kids go away, they receive multiple credit card offers in the mail. Perhaps next session we need to look at life skills classes for all incoming freshmen to cover that kind of thing. We do have to do a better job. Looking at the situation in the country today with mortgages, a lot of that was based on people simply not understanding how it worked.

**Lesley Pittman:**

I have some startling statistics I would like to share with you regarding credit card debt. The average credit card debt of a teenager has increased by 300 percent during the last decade. The number one reason students drop out of college is due to credit card debt. The number of 18- to 24-year olds declaring bankruptcy has increased 96 percent in the last ten years. There is definitely a problem.

**Cheryl Blomstrom, Carson City, Nevada, representing the Nevada Consumer Finance Association, Topeka, Kansas:**

We have all seen what has happened as we have gone through a financial meltdown over the past couple of years. As you know, we do need to increase what our children know about money. We need to make it less attractive and more about what is real in their lives. Encouraging this to be included in a piece of curriculum that they understand may also help make what they are learning in a math class, in a social studies class, or in an economics class relevant and real in their actual day-to-day life. That may actually help kids understand more about what is going to happen to them as they transition into adulthood.

My client, the American Financial Services Association, also has curricula online. They are a founding member of JumpStart in Nevada and would encourage any of you to look at <[www.afsaef.org](http://www.afsaef.org)>. There is lots of free curricula and interesting information.

**Chair Parnell:**

Before you leave, I am wondering if you remember what your daughter said to me in the Phoenix airport. We were talking about this issue, and she said, "They have that class at our high school, but it is just a class for dummies that nobody really wants to take, and it does not say much about your math skills." The best thing she said was, "It is kind of ridiculous that some of us are taking trigonometry and calculus, but we do not even know how to balance our check book." I thought that was out of the mouth of a 17-year-old who "got it."

There is a time and a place for everything and for understanding your responsibility and how it works. Long-term, I think we have learned as a country in the past six months to a year, that having something like this, where we have a generation who "gets it" can really affect the national economy. Look what started the national downturn. It was a lot of people having mortgages who did not understand things like adjustable rates, interest only, and balloon payments, and all of the fancy ways you could get into a house.

**Cheryl Blomstrom:**

I appreciate your having that conversation with her. She has expressed a little more interest in what it is I do when I do the bookkeeping for our family.

**Barry Gold, Director, Government Relations, AARP Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I need to clarify that I signed in as neutral on this bill. AARP does not have public policy on curricula for schools, although learning is a lifetime experience. I want to comment that AARP through 2007 and 2008 conducted well over 20 community conversations and opinion leader and business forums on our "Divided We Fail" campaign issues of affordable health care and financial security for all Americans. When we talked about financial security, in every single community conversation or forum we had people talked about financial literacy as one of the paramount things for achieving financial security in this country. Every single one of them talked about the need to teach kids at the high school level and instruct them on financial literacy. Trying to teach adults, by the time they became members of AARP, was more difficult as they were set in their ways. Although AARP does a very good job of providing financial literacy tools to older adults, the time you can really make a difference is when they are younger.

We were asked how we were going to make sure schools teach this. Is this not a hard thing to do? In looking at this bill, it occurs to me this is a tool that can help achieve financial security for Americans in this country so I decided to come and talk about that. It was an observation from all over the state; people talking about the need for financial literacy in our society and what are the best ways to do it.

Unfortunately, I have to be neutral on this bill.

**Heather Dye, Gardnerville, Nevada, representing Nevada Association for Career Technical Education, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Some courses that have not been mentioned yet are the Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses. I know this Committee has heard a lot about CTE, and one of the areas under CTE is business and marketing. Standards are already developed in various areas within business that I think would really meet some of the requirements in this bill. Additionally, some areas within Career and Technical Education may teach portions of other business skills identified within the bill, such as, agriculture business courses and family and consumer science courses.

Furthermore, within Career and Technical Education, a few sessions back, we set up the program area of what Career and Technical Education should consist of. There were ten areas within that. One was student-based projects. These varied between the disciplines within CTE, but being a student-based project, in many cases they did have to keep financial records, such as a budget. For example, if a student is going to build an item, they may have to put money out to buy the supplies, and then on the backside, sell those. Again, that is putting relevance, which has been mentioned, into some of the CTE areas.

The Nevada Association for Career and Technical Education is in support of Senate Bill 317 (1st Reprint) as well as Assembly Bill 505. Whether the Department of Education or the districts are managing it, it will have the same effect. I just wanted to highlight that CTE is another way to fulfill the requirements.

**Chair Parnell:**

I still remember when we went to the math class at ACE High School and they were learning math through construction math, which I thought was amazing. They were learning everything they need to know about math, but it was through construction. It is the same idea—real-life math.

**Bart Mangino, Las Vegas, Nevada, representing Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

As with Assembly Bill 505, we are in support of Senate Bill 317 (1st Reprint). It focuses on financial literacy as well as reinforces the relevancy of the various financial topics we find within the context of high school, as far as the student's current programs of study go.

**Chair Parnell:**

Do you have a comment about the school district versus the Department of Education?

**Bart Mangino:**

We are in favor of the school districts taking responsibility for the financial instruction.

**Bryn Lapenta, Senior Director, Public Policy, Accountability and Assessment, Washoe County School District, Reno, Nevada:**

We currently have the requirements of Senate Bill 317 (1st Reprint) in our curriculum. It is located within our math curriculum. All of our students are required to take four years of math, and we have developed a gateway math course which contains a nine-week course on financial literacy. The majority of our students do take that course during their high school career. We would be in favor of the district retaining the option of being in charge of what is in that curriculum.

**Chair Parnell:**

Could you check for me and see whether the curriculum that Washoe County is using talks about payday loans?

**Bryn Lapenta:**

Yes, I will.

**Chair Parnell:**

I do not have anything against them; I just want to be sure kids are aware of what they are getting into if they choose to access one.

**Bryn Lapenta:**

I know that our curriculum does go into more depth than is required in the bill.

**Chair Parnell:**

What do you think Committee? What would you like? Would you be comfortable if the Committee changed "Department" to "school district" at this time and kept the bill going?

**Senator Copening:**  
Absolutely, Madam Chair.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

Under Standing Rule 23, I would like to disclose that I work for a textbook publishing company, and I will abstain from voting on this bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 317 (1st REPRINT).

**Chair Parnell:**

The amendment would be, in section 1, subsection 1, to simply delete the reference to the Department of Education and to make the requirement with the school district. It would say "the local school district shall ensure," or however it is stated in Assembly Bill 505.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP  
ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE.)

**Chair Parnell:**

Mr. Bobzien, I will give you that to handle on the floor as our standards person. At this time we will open the hearing on Senate Bill 389 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 389 (1st Reprint):** Revises provisions governing accountability in public schools. (BDR 34-807)

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

It is with pleasure I bring forth this bill. This is a bill the Department of Education requested of Senator Wiener, and she was kind enough to help bring it to fruition, at least to the point of this Committee having the opportunity to consider it.

Senate Bill 389 (1st Reprint) sets the ability of the Department and the school districts to differentiate the consequences attached to the designation of schools through the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) process from the point of being identified as a school "in need of improvement Year 3 (N3)." That is four years of not making adequate yearly progress. At the current time, the statute requires that at this juncture the Department of Education in conjunction with the school district will identify and provide a school support team and a

school support team leader for all schools that are N3 and beyond. This is a consequence that is consistent with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act but is not the only consequence that could be available for non-Title I schools that are N3 and beyond. We have had experience now with several years of schools that have been identified as N3.

The feedback we have received is that it is not always necessary or prudent for the same consequence to be given to an N3 school. Perhaps, rather than having to have a school support team and school support team leader at every juncture when a school has been identified as N3, there may be a better opportunity to differentiate the consequences. We also wanted the Committee to understand that at the current time, with the number of support team leaders provided to the non-Title schools and the amount per school support team leader, which is approximately \$10,000 in the current budget, the budget will run out of funds very quickly with the potential of the number of N3, non-Title I schools increasing. You may recall that the AYP target increases to 100 percent proficiency as we get to the 2013-2014 school year. With any one cell of failure—which is almost 40 analyses done by subgroups, and by English versus math, and versus the additional indicators which are attendance for each of the subgroup areas—the potential of not making AYP increases dramatically as we get close to a 100 percent proficiency requirement. Unfortunately, we are realistically anticipating that as long as the current computation is required by NCLB and state law exists, the number of N3 schools will potentially increase. Right now we have a budget that would cover school support team leaders for the number of schools that we project for this year. As that increases we will not want to have to come to the Legislature to ask for more for school support team leaders.

Due to these two forces—the prudence of being able to differentiate the consequences to meet the needs of the school, and the increasing number of N3 schools that would necessitate coming back and asking for additional funds—we felt it would be prudent to modify the bill to allow the differentiated consequences utilizing the fund, but not having to have the school support team leader assigned each time you have an N3, non-Title I school.

We would also like to suggest that the alignment of the instruction to the standards in curriculum is an important component that we have found to be a critical factor in schools actually improving their status. In order to accommodate that, we have included a recommendation that at the N3 level, rather than the support team, we institute an analysis of the alignment of the "standards curriculum instructional delivery" at the school level. That would then drive the N4 plan, which would be the turnaround plan that would have



consequences attached to it, one of which could be a school support team, but would be able to have differentiated consequences ([Exhibit F](#)).

Other than a few technical amendments, this is a win-win circumstance. It does not increase demand on the state budget, addresses the consequences to the needs identified, still aligns with NCLB, and provides a mechanism to analyze and focus the corrective action.

**Chair Parnell:**

Was there a substantive change in the Senate, or were the Senate changes fairly technical? I am surprised it was amended, so I am curious as to what the guts of the amendment were.

**Gloria Dopf:**

Part of the blueprint looks like much has been amended, but that had more to do with staff and their perception of what we wanted for the Title I component; they misunderstood in the first print relative to Title I. We were intending to leave Title I essentially untouched. That became the substance of some of the amendments that were merely bringing it back to what the intent was in meeting with Senator Wiener and staff. There were a few other amendments that came forth that had to do with fine tuning of the corrective action.

**Chair Parnell:**

Okay, just cleaning up the difference between the Title I schools and the non-Title I schools was a lot of it.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I need some definitions in reading through this. I need the definitions for a Title I school, a turnaround plan, and a restructuring plan. Otherwise it is difficult for me to read through this.

**Gloria Dopf:**

We do have a list, and we would certainly provide it to the Committee. Title I is based upon poverty level, and the districts have the availability of identifying the poverty level, ranking the schools by that poverty level, and then making a cutoff point as to which schools will actually receive Title I funds. For the purposes of this bill, Title I is actually "Title I served," meaning the schools, by poverty ranking, by district, that are receiving the actual federal funds under NCLB directed to Title I.

Regarding the turnaround and restructuring, under NCLB, when a school hits N5 they are required by federal law to develop a plan that is called a restructuring plan. The components of that plan are set by federal law, and we oversee the

process to make sure that plan fulfills all the requirements of federal law. There are things that can be changed under restructuring mode that are acceptable by the federal government. Our intent here is to align a turnaround plan, which is what we are calling this plan for non-Title I schools, with the restructuring plan under NCLB. The restructuring plan under NCLB for N5 would have more specificity than what we are contemplating for this turnaround plan, but it would be at a similar juncture.

**Chair Parnell:**

Actually, I did not realize the different districts could use a different number for the cutoff of Title I. Is it pretty much until the money is gone?

**Frankie McCabe, Director, Office of Special Education, Elementary and Secondary Education and School Improvement Programs, Department of Education:**

It is based upon the average poverty level in the district. Every district has a different average poverty level. That is where they begin to look at who they are going to serve and who they are not, and the amount of money they get. Most districts try to ensure that the schools they serve have a large enough amount of money that they can actually do something different at the school. That is where you get the different cutoff level. You can go on our ePAGE system, which is our electronic grant system located on our website, right on our front page. You can look at each district's number of schools served, which ones are Title I eligible, and what their poverty levels are. That is all of our public disclosure in our grants systems. You can look at that information today.

**Chair Parnell:**

If you were in a wealthy school district and your demographics did not create a typical Title I school population, could you still, as a school district, identify your lowest-income school as a Title I school?

**Frankie McCabe:**

Yes, Eureka County School District has very low poverty levels. They go down to 40 percent. Clark County services schools down to around 70 percent. Then you have Eureka which goes down to 40 percent because they do not have a lot of high-poverty schools in their district, and it is just because of the income in that little district. You will see different numbers in different districts based upon the district's average poverty level.

**Chair Parnell:**

I find this interesting. Are those all federal dollars, or are we spending state dollars on those 40 percent?

**Frankie McCabe:**  
It is all federal.

**Chair Parnell:**  
Has the federal government considered having a cutoff for federal funds? It seems to me that those dollars could be really misused.

**Frankie McCabe:**  
We monitor it. At a certain percent poverty level, they have to serve schools. I think it is around 75 percent. Any district that has a qualifying population would have Title I funds available to them. It is different from district to district.

**Gloria Dopf:**  
I would like to add one component as a reference point. Only approximately 51 percent of the schools that are eligible are served with federal funds. We have made the federal government aware that there is a need in Nevada that is not being met currently.

**Chair Parnell:**  
I would think it would cause great consternation between school districts for one school district to actually utilize Title I funds at a school that most of us would not consider to be a Title I school. Then you have other districts that truly have Title I needs, but do not have access to money to serve those students. In other words, you could have a school at 40 percent getting Title I money and a school at 60 percent not eligible because that district could not become eligible for any more schools. That to me seems like a real inequity.

**Frankie McCabe:**  
We did provide a summary of the changes for Senate Bill 389 (1st Reprint) (Exhibit F). We did try to highlight what was changed on the Senate floor. Probably the most substantive change during the Senate process was that we repealed the requirement for school improvement plans in Year 5 when schools would actually begin to implement a turnaround or restructuring plan.

Currently, under Title I-requirement schools, we have schools that have restructured and are trying to implement two plans simultaneously. It has created confusion so when we redrafted this, we always want the schools to operate from one plan. Beginning Year 5 it would be the turnaround plan. That was one of the major changes we made during the Senate hearing process that really had some substance to it.

The other piece was clarification and specific language. We tried to be very clear in the statute on what the expectations would be for both the curriculum

audit and the differentiated consequences, so we added clarifying language to other sections.

To summarize what Gloria Dopf had talked about, the primary change in this legislation is that beginning in Year 3 for schools identified as being in need of improvement, we have removed the requirement for school support teams for every school and put in a requirement for a curriculum audit in the third year. In the fourth year, to parallel the Title I requirements, schools would begin to plan for restructuring for Title I schools. For non-Title I schools they would begin a plan to turn the schools around. Turnaround plan and restructuring plan are somewhat synonymous terms. If you can think of restructuring associated with Title I, and turnaround with non-Title I, that is the way we differentiated between the two. Essentially, it will accomplish the same thing.

Beginning in Year 5, if the schools still do not make improvement, they will implement the turnaround plan and no longer be required to do a school improvement plan.

When we reread the legislation we realized we had two basic issues which resulted in some of the changes we are asking for in the friendly amendment today ([Exhibit F](#)). One was with regard to the timelines for the development and implementation of the turnaround and restructuring plans; we had not amended the timelines for those. They still paralleled the school improvement plan requirements, so we are submitting new timelines for the development and implementation of the turnaround and restructuring plans so they parallel the Title I requirements.

We have another revision just to change some wording that was in the drafting that we did on the floor of the Senate and wanted to clarify ([Exhibit F](#)).

We would like to add the new timeline in section 5.5, subsection 9. It would be a new section so there is no line reference. It is the timeline for when the principal would need to submit the restructuring or the turnaround plan. That would be June 30 of each year that they are designated in need of improvement for five years or beyond. This parallels the federal requirement because under Title I, restructuring plans must be implemented at the beginning of the school year. We would need those plans turned in to the various entities that already appear in the statute by June 30 to be reviewed. Then we would need the schools to be ready once they found out their AYP results. If they make AYP, they do not have to implement the plan. If they do not make AYP, they must implement the plan at the beginning of the school year.

We kept the timeline at the beginning of the school year as broad as Title I allows, so that if schools need to get some things put in place in that first month of school, it does not require them to be implemented on day one. That encompasses the additions under section 5.5, subsection 9 and 5.5, subsection 10. Those are just new additions to what was already in this proposed statute.

The next section is 14. This has to do with the duties of the school support team. Within the duties of the school support team, under subsection 1(h), there is a requirement that the turnaround plan or restructuring plan be submitted by November 1 for the district to review. We would recommend that be removed. The timeline is now off, we would have to require that those plans be submitted by June. If there was an internal timeline within the district, at this point, we would recommend that the district put those timelines in place.

**Sara Partida, Committee Counsel:**

You are referring in the first couple of changes to the turnaround and restructuring plans, which are actually not included in that section 5. Section 5 is the plan for improvement, so I want to clarify that the turnaround and restructuring plans should be added to sections 2 and 3.5 of the bill.

**Frankie McCabe:**

That would be great. We were trying to put them in where there were timelines. That is a great correction.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Do we have any history on whether these turnaround or restructuring plans have been successful? It seems that when we have a school that is not doing well, we change the principal.

**Frankie McCabe:**

We certainly have the authority to do that now. We have, under the Nevada Education Reform Act of 1997 (NERA), done that. As for the national literature, there is very little research on schools turning around. To develop these particular amendments, we did consult the research which is mostly case studies. We are just now entering an era where schools are being required under Title I to be restructured. Our state is not quite as far down the path of restructuring as many other states. What success states have had with restructuring, we have taken the lead on, and that is why we are looking at curriculum audits that look at curriculum instruction and assessment beginning in Year 3 and then utilize that data for school turnaround or restructuring in Year 5. That is what the literature is telling us we need to focus on rather than

switching out principals—to look at the instruction, curriculum, and assessment in the classroom.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Would you agree the curriculum is pretty much the same in each school district?

**Frankie McCabe:**

No.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

We do not have the same elementary curriculum in Clark County? Does it vary radically from school to school? Middle school to middle school?

**Gloria Dopf:**

Looking at the alignment issue, the curriculum document is something that is adopted at the district level. District to district there may be some variation in curriculum. What we did find is that the delivery of that curriculum is very dependent on the instructor and the teacher. Not all teachers deliver the curriculum exactly the same. I am not suggesting that would be a benefit; however, there is enough variability that from classroom to classroom delivery is not always the same, let alone from school to school. The issue we are suggesting is that sometimes it is the delivery of the curriculum, and some of the variations, that would be picked up in a curriculum audit. That may not be beneficial to the achievement of the youngsters, and it would be this analysis that would help identify where some of the weak points are and allow for corrective action.

The other thing we have found is that differentiating the curriculum for the struggling learner who is in a given classroom is not something that is done consistently for the English Language Learner (ELL) and the Special Education youngster.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

I still do not understand the situation with a turnaround plan if you have a principal who has been there for three years or five years doing something, and then they are going to have a plan to change what they have been doing. It seems to me that we do not have any research to show that it is successful. We do have a lot of instances where you have changed the principal or the administration and that improved the situation. I am not really excited about this.

**Gloria Dopf:**

The ability to change a principal is part of a restructuring plan. You do have that as a potential option, but it is not the only option that may be necessary. We have found that sometimes it is the alignment of the instruction to the curriculum; sometimes it is the ability to provide the curriculum to the struggling learner. Some of the subpopulations do not make the mark. Although sometimes it is the leadership—and leadership is important to the instructional delivery—it is not only, uniquely, the leader that would impact the achievement of the school. Where the plan identifies that it is the leadership, then the corrective action could be to replace a principal. That is one of the options that exist in the restructuring plan for Title I.

**Chair Parnell:**

In reference to Mr. Stewart's question, we have the state standards, but the reason you may see differing results is that we give school districts local control to personalize the curriculum to that district. It is also important to select textbooks different from other school districts. While you have a sixth-grade social studies standard, you have 17 school districts that reflect their own textbook selection for use in that sixth-grade social studies class. I do not know if we have ever done an in-depth investigation on the differences we see.

The *NOW* program, on PBS last Friday, showcased Arne Duncan, the new Secretary of Education and former Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools. It actually follows Mr. Duncan turning around what are called turnaround schools; Harvard Elementary School was a stunning story, the worst performing elementary school in the Chicago Public Schools. It talks about his restructuring plan and how that school changed. It might be worth it for anyone who is not comfortable with this bill to watch it. It really follows very closely the intent of this bill.

The other thing that is important is a lot of what our Department of Education is having to do—and we have had the discussion for the past three or four sessions as to what to do when these schools do reach this point—is mandated by the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The states then have to figure out how best to do that. That is where we are now.

**Gloria Dopf:**

I want to mention that we have analyses of our school support team process. One of the things we found is that they work in certain circumstances, but we also received feedback in our evaluation that sometimes the school does not need a support team and a support team leader. They need other types of support. This would allow us to differentiate that. Right now, the statute, if not amended, requires us to appoint a school support team and a team leader

for every school that is identified as N3 and beyond, year after year. It does not allow us to differentiate with this analysis of audit and then do a turnaround plan that would be a different plan driven by what they found in their analysis of the alignment audit. The new plan could be carried out the following year as opposed to having one support team after another. That was our attempt to use the support team as an option for when the circumstances show that is the need, and provide other options when there are different needs identified through the audit process.

**Chair Parnell:**

In reference to Douglas High School, does this not also give you the opportunity to assess different kinds of "not making adequate yearly progress" and the levels? Douglas High School failed to make AYP one year because they had one student too many absent in 1 of the 36 subgroups. It was not because of academic performance, the school was not failing in any way, but it was one indicator on the attendance portion of the AYP indicators of the 36 subgroups. If we were spending money on support teams and other things for that school, that would waste state dollars. Will this new plan really help you identify the school that is, indeed, having difficulty academically versus the fluke? Many of our schools across the state have had to suffer the embarrassment of not making AYP for something like one person too many being absent the day the test was given.

**Gloria Dopf:**

The AYP analysis would still have to be made; the designation would have to be made. What this bill allows us to do is differentiate the consequences coming out of the N4 and N5 year to be appropriate with the self-analysis that school does as to where the need is. The self-analysis is the audit I am talking about, and it would allow the consequences to match the needs as identified through the audit. That need would differ between a school that misses it by one cell or one subpopulation versus a school with the whole page red.

**Chair Parnell:**

That is what has been frustrating to me; I really think the way we title our schools is blatantly dishonest—to label a school as "not making AYP" because of a subgroup designation for something as inconsequential as an absence for a particular day, versus the schools where we have very serious problems. I would like whole-school labels. It is high time we look at NCLB to designate an entire-school score and then have ways to deal with the subgroups if a particular subgroup fails. I have complained about this for ten years. It is dishonest. When parents or the public open the newspaper and read about Carson High School, or one of our elementary schools, they get a totally different interpretation from that headline than what it actually means.



We have done nothing as a state or with NCLB to clear up that misconception. That is outrageous.

We have inadequate schools, but are they truly inadequate, or have they been labeled because someone was absent? That is really the question. This amendment will not fix it, but it will allow you to respond differently based on the circumstance of that school.

**Frankie McCabe:**

The next clarification we want to recommend as one of the revisions has to do with section 6.3, lines 37 through 42. I have discussed this with Sara Partida before. It is a phrase that was added in but would be best taken out. It talks about a disproportionate number of pupils, in particular, with subgroups like ELL or Special Education. When we had the discussion, we were not talking about disproportionality; we were talking about the educational needs of ELL or Special Education students, or any of the other subgroups. This is very similar to the conversation we have been having where the school could base the consequence on the needs of the whole school or a particular group of students who are struggling, rather than have a school support team. This is exactly what we were talking about with the differentiated consequences. This makes the language more specific to what it is we were trying to get at. Rather than disproportionality, we were really talking about the educational needs of these particular groups of students.

**Chair Parnell:**

I have a question for Sara Partida, and you can work on it later since the language needs a little massaging. In the middle of the page where it states, "Remove section 14.1 (h)," we will need clarification on that.

**Assemblywoman Mastroluca:**

I have some concerns regarding the changes you are referring to in section 6.3, and will probably talk to Sara Partida about it. Comparing what you have given in this friendly amendment versus what is actually in the bill, you have taken out a lot of things, and I do not think that is exactly what you meant to do. The lines you are referring to are not the lines that are on this sheet. I have some concerns because as Chair Parnell brought up, I too have experienced the issue of an entire school being rated as not making AYP because three students were absent. Now the school has this huge competition to reward children for showing up to school during those three days. To me that is ridiculous. The fact that my child gets ice cream because he showed up to school for those three days—we are talking middle school, not elementary—is crazy. That is the depth they go to to ensure they continue to make AYP.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

In terms of improving schools, do you borrow ideas and use other schools that have been successful as models? I have had the opportunity to tour some schools in Washoe County. I visited Traner Middle School and have never seen a school as well run, well organized, and with the principal right on top of things. I have never seen a middle school as well controlled, disciplined, and on-task even in the classrooms. They also had dynamic teachers. There is a model right there. I know at one time they were struggling, and the principal did a fantastic job, because she has turned that school completely around. It is an at-risk district, and most of the students are students of color. They were performing. I was impressed. As an ex-teacher, I could have walked into any of those classrooms and begun to teach, and they would have responded to me. It was beautiful.

**Frankie McCabe:**

We do use our own schools as models for other schools that are struggling. The designation of a "need of improvement," even for some of our schools that are Year 5 and 6, does not do some of our schools justice. In many cases, many of our schools identified "in need of improvement" in Year 5 or 6 are closer to the target than the schools that are identified in Year 1. It depends upon the distance that they have to come. It takes a long time to turn a school around. We do have some wonderful things going on and do acknowledge those schools that are models for other schools to visit. We do that at our annual conference where we actually bring schools in and allow them to present what they are doing that has allowed their school to turn around without regard, necessarily, to their identification as "in need of improvement." Many times that does not tell the story.

**Chair Parnell:**

Do you have an update or any rumors of how the reauthorization for NCLB is going, how it will be changed, and what the new administration might want?

**Gloria Dopf:**

The timeline is not immediate. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) has gotten everyone very involved in the work of education. It is taking a lot of time at the U.S. Department of Education level as well as at our level at the state. No Child Left Behind, we have been told, will be a discussion point for the next school year. I do not believe we will see an amended act that would impact us for the next school year.

With that said, we did get guidance from the new administration on the components of the regulations implementing NCLB passed at the tail end of the last administration, which ones would be kept in place, and which ones would

have further modification. Much of what had been done at the end of the last administration, including continuing the graduation rate computation as put forth and many of the other components, has not been substantively changed. I think we can get a glimmer, at least from the U.S. Department of Education's perspective, on NCLB from some of the themes of the ARRA, and those will be the ones that will prevail. We may get some greater ability to do growth versus how the current AYP is constructed, but that would be at least two years away.

Both the congressional leadership that we have met with as well as the new administration are aware of the very concerns you have raised with AYP, and need to balance being seen as forsaking some of the focuses of accountability under AYP with the rationality of what needs to happen with some of the AYP modifications. We will see more growth allowed for AYP purposes, perhaps without the obstacles this state has faced—it can only be used once you have fulfilled all of the other requirements. At that point, maybe you do not have to do it anymore because it would not be of benefit. That has been our problem—not being able to access the growth model for this state. I believe the amendments will move us toward that type of rationality.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

I appreciate your intent to be more flexible in taking care of NCLB, but I see a fiscal note here. It seems to me we are going to have fewer support teams, so we would have a reduced fiscal note instead of an increased one. Can you explain that for me?

**Gloria Dopf:**

The intent was to provide the funding to the schools whether for a school support team or any of the other types of consequences. The same pot of money would go for more schools, and not every school would need a school support team. For example, we would be able to provide some training in how to deliver a differentiated curriculum for Special Education youngsters. If that was the need for the supplemental training, then that pot of money would be able to support that consequence.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

What is the fiscal increase in funding that you anticipate?

**Frankie McCabe:**

We did not anticipate an increase for the next biennium at all. We would utilize the same amount of funds we have available now. We are not asking for any additional funds.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Why is there a fiscal note then?

**Chair Parnell:**

I can answer that. I had Ms. Stonefield look up the fiscal note, and the state Department of Education put in a zero fiscal note. No one else has entered one, so it appears that will have to be removed. That bill is available online. This bill did not go to the Senate Finance Committee, did it? It just went straight out of Committee?

It is a complex subject, and one, again, that we have been working on for quite some time.

**Bart Mangino, Las Vegas, Nevada, representing Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are in support of Senate Bill 389 (1st Reprint) as amended, primarily because it does differentiate as far as the type of support. As principal of Bonanza High School for the past two years, I have had two different support teams, even though we made AYP the first year and were on hold. This particular bill would provide us with some flexibility and we would not have to have the support team. We could differentiate and identify what we needed.

**Chair Parnell:**

I would agree with Mr. Stewart. It would seem, based on the testimony, that if anything, this would have a negative fiscal note. This would save the Department some money because you are not going to have that same level of intensity across the board. The schools I have noted would have a much lesser need than if they were all a standard.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Mr. Mangino, can you tell us who makes up a support team, how much it costs, and in your opinion, how effective they have been?

**Bart Mangino:**

As far as the actual cost, I have to defer to the Department of Education. However, as a team leader, we usually have representatives from the parent community and also highly qualified teachers. Those individuals would have been identified, in addition to administrators, not only from the region as far as Clark County is concerned, but also from a high school, in our particular case. If it were an elementary school, the individuals would also be from an elementary school.

As far as the effectiveness, I would say it would be dependent upon the school support team. It does vary.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Are they paid so much per meeting, or where does the money go?

**Bart Mangino:**

I would ask the Department to come up for funding, because it is not funded through the school.

**Chair Parnell:**

It is all state dollars, no local school district dollars are utilized for the support teams.

**Frankie McCabe:**

The membership of school support teams is already defined in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 385. That is the membership. It is required. The only person from the school who is actually on the team, as required in statute, is the parent of a child who goes to that school. Everyone else is from another school or from the district; so there is supposed to be a balanced perspective about what the needs of the school are.

As far as payment, it is differentiated for Title I school support team leaders because they are paid with Title I dollars. They get \$20,000 for the year. They are required to meet numerous times through the fall because, in statute, there is a November 1 report due. The contents of that report are also in NRS Chapter 385. After that, Title I school support team leaders are required to visit the school site at least once a month and convene that meeting and provide reports to the Department of Education. For non-Title I school support team leaders, because that is state-funded, there is a reduction in the amount that they get. The requirements through the fall until the November 1 report is completed are the same as the Title I requirements. The contents of that report are the same whether you are Title or non-Title. After that, we require those support team leaders to be there every other month and convene that team to check and make sure that school is on track with implementing their plan. They also have to write quarterly reports and turn those in to the Department. The compensation is differentiated depending on whether it is Title I or non-Title I.

**Chair Parnell:**

Is it the whole team that is given \$20,000, or each member of that support team gets \$20,000?

**Frankie McCabe:**

The only person that is compensated for that is the school support team leader. There is a pot of funding available through the state to pay substitute costs for the teacher.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Who is the team leader normally? Who selects the team leader?

**Frankie McCabe:**

The process we have engaged in to select the school support team leader is a collaborative process between the district and the state Department. The state Department is actually charged with the hiring and contractual arrangements and the training of the school support team leaders. We try to work with the district to determine who would best fit a particular site. For example, if a school site has some identified needs around ELL students, we try to find someone who has expertise in that area so they can provide more support to the principal of that school. We work collaboratively with the district, but the Department actually assigns the school support team leaders and contracts with the school support team leaders.

**Chair Parnell:**

Is there anyone else to speak in favor of S.B. 389 (R1)? Is there anyone opposed? Is there anyone neutral? [There were none.]

I will close the hearing on S. B. 389 (R1). Are there any Committee members who might wish to make public comment on anything that is not agenzized?

Since this last bill needs a little bit of work, we will not be voting on it today.

The meeting is adjourned [at 5:38 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sharon McCallen  
Committee Secretary

---

---

Denise Sins  
Editing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair

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

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Education

**Date:** May 4, 2009

**Time of Meeting:** 3:47 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 185 (R1)	C	Senator Allison Copening	Remarks to the Assembly Committee on Education for <u>Senate Bill 185</u> .
S.B. 185 (R1)	D	Allen Biaggi	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 317 (R1)	E	Senator Allison Copening	Remarks to the Assembly Committee on Education for <u>Senate Bill 317</u> .
S.B. 389 (R1)	F	Department of Education	Friendly Amendments to <u>S.B. 389</u> .