

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

**Seventy-Fifth Session
March 2, 2009**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Bonnie Parnell at 3:54 p.m. on Monday, March 2, 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/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair
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:

None

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:

Nicole Rourke, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada
Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins, Executive Director, Center for Charter School Development, Charter School Education Consortium, Sparks, Nevada
Bryn Lapenta, Senior Director, Public Policy, Accountability and Assessment, Washoe County School District, Reno, Nevada

Chair Parnell:

[Roll called.] We are doing a work session today, and during work session we do not call anyone to the table to testify unless a Committee member has a specific question for one of you. There will be time at the end of the meeting for public comment. Ms. Stonefield will be guiding us through our work session document, which consists of Assembly Bill 26, Assembly Bill 96, Assembly Bill 100, and Assembly Bill 154. With that, I will turn the responsibilities over to Ms. Stonefield.

Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:

The work session document should be in front of each Committee member, and there are copies available for the audience. The first bill for consideration is A.B. 26 ([Exhibit C](#)), which relates to charter schools.

Assembly Bill 26: Revises provisions governing charter schools. (BDR 34-411)

Assembly Bill 26 changes the deadline by which a charter school must submit to its sponsor an application for renewal of its charter. Existing law requires filing 90 days prior to the expiration of the charter; this bill would increase that to 120 days. Under the existing law, a charter school may submit to a performance audit once every three years if it meets certain conditions. This bill provides that if a charter school no longer satisfies the requirements for an

exemption, or if good cause exists, the charter school will be required to submit to an annual performance audit. It may subsequently reapply to its sponsor for the exemption. The bill also provides that a charter school is not eligible for funds from legislative appropriations for facilities until it satisfies the requirements for the exemption. I would point out that, up to this date, there have not been any funds appropriated from the Legislature for facilities.

There is one amendment, which was offered by Washoe County School District. It amends both the proposed language, as well as existing statute. The term "good cause" is provided in existing law as well as in the revisions proposed by A.B. 26. This amendment would delete the phrase in both places and insert, as criteria, "reasonable evidence of noncompliance with educational progress as required pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 386.610." Under the special note, I have given you a brief description of those criteria. The report is to describe a charter school's progress toward achieving its educational goals and objectives. The amendment from Washoe County School District also would require that charter schools sponsored by the State Board of Education are included in annual reporting requirements. I would like to point out that the language relating to performance audits is also included in A.B. 100, which is before the Committee today for consideration.

Chair Parnell:

Thank you Ms. Stonefield. On page 1 of the original A.B. 26 ([Exhibit C](#)), the issue is changing 90 days to 120 days; I believe everyone was quite comfortable with that part of the bill. The confusion came on page 3. The use of the term "good cause" caused people to pause. Primarily, the change in the proposed amendment deletes "good cause" and uses "if reasonable evidence of noncompliance with educational progress." Would you please explain that last change again for us?

Carol M. Stonefield:

The amendment, as submitted by the Washoe County School District, would add charter schools that are sponsored by the State Board of Education to the reporting requirements that are provided in NRS 386.610, which is also included in the amendment for the members. This is the report on the progress that a charter school is making towards achieving its goals and objectives. In the charter that is submitted to a sponsor for approval, a school must identify what it hopes to achieve, and then it has to make periodic reports to its sponsor as to its progress in achieving these goals. This proposal from the District would simply add charter schools sponsored by the State Board of Education to that requirement for reporting.

Chair Parnell:

Is there anyone in the audience who is representing a state-sponsored charter school? I did not hear of anyone having an issue with this. I want to have on the record that this language does not cause concern. Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblyman Munford:

I thought I read here that a charter school cannot use state funds for anything other than materials and resources related to the students. They cannot use those funds for facilities or anything of that nature, can they?

Chair Parnell:

Facilities are the only area that we tried to get approved in a bill last session, but it was the one part of our mega charter school bill last session that was deleted. So there is still no way to access funds for facilities. I would say that is the only exclusion.

Assemblyman McArthur:

On page 3 under paragraph (e), it says 75 percent of the students have to pass. I was just wondering why it was so high. We were told that high school students pass at around a 55 percent rate. Why is this so high for the charter schools?

Chair Parnell:

Last session we did a "tiering" of charter schools. We looked at whether, over a five-year period, they were fiscally sound, their audits were clean, and their students were succeeding. We used the 75 percent rate for that marker on success. The result was that it put them into a tier 2 category, which lessened the oversight. We had to come up with fiscal and academic accountability for the school to have less regulatory oversight. All the other schools can stay open, but they would continue to be monitored at a greater level.

Assemblyman McArthur:

So it does help them out since it puts them in a different tier?

Chair Parnell:

Yes, it is actually a benefit if they can show that they have had that many students do well and it also benefits the school because they will be on the other hand to the fiscal accountability.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Thank you.

Chair Parnell:

Are there any additional questions or comments? Is there anyone who would like to testify in support or opposition of A.B. 26? I will call for a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 26.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 96.

Assembly Bill 96: Clarifies eligibility for and the administration of Millennium Scholarships for students who are enrolled in more than one eligible institution. (BDR 34-441)

Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:

Included under the tab labeled A.B. 96 ([Exhibit D](#)), this bill relates to the Millennium Scholarship. It clarifies that a student who is enrolled in more than one eligible higher education institution is eligible for the Millennium Scholarship if the student's total enrollment is at least 12 semester credit hours. The Board of Regents is directed to establish procedures and guidelines for administering the scholarship. If a student is enrolled in more than one institution, the student must maintain a combined grade point average (GPA) that meets the requirements of NRS 396.934. There is an amendment following this introductory page offered by the Nevada System of Higher Education to eliminate the provisions requiring a combined GPA.

Chair Parnell:

Thank you. It was just last week that the Governor's Office and the Nevada System of Higher Education agreed on that deletion in the bill, and there was no controversy over whether or not that should stay in. There was a comment made during the hearing as to the effective date; yet both sides agreed it should stay as is, which is July 1, 2009. In the discussions on the effective date and the agreement on deleting "the student must maintain a combined GPA", there was no dissension.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I just need some clarification. If that section does come out, but subsection 3 (b) stays, the 2.6 and the 2.75 GPA requirements are still in place, but there is no reference to the requirement that they have to come up with some sort of combined GPA?

Chair Parnell:

I think they made it very clear. We were concerned whether there was an issue about who makes the decision about what that minimum GPA is. It was apparent that it would remain the same; they both felt it would be difficult to show a combined GPA. Therefore, it would remain 2.60 on the 4.0 grading scale for each semester during the first year of enrollment, and at least a 2.75 GPA for every year thereafter.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I just want to be clear, we are not creating two classifications of students in terms of requirements they have to maintain.

Chair Parnell:

That is correct. Are there any additional comments or concerns? I will now accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 96.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will now open the hearing for Assembly Bill 100.

[Assembly Bill 100](#): Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-424)

Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:

A.B. 100 was requested by the Department of Education. It contains a number of revisions to existing law relating to charter schools and to university schools for profoundly gifted pupils. The items included in the bill are provided in bullet format ([Exhibit E](#)). Under existing law, the Deputy Superintendent for Administrative and Fiscal Services examines and reports on the funds and accounts of school districts. A.B. 100 would require that the deputy superintendent provide the same services for charter schools and university schools for profoundly gifted students.

Under existing law, when a charter school is going to close, the governing body must appoint a trustee. This bill requires that the trustee be subject to the approval of the sponsor. If the governing body is unable to appoint a trustee, the sponsor will make the appointment.

Existing law provides that if a charter school is eligible, it may submit to a performance audit once every three years; this is the provision that is similar to the one that was just discussed in A.B. 26 ([Exhibit C](#)). This bill would also require an annual performance audit for schools not satisfying the exemption, and provide that the charter school may subsequently reapply for the exemption if it meets certain conditions.

Existing law provides for annual reimbursement to a sponsor for administrative costs for services provided to the school. Assembly Bill 100 provides that the sponsor may request quarterly reimbursement with a final adjustment following the final computation of apportionment for the charter.

The Department of Education shall develop a formula to determine the minimum amount of money that a charter school must expend for textbooks and instructional materials. This is similar to the maintenance of effort requirement for school districts. Also in this bill, adjustments are made to reports of charter schools and school districts to eliminate the duplication of certain reporting.

There has been an amendment offered that is included in your work session document ([Exhibit E](#)). It comes from the Department of Education. Existing law provides that when a pupil, enrolled in a charter school, wishes to participate in sports or a class not offered by the charter school, the Board of Trustees of the district in which the charter school is located is authorized to approve. This amendment would change that to the Board of Trustees of the district where the pupil resides.

There has been another amendment proposed that has been distributed.

Chair Parnell:

Before you, you should have a proposed amendment to A.B. 100 from Clark County School District ([Exhibit F](#)).

Carol M. Stonefield:

The purpose of the amendment is to defray costs incurred by the sponsor in the appointment of an administrator to handle closure of a charter school. The amendment refers to NRS 386.536 section 2, number 4; it provides that the governing body of a charter school or sponsor of a charter school may, to the extent practical, provide financial compensation to the administrator or person appointed to carry out provisions of this section. To the extent the sponsor provides financial compensation for the administrator or qualified person to act as the trustee during the process of closure, the sponsor is entitled to reimbursement from the charter school for those services.

Chair Parnell:

Since you just received this, could Nicole Rourke please come up and explain why this is needed?

Nicole Rourke, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada:

The district presents this amendment purely to be reimbursed for costs associated with the closure of the school. The sponsor no longer gets fees from the charter schools, so this would help defray the costs.

Assemblyman Hardy:

This would allow the state, if it is a sponsor of a charter school, to have the same type of application towards it?

Nicole Rourke:

Yes, that is why the language states "sponsor", rather than "school district."

Assemblyman Denis:

I know that the districts will not be getting fees, but is the state still going to be getting its fees as a sponsor?

Chair Parnell:

Currently, the sponsor could be the school district, the State Board of Education, or a university. After this session, there might be an additional one, but right now those are the only possible sponsors. So "sponsor" would refer to one of those three entities.

Assemblyman Denis:

Is there a point where they stop giving fees for sponsorship?

Carol M. Stonefield:

As I understand this amendment, it would apply in a situation where the charter school is closing and an administrator would be taking care of all of the legal responsibilities of closing down the school. His function might stop after a period when there are no longer any students, and the purpose would be to provide compensation for the administrator who is carrying out this function. If there are no students, there is no distributive account funding, so there is no percentage to apply that to. Any one of the sponsors would be eligible to receive that reimbursement, which would include the Department of Education.

Chair Parnell:

When a school closes down and the sponsor provides financial compensation for the administrator who acts as the trustee, there is not an end point for that? That part is unsettling. There is not an ending date for when that administrator might be getting paid for closing down a school. What length of time do you think would be appropriate?

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

We do have a timeline of up to six months specified in regulation that puts an end date to officially close everything out and do away with the school. Two of the last three that were closed were bankrupt, so there would not have been any funding available. Yet, there is still a lot of equipment that needs to be put into state inventory and other necessary duties to close the school down.

Chair Parnell:

Have you found it takes about six months in that case to tie up all the loose ends?

Keith Rheault:

By the time we had a good inventory, got all the records transferred, and got the school out for auction, six months was a reasonable amount of time to get it done.

Chair Parnell:

Is that time period currently spelled out in statute or regulations?

Keith Rheault:

I do not believe it is in statute, but I do know it is in our regulations that specify the time for closing a school. The statute states that the Board will develop the regulations for closure.

Chair Parnell:

I do not know if we should make some reference to this language to tie it in, but if we do, that is probably something Legal that could easily be taken care of, if necessary.

Keith Rheault:

Or you could just say that there is a six-month deadline.

Chair Parnell:

I think everyone would feel comfortable if we had a time frame there of "not to exceed six months," which is reasonable.

Keith Rheault:

The Department does support the amendment.

Chair Parnell:

When we look at this bill in particular, the policy changes made last session were great. This bill is refining things you found needed greater clarification. It gives a sense of a greater policy issue, but this is a clean-up item from what we did in 2007.

Keith Rheault:

That is correct. For example, the amendment we added came in after we submitted the bill. The old law stated that if a student wanted to participate in sports at school, he had to do it in the school district where the school was located. One of the charter schools is located in Las Vegas and they have some students from Elko, so that would not work. As we worked through the new changes from 2007, we kept track of issues that came up.

Chair Parnell:

Is this okay with the charter school personnel in the audience?

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins, Executive Director, Center for Charter School Development, Charter School Education Consortium, Sparks, Nevada:

Are you discussing Mr. Arensdorf's amendment regarding residence? I have a comment about that amendment.

Keith Rheault:

As part of the original hearing on the bill, Bill Arensdorf and my staff provided one more amendment that we did not put in the original bill. It changes the wording involving a student at a charter school who participates in a program or sporting activity of the school district; it clarifies that approval is made by the board in the county of residence of the student instead of in the county in which the school is located.

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins:

That is a very valid concern that they are trying to address, and I appreciate that. However, there is another perspective. For instance, a student attending Sierra Crest Academy in Minden, which feeds from three different school districts, may reside in Carson County, but attend school in Douglas and want to take a class that Sierra Crest Academy does not offer. It would be impractical for a parent to pick them up and take them to Carson County when they could just attend the class at Douglas. It goes both ways. If possible, we could have the option of either (a) where the charter school is located, or (b)

where the student resides, depending on the particular circumstance of the family involved.

Chair Parnell:

I think we need to have a regulation. If the pupil wants to attend an extracurricular class or a class that is not offered at their charter school, it impacts the school district where the pupil resides, so I think that school is the most appropriate. We are not going to be able to give lots of options; I think we need to stick with one. For the intent in which this is presented, the residence of the pupil probably fits best.

Ricci Rodriguez-Elkins:

Thank you for hearing me. I do agree with the provision for the fees.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

It is easy to see how both scenarios would apply and play out. I am concerned that we not miss any impacts to the districts by this happening. I do not want districts to suddenly have to provide services for students who they had no idea existed, since they are not enrolled in a district. I would particularly like to hear from someone from Washoe County School District. I just want some assurance as to the impact here.

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

It does not have a fiscal impact or an unnecessary impact on this school district because we will be paid at the same rate we are currently paid for charter school students residing in our districts. We think this is a good amendment.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Did we address the "good cause" issue in section 3, subsection 2 of this bill, as we did in A.B. 26 ([Exhibit C](#))?

Carol M. Stonefield:

That is an excellent point. You have amended the language in A.B. 26, but it has not been amended in A.B. 100. If it is the desire of the Committee that the bills are the same, you will need to include the amended language that was just passed in A.B. 26.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Would that be appropriate, Madam Chair?

Chair Parnell:

Definitely, I am glad you caught that because I had assumed it was done. On page 3, line 17 ([Exhibit E](#)) the language would say "if the charter school no longer satisfies the requirements of subsection 1 for an annual performance audit, the charter school shall...." We are deleting "or good cause exists."

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

Would we just be deleting "good cause," or would we insert the language we used in the previous bill?

Chair Parnell:

That is up to the Committee. Do you want to repeat the language of A.B. 26 which is adding the reasonable evidence standard? In place of "good cause", it would say "or if reasonable evidence of non-compliance concerning educational progress," as provided in A.B. 26.

Carol M. Stonefield:

The amendment before the Committee at this time would include the language proposed by Mr. Arensdorf, the language from the Clark County School District, and the language relating to "good cause" from A.B. 26.

Chair Parnell:

Are there any questions on the amendment? I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 100.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MASTROLUCA SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Our last work session bill is Assembly Bill 154.

Assembly Bill 154: Revises provisions governing the policies of school districts relating to criminal gang activity. (BDR 34-143)

Carol M. Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:

Behind the tab marked A.B. 154 ([Exhibit G](#)) is a summary of the bill that relates to policies of school districts relating to criminal gang activity on school property. This bill provides that a Board of Trustees is required to establish a policy to prohibit activities of criminal gangs on school property. The policy must include training for the prevention of activities on school property and the designation of grade levels and personnel who must receive the training, and

then the Board must ensure the training is provided. There were no amendments offered. Existing law relating to criminal gang activity is permissive with regard to policies established by boards of trustees.

Chair Parnell:

Are there any questions, comments, or concerns?

Assemblyman Hardy:

Did we address my concern about Boy Scouts who could have a leader who is "criminal"? Will this bill decrease Boy Scout activities on campus? The legislative intent is to prohibit gangs at schools, not organizations which may have someone who is nefarious in his approach and takes advantage of youth organizations. It could be construed as a gang if one member is a criminal. We do not want to prohibit the activities of bonafide organizations such as youth groups.

Chair Parnell:

Is that alright with the sponsor of the bill?

Assemblyman Munford:

The use of the school after school hours may have some connection or association with it. You could insert that somewhere; I would not have a problem with that.

Assemblyman Hardy:

That was my concern, the definition of criminal gang. I know we do have it in NRS somewhere.

Chair Parnell:

That is located in NRS 213.1263.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I just want what we intend to do to be on record.

Chair Parnell:

I appreciate that. Although it sounds silly, years ago when my sons were still in high school and there was talk about gangs, the term was used loosely. There was concern that a gang could be a group of the football players. I think you will notice that statute either references that NRS section or repeats the word criminal, so criminal always precedes gang. Therefore, we know that a gang is different from the Boy Scouts or football players.

Assemblyman Hardy:

In my experience, there can actually be teams who come to the school to play and have different ways of doing things.

Carol M. Stonefield:

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 213.1263, subsection 2, describes a criminal gang as: "any combination of persons, organized formally or informally, so construed that the organization will continue its operation even if individual members enter or leave the organization, which (a) has a common name or identifying symbol; (b) has particular conduct, status and customs indicative of it; and (c) has as one of its common activities engaging in criminal activity punishable as a felony."

Chair Parnell:

Is there any further discussion on A.B. 154? I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 154.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will now go back through all the bills we have covered today and assign a floor statement. A.B. 26 is assigned to Assemblyman Bobzien, A.B. 96 is assigned to Assemblyman Denis, A.B. 100 is assigned to Assemblyman Hardy, and A.B. 154 is assigned to Assemblyman Munford.

Is there anyone wishing to make a public comment? Is there any additional business to come before this Committee? Mr. Bobzien attended a National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) education forum last weekend, and I have asked him to give us a rundown on current education issues.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

You should have at your seats a handout that is Nevada specific from NCSL, dealing with improving education outcomes ([Exhibit H](#)). I thought this was really pertinent for a number of reasons; it shows our dismal statistics when it comes to graduation rate percentage. If you flip over to the back part, there is a chart titled P-12 Longitudinal Data System Elements in Nevada. At the policy conference I attended, there were a number of different programs, but the one that I thought was most pertinent to the things we are dealing with in this Committee was on dealing with drop-out rates. There was a lot of discussion from the big picture standpoint of what the cost is for dropouts, and the fact

that it represents lost income and increased service demand through incarceration; so there is certainly economic incentive for wanting to address the problem head-on.

As for specifics about how to actually do this, the speaker, who was a former West Virginia Governor, Bob Wise, and who has a nonprofit educational policy group now, was making the case that there are certainly lots of individual tactics that you can choose from, and we have covered a lot of those in testimony, but he was arguing for a data-driven, evidence-based approach. If you are going to make a concerted effort on high school dropouts, you need to make sure you have the data in place to be able to do the tracking and be able to test what it is that you are doing.

There is a group called the Data Quality Campaign that makes recommendations of ten data elements for a good statewide data system, so this P-12 chart is NCSL's assessment of where we are on using those. We have most of the ten, but the two that we do not have are: a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students and student-level college readiness test scores ([Exhibit H](#)). Both students who continue to college and students who go straight into the workforce, and benefit more from Career and Technical Education (CTE), have merged, and college readiness and workforce readiness are more aligned.

It does bear some consideration that maybe the goal for students in K-12 is actual college readiness, regardless of whether they go to college or not. I think this relates to the conversations we have had about ACT test scores and the other ways to look at things. There was a lot of good material and data I received at the conference. There was some discussion of the stimulus package. The NCSL should be posting their spreadsheet sometime today, which includes their analysis of where we are as far as education funding through the stimulus, and there are a lot of questions about what the details are.

With that, I would also like to end by presenting the other document on your desk ([Exhibit I](#)), which is unorthodox and fun. If you think back to the Committee hearing that we had where we opened it up for ideas about how to deal with high school dropouts, at the time, I had put some requests out on the Internet asking for additional comments. The sheet that you have is a completely unedited document consisting of all the different suggestions that came to me. Some of them you may find interesting, others not so much, but I just wanted to provide an additional avenue for public input on the work we have been doing.

Chair Parnell:

Thank you very much for that, and I would like to extend an invitation to all Committee members, if you do attend anything outside the building regarding education issues, please let me know so I can have you report back to the Committee and the public about what you have learned. I love the comments received over the Internet regarding education. I particularly like the suggestion of taking away cell phones at school, since schools need the means to expect students to concentrate on education while in class; students need to focus, to learn, not to play video games ([Exhibit I](#)). They really are very great ideas.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I appreciate that report. I focused on the bullet point on the second page ([Exhibit H](#)) which states: "If Nevada's high schools graduated all students ready for college, the state would save more than \$25 million annually in community college remediating costs and lost earnings." We have tried to get that number, which is called a \$50 million price tag, into our biennial thinking. It makes me wonder how NCSL got it, because we have gone round and round trying to figure that out. I am curious how they did that. Perhaps we could ask our staff to talk to them.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I am not sure of the source of that one figure, but I am sure someone could make a connection with NCSL and ask what the actual source of that was. There was also a program on remedial or developmental education and the whole intertie between K-12 and post-secondary; that was another program that I attended.

Chair Parnell:

I would also like to draw everyone's attention to the bullet point that states: "more than 19,500 students did not graduate from Nevada's high schools in 2008; the lost lifetime earnings in Nevada for that class of dropouts alone total more than \$5.1 billion" ([Exhibit H](#)). So certainly we have a justification, as this Committee, to do everything we can to implement the wonderful suggestions that have been given to us in order to increase that high school graduation rate. Are there any further comments?

[Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Scarlett Smith
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Education

Date: March 2, 2009

Time of Meeting: 3:45 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 26	C	Carol M. Stonefield	Work Session Document A.B. 26
A.B. 96	D	Carol M. Stonefield	Work Session Document A.B. 96
A.B. 100	E	Carol M. Stonefield	Work Session Document A.B. 100
A.B. 100	F	Clark County School District	Proposed amendment to A.B. 100
A.B. 154	G	Carol M. Stonefield	Work Session Document A.B. 154
	H	Assemblyman Bobzien	Improving Education Outcomes
	I	Assemblyman Bobzien	Comments Received 2009, Regarding Education