

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND EDUCATION**

**Seventy-fifth Session  
May 27, 2009**

The Senate Committee on Health and Education was called to order by Chair Valerie Wiener at 3:06 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2009, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair  
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Vice Chair  
Senator Maurice E. Washington  
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske  
Senator Dennis Nolan

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Steven A. Horsford (Excused)  
Senator Shirley A. Breeden (Excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Assembly District No. 40

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Marsheilah D. Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst  
Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst  
Sara Partida, Committee Counsel  
Maureen Duarte, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District  
Bryn Lapenta, Washoe County School District

Senate Committee on Health and Education  
May 27, 2009  
Page 2

Dottie Merrill, Nevada Association of School Boards

CHAIR WIENER:

Welcome to the Senate Committee on Health and Education. As you may remember, we have already heard Assembly Bill (A.B.) 505 sponsored by Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell. It is an education measure and Ms. Martini will give us an overview of the bill. We will see where we go from there.

ASSEMBLY BILL 505 (2nd Reprint): (Revises provisions governing pupils enrolled in high school. (BDR 34-784)

MINDY MARTINI (Committee Policy Analyst):

For provisions of this work session, A.B. 505 requires the school district board of trustees to adopt several policies relating to high school people. That would include a program of peer mentoring that may include a component of adult mentoring. This measure also would require the State Board of Education to prescribe an adjusted diploma, which is based on a qualified adult individualized education program and individual education plan (IEP). Proposed amendment 5380 has been submitted by Senator Wiener (Exhibit C, original is on file in the Research Library). If you begin on page 20 of the proposed amendment mock-up, you will see, under section 7, subsection 3, the proposed first amendment.

CHAIR WIENER:

This is a streamlining amendment. Again, there are two parts to proposed amendment 5380 to A.B. 505 I am offering in the mock-up. Ms. Partida will explain section 7, and then we will move on to section 9.

SARA PARTIDA (Committee Counsel):

Section 7, subsection 3 of the mock-up deletes the current enumerated criteria for getting an adjusted adult diploma. It instead provides the State Board of Education shall prescribe an adjusted diploma, and the requirements for the receipt of an adjusted diploma, by an adult who did not satisfy the requirements of subsection 2 of this section. As in subsection 2, it is the criteria for an adjusted diploma for a pupil with a disability who has an IEP.

CHAIR WIENER:

It is important to realize these are for those special-needs students. I have previously gotten Dr. Rheault's input on this revised offering to determine if the streamlines make it more manageable than the original language in the measure.

KEITH RHEAULT, PH.D., (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

It would streamline it from the previous version in that the State Board would have to hold public hearings and workshops on it. That is where we could, if you kept it more open, get the detailed input from the districts, working with them and the other adult education providers as to what will work for them. If it is too specific, I am not sure I know all the details yet of what that adjusted diploma should be. We could live with that.

I would mention the other important information; hopefully, this will not be a bill killer if worse comes to worse, for that reason. The way you have the amendment written could easily be handled by the State Board.

CHAIR WIENER:

It is important to remember throughout the work we have done in this Committee, addressing special-needs children, wanting to bring people forward and allowing them the opportunity to progress, that with this kind of educational opportunity, this is something we are offering people who might not otherwise be able to reach this level of education and accomplishment. Special needs have been a focus of the work we have done. This is an important way to raise the bar to encourage these students who otherwise would not be able to achieve this level of educational recognition.

DR. RHEAULT:

If I might add, I would expect the numbers to be pretty small because most of the individuals who went through the Nevada system have access to the adjusted diploma, which most of them request before they reach age 22. We probably would be dealing with a lot of individuals who have moved into the State when they were 17 or 18. They enrolled in the adult diploma program but did not have access to an adjusted diploma. I think there are only about 8 or 10 states issuing it.

CHAIR WIENER:

How many students would you think?

Senate Committee on Health and Education  
May 27, 2009  
Page 4

DR. RHEAULT:

I think 50 would be a high number per year.

CHAIR WIENER:

With this program, 50 people would have an opportunity to reach a level of achievement they might not otherwise reach.

DR. RHEAULT:

Right now, if they do not all achieve the adult diploma, they still have nothing, even though they might have completed the course work.

CHAIR WIENER:

There were some questions from Clark County which dealt with section 9, teen mentoring. If you recall, Senate Bill (S.B.) 77 was the bill brought to the Legislature by the Nevada Youth Legislative Forum. This is a bill which made it through, and it has been enrolled. It is now the way we do business in Nevada. That is permissive language for the mentoring programs. The original A.B. 505 had the amendatory provision for peer mentoring, and we have enabled the buildup to that. This is marrying the two and would push out to 2011 language for the mentoring as originally proposed in A.B. 505. Then the mentoring programs would be mandatory. Senate Bill 77 is already in place as a measure that has been passed through this Session and honors the young people who brought it. Those are the two components of the proposed amendment 5380 that I have brought before the Committee.

[SENATE BILL 77](#): Provides for the establishment of programs of teen mentoring in public high schools. (BDR 34-696)

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I think I remember the hearing, I am trying to recall. Was the fiscal note we did "shall" instead of "may" for the mentoring program?

CHAIR WIENER:

I never saw them. Because this is going to be in 2011, it does not impact this budget. I do not know if we ever got any fiscal note.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I am just concerned about mandating something for future legislation when we already know that we are going to be in debt there. The school districts do not

have the funding, and we are mandating it. I am for the program. It is a great idea and I like it, but I am concerned about the impact it would have. I do not know if Senator Woodhouse would know a little more, being an administrator in the school district. We could put in "may" instead of "shall" and ask them to report back to us next Session, or they could implement a pilot program as some schools have—it is the fiscal part that concerns me.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

All of the programs that I managed were volunteer programs, so I never dealt with any costs for these kinds of programs. Nicole Rourke may be able to add to this.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

If it was at no cost, we could say to "implement without funding," or "as funds are needed and available," or something along those lines. If you can do it without cost, that is great.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

The payback program, which was the middle school program, had no cost. That was just managed by a department within the school district. We did put in a program called the "stay in school mentoring program." We had a grant from the United Way that provided the initial funding and the school district, over time, picked that one up. That cost was for the administrator of the program and it was just that salary; the office costs were borne by the department. There was one administrator for all of the middle schools.

CHAIR WIENER:

I had offered wording to Assemblywoman Parnell, possibly "accepts gifts, grants, donations, bequests," and provisions to assist with the funding as something we could look at as well.

DR. RHEAULT:

I do not want to respond to the fiscal costs. The key piece would be the district should establish a policy for the mentoring program so that if they do offer one, it is one that has been proven to work and is effective. If there is a mentoring program, at least there is a policy that all of them will follow, whether there is funding or not. They can come back, keep it optional, and show how the volunteer programs were using it, but following the district policy. If there is

money to support it, then the next Session could leave it flexible for this one, but get the policy mandated like the first section requires.

CHAIR WIENER:

We have had that conversation, possibly mandating the district to establish a policy and then making it permissive for the schools to ... .

DR. RHEAULT:

The key part is making sure it is an effective mentoring program, not to let just anything happen, but require the policy, district-wide. If they do provide the program on a voluntary basis, they must use that policy.

CHAIR WIENER:

Would it be a mandate that they establish the policy?

DR. RHEAULT:

Correct.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

The Stay in School Mentoring Program in the Clark County School District (CCSD), as I indicated earlier, in the at-risk middle schools is a one-on-one match. Those mentors work with the students for one hour a week throughout the entire school year. They usually match them in late September, and they continue through the end of May. They indicated that the administrator of the program, if funded through the school district now, originally started with United Way funding. One of the things that Dr. Rheault indicated is because that mentor is working with his or her mentee, they are on the school grounds, but they are not necessarily in the classroom. We always did background checks, interviews and training. There was a minimal cost there because we went through school police who then sent it on to the State law enforcement as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We never matched a student with someone who should not be matched with a student.

There are some costs to it, so with this teen mentoring in high school, I know the program that the CCSD now has would not have the funds to continue it.

NICOLE ROURKE (Clark County School District):

That is correct. Currently there are no funds to add anything to this. In addition to that, I would also add that mentors are doing this by volunteering their time.

It can be difficult some years, especially in our economy right now. I have some figures for peer mentoring that range from several hundred thousand to over a million dollars, depending on the type of program that is implemented, including the number of staff required, etc.

Our Link Crew program, which is peer mentoring, would cost about \$309,000 and would include a minor curriculum purchase. Professional development is the largest expense, as well as materials. We are looking at 45 high schools. Approximately two teachers per site would be needed.

Along the lines of adult mentoring, we use a program called Capturing Kids Hearts, and I have a cost for 45 high schools of \$5.8 million for that. That would include consultation materials, training and teacher extra duty pay for that training.

BRYN LAPENTA (Washoe County School District):

I would have to say that I agree with what Senator Woodhouse was saying. There are costly steps one needs to take when using adult mentors to make sure they are people who should be working with children.

CHAIR WIENER:

Are there any thoughts or suggestions? Certainly, I would like the gift, grant donation and bequest provision for whatever measures we have in the legislation, as there are many pieces to the bill. These are the two we are addressing that were of concern during the hearing.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

In light of that, if you processed this bill as is, it would have to go to the Senate Committee on Finance. I cannot support this knowing the cost implications, unless it is totally permissive in allowing the programs as available or as funds are available. As Dr. Rheault suggested, mandating policy development and then being permissive, is that doable without impacting a fiscal note?

MS. LAPENTA:

Yes, that would be doable at this time.

CHAIR WIENER:

That is one of the provisions. These are the two that were raised during the hearing. There is also section 7 where we streamlined, and there would be

about 40-50 special education students in Nevada that this would impact. For the past 12 years since I have been here, we often hear about raising the bar, lowering the bar; we would challenge people and give them the best opportunities. This would allow those who have had an IEP, who need this one extra piece, to reach the level of achievement that could improve the rest of their lives. Many, as Dr. Rheault stated, might not even start in Nevada schools; they might be coming in from other states and need something like this to move to the level of completion that we would offer.

The language that I proposed streamlines it and puts it back in the hands of the Department of Education. They can work on the measure while coming to the table and sharing their input as to the possibility of making this happen.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I think we are fine with section 7. With section 9, do we have enough "may" in here that the fiscal note does not have to come into play this biennium, or does it?

MS. PARTIDA:

Section 9 of this bill is "shall" have required and becomes effective July 1, 2011.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

So, the mandate on this is to set the policy, correct?

CHAIR WIENER:

With the green type that is underlined, [Exhibit C](#), page 21, section 9, subsection 1, there is a requirement to adopt a policy. There is "shall" adopt a policy, and then there is "shall" implement at the principal level, [Exhibit C](#), page 22, line 2. It becomes effective in 2011. What is currently enrolled in law is S.B. 77 which was the Youth Legislature's bill. Their bill is a little bit more detailed because that was the one piece they brought, and they did include a little bit more about community involvement and civic engagement because that was of great concern to them. Their bill is permissive all the way. That is now law. Their bill has been enrolled; it is now law, as permissive. This A.B. 505 takes it to a mandate with "shall" language for the development of policy and the implementation as of 2011.

What I was asking of the local school districts was what the in-between would be, this "shall develop the policy" and then, "as the funds are available." Can we put "as funds are available they must implement ..."? Can that be written that way?

MS. PARTIDA:

You can say "shall to the extent money is available" for that purpose to carry out the program.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I do not mind putting in language "when money is available." I do not know how the school boards feel. There is nobody here for them. If the school boards do not mind the mandate to put a plan forward, if there is no money and they cannot even exercise it, I would rather say "may" or give some suggested language and bring back a plan to the next Legislative Session.

CHAIR WIENER:

Dr. Rheault had mentioned in his suggestion that it would be a best practice if we had some language like a "best-practice program," some qualifiers about that policy for the mentoring; or something that is proven and can be adapted to many schools.

One of the major concerns of proposed amendment 5380, A.B. 505, has been in section 9. Fiscal information provided to the Committee will hold a future Legislature to what those costs might be. The CCSD offered that the Link Crew costs would be \$309,000 for the 45 schools with 2 teachers per site. Capturing Kids Hearts, an adult mentoring program, would cost about \$5.8 million for 45 high schools,

The concerns then expressed in the Committee are binding a future Legislature to that significant fiscal impact. We are at the point where we are talking about where to put "may" and "shall." We have had testimony for a mandate of the district to create a policy, and we are right at the point where the last offering was that the "principal shall provide it as funds are available," and also, "to accept gifts, grants and donations, ... ." Section 7 looks like we are okay. Section 9 has some challenges with language.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BONNIE PARNELL (Assembly District No. 40):

While I was sitting here, I realized we had passed A.B. No. 212 of the 74th Session. I think that required the policy part on peer mentoring; it did for our high schools. The district should already have the policy in place for that peer-mentoring piece. That is something maybe Sara Partida could check from A.B. No. 212 of the 74th Session.

The last page says, "section 9 of this act becomes effective on July 1, 2011. What I thought was important was giving this two years, understanding completely the situation allows the 2011 Legislature to take a look. If things are going along and if that is something that we can afford at that point in time, it would just be automatic. We would not have to come back in to start with another new piece of legislation.

I was pleased to have S.B. 77; it would really affect these two years with the enabling language and then would become effective in summer 2011. That is my hope.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

My concern is that we do not know what is going to happen in the future. When they told us the cost today, just in Clark County, is anywhere from \$100,000 to a million dollars, I do not think they have that money lying around. I love the program idea, but I cannot support the "shall" in telling them that they have to have this and that the program has to begin and start, knowing that in two years they are not going to have that money. I would like to believe that something is going to turn around, but I do not think the budgets are going to be such that they can be putting in new programs in Clark County. We have been cutting back on administrators, big time, and to now force them to bring new people on, to put a program in, I think we have to be fiscally conservative on this.

If we pass A.B. 505 as it is, there is a fiscal note on it now, and it would have to go to the Senate Finance Committee, because the school district told us what the numbers would be to enact this bill.

CHAIR WIENER:

Because this is not this biennium, that means it would be the next biennium. If pushed out for two years, does it get rereferred to Finance?

Senate Committee on Health and Education  
May 27, 2009  
Page 11

MS. PARTIDA:  
Yes, it will.

CHAIR WIENER:  
Okay, it will. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

The global thought, with this piece of legislation in particular, is how do we increase the graduation rate? Every person we have heard from, including dropouts, a student body president, counselors, nurses, teachers and administrators, said peer mentoring was having somebody at that school who knew you were struggling or whatever. That was probably the most important comment made. I feel strongly about this; that is why the students are involved in Nevada Youth Legislative Issues Forum. Of all the things our high school students could have selected as their most important piece of legislation, it was peer mentoring. I would also ask if there was new information given today in the work session from the school districts that we did not receive before.

CHAIR WIENER:

We asked for that in our Committee when we heard the bill. Nicole Rourke from Clark County provided the numbers today. We had asked before the work session, but today was the first time we had heard the numbers.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I totally agree with Assemblywoman Parnell, this is one of the answers to increasing our graduation rate. I simply think we need to keep this concept not on the back burner, but on the front burner, even though we do not have the funds. I was looking for one "shall" on page 22, line 2, [Exhibit C](#). If we changed that to "may"—the principal of each high school "may" carry it out. If we did that, and then on line 20 of page 22, "gifts, grants and donations" would that then remove our necessity for a fiscal note this Session? Everything else I see has a "may" except there is a "shall" on line 2.

CHAIR WIENER:

It says, "to the extent money is available ... the board shall." There are numerous different iterations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

I believe that "to the extent money is available" has the same provision in it. I think rather than using an extended date, we should just use "to the extent money is available" language. We might want to just recreate the language from A.B. 487 and see if it would fit in A.B. 505.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 487 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing pupils enrolled in middle school and junior high school (BDR 34-780)

DOTTIE MERRILL (Nevada Association of School Boards):

I believe the question was whether our school boards are willing to adopt these policies even if there is a delayed implementation, and the answer is yes. That would establish consistency across the State with these programs so that we do not run into liability problems or other unintended consequences as a result of the inconsistency.

CHAIR WIENER:

When Dr. Rheault suggested we need to state in the statute, "best practices," do we need that? If we need qualifying language, certainly now is the time for us to address that.

MS. MERRILL:

I am not sure what Dr. Rheault had in mind. It appears to me that the specifics in subsection 2, page 21, continuing over onto page 22, [Exhibit C](#), would provide consistency.

DR. RHEAULT:

I was just saying that when the district develops their policy, they would consider best practices; then it would be one policy for any program in the district. I was not suggesting that they will be amended to include additional language.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

We learned from Excellence in Education that there are many different mind-sets of what is good and what is not good. It was kind of helter-skelter as everybody was put in different programs. We were looking for something more universal for our State. I know we like to have innovative-type programs, but I do not want us to get too far off course. We saw some nightmarish situations where money was being given out for things that we knew did not work. It really

concerns me that we would just leave it open-ended to some extent. I do not know if there should be something to have the State Board oversee to get some kinds of checks and balances. I know the CCSD has been successful in their programs, but I do remember what happened when we had all of that money to give away, and people took the money. Who would be checking that? Maybe it could be sent to the Department of Education for the superintendent to oversee before it is granted.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

One of the really exciting things about existing peer-mentoring programs is that the school district is creating policy over the programs that are going on within their own school district. It would really be dependent upon best practices used by the school district. One of the good things about it so far is the peer-mentoring programs have been probably, to some degree, a little bit different, depending on the high school, the size of the high school, the population of the high school and the area it is in. I am fine with some language for accountability, but the important thing is to allow that differential and the kinds of programs that are being used.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I want us to have that flexibility to some extent, but I saw what happened in those first two years that we had that money, and we cannot let that happen again. We have to be very mindful. We cannot just give somebody a job to give them a job; we want to actually have something that is meaningful. What about submitting it to the Legislative Commission on Education?

I do not know if Dr. Rheault wants another assignment or not. Maybe it could go to the Legislative Commission on Education? I think we need to have something brought back so that we can look at it and have all 18 school districts bringing back to us how they are going to do that, if that is alright.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

During the last Legislative Committee on Education, in the interim, we actually had the kids from the Link Crew in Carson City come to talk about their program. We had two or three different groups of kids who are currently involved in programs, so maybe the Legislative Committee on Education could invite different groups to come from throughout the State to talk about how their program is working. At least we are touching bases, but other than that,

I think it would be the school district, within their policy, to determine best practices, or certain standards for peer mentoring. That would be fine with me.

CHAIR WIENER:

We can have references to best practices so that we know we are not reinventing.

MS. PARTIDA:

I would also point out on page 22 of the proposed amendment 5380 mock-up, subsection 3, paragraph (c) does require that each board of trustees provide to the Legislature a summary of the effectiveness of the program and the activities that were carried out.

CHAIR WIENER:

Do we know about the motion? Is there any discussion on the motion?

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

A question of Assemblywoman Parnell, if we change subsection 3, on page 22, to "To the extent funds are available, the principal of each high school may," and continue with paragraphs (a) through (c), are you okay with that?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

My question would be, technically, if you say "shall to the extent money is available" does that mean if the money is not available, they are not held to the "shall"?

MS. PARTIDA:

That is correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

So, shall we leave it at "shall to the extent money is available"? If money is available, we are saying to the principal, "If you have money to operate this program, then you will operate it."

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The issue I have is that we are putting in a mandate. That really concerns me because they might have money that is needed for something else and how do you know? They can use the money for this or for that, and by putting the "shall" in ... every school gets X-amount of dollars.

SENATOR NOLAN:

I would like to expand on something Senator Cegavske said. If the principal is getting the budget, in order to prioritize those things and take care of the necessities first, and if there are funds to fund this type of program, then they will fund the program. I think that is what the language tries to say, "if the money is available." Well, the determination for whether or not money is available would be if the principal says "to include it in their budget over and above the essential budgetary items that they have." Even if you say "shall," they will do it if in their budget they are able to create it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL:

We have talked about language, "grants, gifts and donations." If there were a grant the school applied for as federal dollars for peer mentoring and if they got that money, then they would have the mandate. I do not know if there is a way to cover both of those. I was not assuming that it would be taken out of the general school fund. If there is a way to tighten it, I would prefer it. If not, I would just do the pleasure of the Committee.

MS. PARTIDA:

You could say, "to the extent funds are available for that purpose," then "shall carry out the program." I think that may take care of some of the issues. We can do whatever you want with "apply for gifts, grants and donations."

CHAIR WIENER:

That would match "for that purpose" language, and it matches the "gifts, grants and donations" language.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I still like "may." If I make the motion, I will use "may." On line 11, page 22, [Exhibit C](#), we could put in "Legislative Committee on Education," in lieu of "Legislature" on the date prescribed by the Committee on Education. In addition, you have to clear off the date on page 24, line 39, to delete the date.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

I would move that whatever the amendment was that was discussed, ... you have the language ... .

Senate Committee on Health and Education  
May 27, 2009  
Page 16

MS. PARTIDA:

Given what Senator Cegavske said, I think this bill would be in conflict with S.B. 77; the effective dates being staggered, S.B. 77 would become effective immediately and A.B. 505 would become effective in 2011. That is what prohibits the conflict.

CHAIR WIENER:

The conflict is that one is permissive and one is a mandate. The permissive piece would mate the two years which gives us the transition to work into the language of 2011 that has the "shall" language. If we do it immediately, we are going to have a conflict with S.B. 77 that has already been enrolled.

MS. PARTIDA:

You will recall S.B. 77 had it as "may" throughout. That was the conflict.

SENATOR NOLAN:

So, we almost have to put in "shall."

CHAIR WIENER:

If we do "shall," then we move it to 2011. We will have S.B. 77 operative statutory language for two years. If we do the "shall as funds are available for this purpose," then we have a stronger commitment to getting the programs aligned with funding, because it is defined by the purposes of the program. That is where we are.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

To make the record clear, I withdraw my motion.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS A.B. 505 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 5380 WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL CHANGES ON PAGE 22, LINE 3; "TO THE EXTENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR THIS PROGRAM, THE PRINCIPAL OF EACH HIGH SCHOOL SHALL ... "; RETAIN SECTION 1, SUBSECTION 2, PARAGRAPH (b), "THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION ON EDUCATION" AND THEN LEAVE IN LINE 39, PAGE 24, "THIS ACT BECOMES EFFECTIVE ON JULY 1, 2011."

SENATOR NOLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Health and Education  
May 27, 2009  
Page 17

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I just do not want to come back in two years to say I told you so about the funding. I hope that does not put us in any bind and that people do not misread this.

CHAIR WIENER:

Again, with the motion being made, I would add to that discussion the provision that "as funding is available for this purpose," would be that "gifts, grants and donations would be highly encouraged." That would become part of the General Fund.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

MARSHEILAH D. LYONS (Committee Policy Analyst):

With the Chair's permission, the staff of the Senate Committee on Health and Education has a gift we would like to present to Senator Washington. We want to thank you for your service. As staff, we have appreciated your kindness toward us and your patience with us. We want to let you know we appreciate you and look forward to your next endeavor.

Senate Committee on Health and Education  
May 27, 2009  
Page 18

CHAIR WIENER:

There being no other business, the Senate Committee on Health and Education is adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Maureen Duarte,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair

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