

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-sixth Session
May 20, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Mo Denis at 2:25 p.m. on Friday, May 20, 2011, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Chair
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen, Vice Chair
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Sheila Leslie
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Greg Brower

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Assembly District No. 30

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst
Kristin Roberts, Counsel
Matthew Walker, Legislative Assistant, Assembly Leadership Office
Billie McMenamy, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Craig M. Stevens, Nevada State Education Association
Bart Mangino, (Legislative Representative, Clark County School District
Craig Hulse, Washoe County School District
Joyce Haldeman, Clark County School District

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 2

CHAIR DENIS:

We will open a work session on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 230.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 230](#): Authorizes an alternative route to licensure for teachers and administrators. (BDR 34-738)

PEPPER STURM (Policy Analyst):

This is the alternative route to licensure (ARL) bill for teachers and administrators. Certain requirements include that the training may be provided by any qualified provider that has been approved by the Commission on Professional Standards in Education (CPSE), including institutions of higher education. I have a work session document for this bill ([Exhibit C](#)) which includes three proposed amendments to the bill: one from Craig Hulse, Washoe County School District (WCSD), one from Craig M. Stevens, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) and one from Elissa Couch.

CHAIR DENIS:

The amendment as proposed by the WCSD, [Exhibit C](#), adds a provision in section 1 of [A.B. 230](#) to have the CPSE adopt regulations allowing for a candidate to apply for an ARL. This is a good amendment.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT FROM THE WCSD TO [A.B. 230](#).

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. STURM:

The second proposed amendment is from the NSEA, [Exhibit C](#). Craig Stevens proposes adding new language to section 4 of the bill.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT FROM THE NSEA TO [A.B. 230](#).

SENATOR LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS BROWER AND CEGAVSKE VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:

Elissa Couch proposes an amendment deleting section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (1), sub-subparagraph (IV) of the bill on page 2 of your work session document, [Exhibit C](#).

CHAIR DENIS:

I interpret this proposed amendment as defeating the purpose of the bill.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I would like to go back and review the proposed amendment by the NSEA with staff. I am interpreting this as another step in the process that prolongs everything, and that has me concerned.

MR. STURM:

On page 6 of A.B. 230 in section 4, subsection 1, the proposal by NSEA is to add a new paragraph (c) after line 22. The lead line is "The State Board shall."

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

This amendment proposal by NSEA requires the providers approved by the CPSE must include subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) of section 4, subsection 1, new paragraph (c). This is a mandate.

MR. STURM:

This says "the system must." The State Board of Education prescribes the system, and then "the system must" include that information.

CHAIR DENIS:

The system requires collecting information regarding licensed educational personnel and making the information available to the public annually.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

What do we do now? Is this an additional step, and do we really need it?

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 4

CRAIG M. STEVENS (Nevada State Education Association):

The intent of our proposal, [Exhibit C](#), was not to place another layer or delay to ARL for teachers. This is a method to track preservice. We want accountability not just from educators but from those who prepare the educators. This was a part of our federal Race to the Top Application.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I will support the motion for this amendment. We will review this information in each session.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
[A.B. 230](#) WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS FROM WCSD AND NSEA,
[EXHIBIT C](#).

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

I will open the work session on [A.B. 225](#).

[ASSEMBLY BILL 225 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Requires an additional probationary period for certain teachers and administrators. (BDR 34-876)

MR. STURM:

[Assembly Bill 225](#) provides that a "postprobationary" teacher or administrator who receives an unsatisfactory evaluation for two consecutive years shall be deemed to be a probationary employee and must serve an additional probationary period.

CHAIR DENIS:

Are there any questions regarding the intent of [A.B. 225](#)?

MR. STURM:

In our work session document ([Exhibit D](#)), we have four proposed amendments to the bill: one from the Clark County School District (CCSD), the WCSD, the Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) and the Nevada Association of

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 5

School Superintendents (NASS); one from the NSEA; one from Assemblywoman Debbie Smith; and one from the Governor's Office.

The first amendment proposes to delete the words "and section 1 of this act" as proposed to be added in A.B. 225 section 4. Governor Sandoval's office wants that portion of section 4 deleted as well.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I agree with the school districts. Deleting those six words will be meaningful reform. It will show the community, the State and the school districts that we have heard their concerns.

CHAIR DENIS:

I have a lot of angst with this proposed amendment. The collective bargaining process exists. I am not prepared to vote for this amendment.

SENATOR BROWER:

This proposed amendment would make the bill more effective in terms of achieving the goal of the Nevada Education Reform Blue Ribbon Task Force. I support the amendment and encourage the Committee to give this amendment strong consideration.

SENATOR WIENER:

We have not had an opportunity to have a significant debate regarding this proposed amendment. This was not discussed in the house of origin and is a significant policy consideration. I do not feel prepared to remove section 4 because of the substantial nature of it and am not prepared to support this amendment.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

This proposed amendment is a step toward reform. I am supportive of this amendment.

SENATOR LESLIE:

I am not prepared to support this amendment.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS FROM THE CCSD, THE WCSO, NASB AND THE NASS TO A.B. 225.

SENATOR BROWER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS DENIS, KIHUEN, LESLIE AND WIENER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:

The attachment provided by the NSEA, [Exhibit D](#), suggests four changes to the bill.

CHAIR DENIS:

I was not swayed by the testimony previously heard that we need the proposed amendment by the NSEA.

SENATOR BROWER:

I agree with you.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

I need further clarification on items 2b and c of the proposed amendment, page 1, [Exhibit D](#), either from our legal counsel or from the NSEA.

MR. STEVENS:

The purpose of items 2b and c of our proposed amendment is to provide due process to those employees who are going to be placed back on probation. When educators are demoted they have the right to defend themselves, determine whether the process was handled properly and know they were evaluated properly. We are talking about the career of an educator.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

Will the educator who is wrongfully accused and terminated no longer have due-process if we do not vote this amendment into the bill?

MR. STEVENS:

They would have midyear dismissal rights according to the bill. This amendment addresses the time of the demotion. Our concerns are to ensure evaluations are done properly and assistance is provided to the employee before that person is placed on probation. That is the due process we are asking for in this amendment.

CHAIR DENIS:

Due process is an important feature.

MR. STURM:

Item three of our work session document, [Exhibit D](#), is a proposed amendment by Assemblywoman Debbie Smith. At our hearing on May 18, 2011, she proposed that in every instance where the word "year" appears in A.B. 225 it should be replaced with "contract year."

CHAIR DENIS:

School year would also be replaced with contract year.

MR. STURM:

Assemblywoman Smith also proposes that in every instance the word "unsatisfactory" is used, replace it with "minimally effective or ineffective." Assembly Bill 229 has parallel sections for implementing the four-tiered system in July 1, 2014.

CHAIR DENIS:

Assemblywoman Smith's proposal seems reasonable. There were concerns during the hearing on May 18, 2011, with the use of "minimally effective or ineffective." The Teachers and Leaders Council would determine the four tiers. If a teacher is minimally effective versus ineffective, offer assistance right away so the educator becomes satisfactory.

KRISTIN ROBERTS (Counsel):

I need clarification of when the "minimally effective or ineffective" would become effective.

MATTHEW WALKER (Legislative Analyst, Assembly Leadership Office):

We will define the four-tiered system in A.B. 225 and A.B. 229 and it will become effective in 2013.

MS. ROBERTS:

This bill only speaks to the word "unsatisfactory." Section 1 would be for the coming biennium 2011-2013. There would be a parallel section to "minimally effective or ineffective" beginning July 1, 2013.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT FROM ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH TO A.B. 225.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:

Proposed amendment 4 by Dale Erquiaga, Senior Advisor, Office of the Governor, [Exhibit D](#), was addressed at our hearing on May 18, 2011. The Senate Committee on Education has made a decision on item 4a, so we will continue onto items 4b and c of the amendment.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ITEMS B AND C, [EXHIBIT D](#), TO A.B. 225.

SENATOR LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

MS. ROBERTS:

Item 4b is already covered in section 5, subsection 3 on lines 11, 12 and 13 of A.B. 225. The employee would receive notice that he or she will be dismissed before the completion of the current school year.

CHAIR DENIS:

The motion will be for item 4c of the proposed amendment.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON CHANGED THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT, ITEM 4C, [EXHIBIT D](#), TO A.B. 225.

SENATOR LESLIE:

I concur with the change to the motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 9

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 225 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT FROM ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ITEM 4(C) OF [EXHIBIT D](#).

SENATOR LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

These decisions are difficult. We are doing amazing things to reform education.

SENATOR BROWER:

Now that we are moving A.B. 225 forward, I hope there is an opportunity to take a further look at this bill and make it even better. It is important to keep the reform discussion alive and make it more meaningful.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

I will support the bill but have reservations. I am concerned with the due-process rights for educators, especially the ones who are being wrongfully accused and terminated without receiving a hearing.

CHAIR DENIS:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 229.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 229 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing the accountability and performance of public schools and educational personnel. (BDR 34-515)

MR. STURM:

I have a work session document for this bill ([Exhibit E](#)). The major provisions of A.B. 229 include reporting the number and percentages of administrators, teachers and support staff for each school and school district in the State. Assembly Bill 229 also requires the policy for the evaluation of teachers and administrators be revised from the current two-category system of "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" to a four-category system of "highly effective," "effective," "minimally effective" or "ineffective." If a probationary

teacher or administrator has been designated as "unsatisfactory" or "ineffective," the evaluation must include a written evaluation that the contract may not be renewed for the next school year and the employee may request reasonable assistance in correcting the deficiencies.

The bill revises the probationary period for teachers and administrators to three one-year periods without a waiver of any of the probationary years. The bill expands the grounds for which a licensed employee is subject to immediate dismissal or a refusal to reemploy without first receiving a written admonition to include gross misconduct.

Several amendments were proposed for this measure. They are noted in the work session document, [Exhibit E](#). Proposed amendment 6817 is the mock-up by Assemblywoman Smith. The mock-up revises section 13 , on page 31 of the bill and section 14, on page 33 of the bill.

SENATOR WIENER:

On page 2 of the mock-up, [Exhibit E](#), line 27 addresses an unsatisfactory evaluation on section 14 on lines 25 and 26, we would amend satisfactory or unsatisfactory to the four descriptors. Is this correct?

MR. STURM:

Sections 13 and 14 are parallel. Section 13 is the old system of satisfactory or unsatisfactory that is in place until July 1, 2013.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO ACCEPT PROPOSED AMENDMENT 6817
TO A.B. 229.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Do we need to use the word "must;" can it be "may?" If an educator has been evaluated once or twice, and all is in order, do we need "must be evaluated three times in the immediately succeeding school year?"

CHAIR DENIS:

If they receive an unsatisfactory, they go back to a probationary status.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:

Proposed amendment two is also from Assemblywoman Smith, and proposes changes to and an addition to the mock-up, [Exhibit E](#).

CHAIR DENIS:

I am comfortable with this proposed amendment. This amendment is for the postprobationary teacher.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

Who will the third party be?

MR. WALKER:

The evaluation would be provided by an outside administrator. The process is outlined in section 9 of the bill. In rural areas, the superintendent would select a licensed administrator from a neighboring school district to provide the evaluation.

CHAIR DENIS:

The third-party administrator would observe the performance of the educator and then complete the evaluation. Am I correct?

MR. WALKER:

Yes, you are correct. The unsatisfactory evaluation is not from a one-time observation from the classroom but also looks at the lesson plan and curriculum.

SENATOR WIENER:

Will the third-party administrator have comparable expertise as the administrator who had been evaluating the teacher?

MR. WALKER:

Yes, this would be an administrator with the same expertise but from another school district.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I have concerns with a third-party evaluator coming in from another school district. That evaluator does not know the teacher being evaluated. The evaluator needs to be a supervisor who is there, knows the teacher and monitors and looks at the issues. I would like legal to tell us if this is clearly defined in section 9 of the bill.

MS. ROBERTS:

If a probationary teacher or probationary administrator requests that his or her next evaluation be conducted by another administrator, the administrator conducting the evaluation must be employed by the school district or, if the school district has five or fewer administrators, employed by another school district in this state.

SENATOR LESLIE:

That language is sufficient.

SENATOR BROWER:

I am struggling with the requirement that the third-party evaluator be selected by the superintendent and the probationary teacher or administrator as applicable. I understand the intent. If the teacher or administrator just says no, I do not agree, there does not seem to be a way to deal with that impasse. Am I missing something?

MS. ROBERTS:

Senator Brower is correct, there is no qualifying language as to whether the educator objects.

CHAIR DENIS:

Are the superintendent and the educator the ones who select the third-party evaluator?

MS. ROBERTS:

That is correct.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Currently, the supervisor evaluates the educator. Why would we change that?

CHAIR DENIS:

What we are trying to accomplish here is to give postprobationary teachers an opportunity to be evaluated by someone they feel will give a fair evaluation in the event of a conflict.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

This does not let supervisors do their jobs.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

If there is a conflict between the supervisor and the employee, this will allow the teacher to request an impartial third-party evaluator.

SENATOR BROWER:

The employee has to agree with the selection of the third-party evaluator. An intransigent employee could hold up the process by simply not agreeing to anyone the supervisor or superintendent selects.

In another context, like selecting arbitrators or mediators, there is an option to select from a group. In this case, the superintendent could offer three alternative evaluators and the employee would choose from the three. That is an option.

CHAIR DENIS:

The intent is to give the employee a choice.

SENATOR LESLIE:

I agree with that suggestion.

MS. ROBERTS:

The superintendent would provide three options of an alternative evaluator, and the employee would pick from one of those three.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO ACCEPT PROPOSED AMENDMENT 2 FROM ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH, [EXHIBIT E](#), WITH THE ADDITION OF THE THREE OPTIONS PROPOSED BY SENATOR BROWER TO A.B. 229.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 14

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I will vote against item b of proposed amendment 2, [Exhibit E](#). I cannot understand why we would allow teachers to choose their own evaluators.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS CEGAVSKE AND GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:

On page 5 of your work session document, [Exhibit E](#), there is a comparison chart of reduction of force proposals. This chart lists proposals No. 4, No. 5, No. 6 and No. 7. These are proposed revisions concerning reductions of workforce.

CHAIR DENIS:

These proposed revisions are about last in, first out, of the workforce. We need to give these revisions careful consideration.

SENATOR BROWER:

The goal is to have the best teachers survive layoffs. I value seniority, but other factors come into play in making those decisions. Parents would expect those other factors, as presented in the comparison chart to be considered.

CHAIR DENIS:

I agree we need this provision, but I would like an opportunity to work on the details.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ITEM 4 BY THE CCSD, [EXHIBIT E](#), WITH THE WORD SENIORITY OMITTED TO A.B. 229.

SENATOR BROWER SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR DENIS:

I will not be voting in favor of the motion.

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 15

SENATOR WIENER:

We need ongoing dialog. This is an extraordinarily important piece. I am not comfortable choosing one of these proposed amendments over another. This could affect the livelihood of hundreds of people over a period of time.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I support this proposed amendment and motion. We are making good progress.

THE MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS DENIS, KIHUEN, LESLIE AND WIENER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

SENATOR BROWER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT BY THE CCSD.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS DENIS, KIHUEN, LESLIE AND WIENER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:

Proposed amendment number 9 of your work session document, [Exhibit E](#), is submitted by the NSEA. On page 36 of the bill, there is language that has been stricken on line 18. The NSEA would like the stricken language restored. This would essentially restore the ability for probationary employees to receive a 15-day notice if they are going to be dismissed or demoted (the so-called "Hey, Jack" letter) and allows for a hearing upon request.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

How is the bill written?

MR. STURM:

Probationary employees would not receive notice; they would not be offered a renewal.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

At some time "at least 15 days ...," was written into the bill. Is there something in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* that states you must give so many days notice before you dismiss an employee?

MS. ROBERTS:

Under the provisions of the bill, the employee is probationary, so he or she would not be employed for the ensuing school year. The bill would mandate a three-year probationary period.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The language was removed because of the probation period, is that correct?

MR. WALKER:

Our attempt was to replace the so-called "Hey, Jack" letter. Each time probationary employees receive a negative evaluation they are required to sign a statement. They can be nonrenewed at the end of the year because of their unsatisfactory performance.

MR. STURM:

On number 9b of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#), the NSEA proposes to restore subsection 8 of section 19.

CHAIR DENIS:

The probationary employee is at will. Is that correct?

MR. WALKER:

Under the provision of A.B. 225, we added an expedited due-process procedure for those veteran teachers returned to probationary status. In current law, all teachers, probationary and postprobationary, have full due-process rights to third-party arbitration.

CHAIR DENIS:

Instead of a regular hearing, which can take four to six months, can we have an expedited hearing process? Is this section for all employees, or does it apply to those accused of malfeasance?

MR. STURM:

The reason they are probationary and the reason for their dismissal is not outlined in this section. In A.B. 225, we gave a postprobationary employee who returns to a probationary status an expedited due process.

MS. ROBERTS:

The postprobationary employee who went back on probationary status can have an expedited hearing before dismissal.

CHAIR DENIS:

This is the current language in A.B. 225.

MR. STEVENS:

In A.B. 229, first-year, three-year probationary employees are at will. They do not have due-process rights. The NSEA put forth this amendment for beginning teachers. Their first three years are probationary, and they will receive due process only for a mid-year dismissal. They have one-year contracts.

SENATOR BROWER:

If the school district seeks to dismiss a probationary employee midyear, who within the district makes that decision, and how is it determined?

BART MANGINO (Legislative Representative, Clark County School District):

The due process as is outlined in the CCSD; the first hearing would be with the administrator of that building. As far as investigatory interviews, that would again be followed by a representative from the teachers association at that building level. A decision would be made. A recommendation would be made from there. There are additional steps that the teacher and the association can take, as far as the district is concerned. The decision is not ultimately made at the school level; it would be made at the district level.

SENATOR BROWER:

If a principal wanted to terminate a probationary teacher midyear, would it be the decision of the principal, or does the principal make a recommendation?

MR. MANGINO:

The actual dismissal comes from the superintendent.

SENATOR BROWER:

In that process, does the teacher have an opportunity to give his or her side of the story before the superintendent makes that decision?

MR. MANGINO:

That is correct.

SENATOR BROWER:

Does this amendment seek to change the current state of law?

MR. STEVENS:

The principal can move for the dismissal.

SENATOR BROWER:

Would the principal or the superintendent move for the dismissal?

MR. WALKER:

Once the dismissal decision is made by the superintendent, the educator can request third-party arbitration if that educator feels the dismissal decision was not a proper one.

CHAIR DENIS:

The way I read this bill, a probationary employee termination is at will.

MR. WALKER:

If they are midyear terminated for the reasons outlined in section 12, they have the right to request third-party due process. This bill removes that for the first three years.

CHAIR DENIS:

Due-process procedures can take up to six months.

MR. WALKER:

The expedited due-process procedure is sooner. There is a one-day arbitration unless the arbitrator decides additional days are needed.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

I find it troubling to remove section 8 of the bill. Educators should have due process. How does the expedited due-process hearing work?

MR. STEVENS:

Each case is different, depending on the reason for dismissal and the arbitrator. In the most severe cases, the educator is removed from the classroom, without pay, and, depending on the outcome of the hearing, can be reinstated.

CRAIG HULSE (Washoe County School District):

Washoe County School District's procedure for midyear dismissal is: level one is the school principal, level two is referral to the central office—someone near the superintendent or human resources—level three is the superintendent, and the final level is a third-party arbitrator.

CHAIR DENIS:

How long does this process take?

SENATOR BROWER:

For a probationary teacher it should be the superintendent, not the principal. Beyond that it is too cumbersome, time-consuming and expensive. The common sense approach to deal with probationary employees should be an efficient, quick, but fair process.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH (Assembly District No. 30):

The way the bill is written, there is no process on a midyear termination in the first three years of probation. In the second round of probation, we added expedited due process for a midyear termination.

MR. STURM:

In number 9c of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#), the NSEA proposes to delete section 11, which removes probationary teachers and new employees hired as probationary administrators from the applicability of the provisions governing admonition, demotion, suspension, dismissal and non-reemployment.

SENATOR KIHUEN:

I have serious concerns removing section 8 of [A.B. 229](#). These employees need to have the due-process right. I would support the proposed amendment by the NSEA. It would be troubling for me to support the bill without their amendment.

SENATOR BROWER:

I cannot support proposed amendment number 9. I can support movement of the bill in its current form.

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 20

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

For the record, there were other proposals by the CCSD.

JOYCE HALDEMAN (Clark County School District):

The proposals developed were not just the CCSD but a part of ongoing discussions that included representatives from the NSEA, WCSD, CCSD and a number of people. We developed "Due Process Lite." A probationary teacher facing a midyear dismissal may present their case to a third party. We designated the superintendent as the third party.

CHAIR DENIS:

Please submit your proposed amendments so we can enter them into the record.

MR. STURM:

Proposed amendment number 10, [Exhibit E](#), is from Dale Erquiaga, Senior Advisor, Office of the Governor.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO ACCEPT PROPOSED AMENDMENT NUMBER 10, [EXHIBIT E](#), TO A.B. 229.

SENATOR LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

SENATOR KIHUEN:

We know there is need for education reform. I will support the bill for now. My concern is with subsection 8 of section 19. I am reserving my right to change my vote on the Senate Floor if the due-process issue does not get resolved.

CHAIR DENIS:

We are talking about reform with these bills. The big picture is we will be helping children and educators. I support the bill and have committed to continue the dialog.

Senate Committee on Education
May 20, 2011
Page 21

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 229.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

Having no further business, this meeting is adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Billie McMenamy,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mo Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
A			Agenda
B			Attendance Roster
C	A.B. 230	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
D	A.B. 225	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
E	A.B. 229	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document