

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-sixth Session
June 1, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Mo Denis at 3:45 p.m. on Wednesday, June 1, 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 Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst
Billie McMenamy, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Director, Office of Charter Schools, State Board of Education and State Board for Career and Technical Education, Department of Education
Kathleen Conaboy, K-12 Inc.
Chris Ferrari, Imagine Schools Nevada

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 2

Leigh Berdrow, Friends of ACE High School
Craig Hulse, Washoe County School District
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Dotty Merrill, Ed.D., Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards
Lonnie Shields, Nevada Association of School Administrators
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Craig Stevens, Nevada State Education Association
Zhan Okuda-Lim, Nevada Association of Student Councils; State Board of
Education and State Board for Career and Technical Education.

CHAIR DENIS:

The Committee will hear Senate Bill (S.B.) 197.

SENATE BILL 197: Revises provisions governing the system of governance and oversight of public education. (BDR 34-94)

PEPPER STURM (Policy Analyst):

The Committee has received a copy of "Proposed Amendment 7349 to Senate Bill No. 197" ([Exhibit C](#)) which rewrites S.B. 197 considerably. I have prepared a summary of the proposed changes, "Senate Bill 197 (K-12 Public Education Governance)" ([Exhibit D](#)), which the Committee has received. Changes are proposed to be made to the State Board of Education (SBE) as described in the summary, [Exhibit D](#), and the proposed amendment, section 6, pages 1 through 3, [Exhibit C](#), and section 7, pages 3 and 4, [Exhibit C](#). Section 12 of the proposed amendment, page 9, [Exhibit C](#), states the duties and tightens the measureable goals of the SBE with regard to the state improvement plan.

CHAIR DENIS:

The proposed amendments are a mixture of A.C.R. No. 2 of the 75th Session and the Education Reform Blue Ribbon Task Force report governance recommendations.

MR. STURM:

The S.B. 197 changes regarding the superintendent of public instruction (SPI) are described in the summary, [Exhibit D](#), and in the proposed amendment 7349, section 8.5, page 4 and sections 10 and 11, page 5, [Exhibit C](#).

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 3

CHAIR DENIS:

Does the SPI prepare an education state of the state report in conjunction with the SBE?

MR. STURM:

Yes.

The SPI's responsibilities with respect to certain councils, commissions and programs are included in my summary, [Exhibit D](#), and proposed amendment 7349, section 3.3, page 1, [Exhibit C](#).

Proposed amendment 7349, section 37, page 12, [Exhibit C](#), requires a report from the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to the SBE and the Legislature.

The changes to the regional professional development programs (RPDP) are shown in my summary, [Exhibit D](#), and in the proposed amendment 7349, section 47, pages 14 and 15, [Exhibit C](#).

CHAIR DENIS:

We are waiting for an amendment to [S.B. 197](#) regarding the RPDP.

The Committee will now hear [S.B. 212](#).

SENATE BILL 212 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing charter schools.
(BDR 34-900)

MR. STURM:

The Committee has received "Proposed Amendment 7182 to Senate Bill No. 212 First Reprint" ([Exhibit E](#)) which adds a new section, section 35.7, to [S.B. 212](#). The Committee has also received my summary of the amendments to [S.B. 212](#) ([Exhibit F](#)).

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

Since the Committee initially heard [S.B. 212](#) and moved it forward, the interested parties have talked and have four additional amendments.

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 4

CHAIR DENIS:

The Committee will discuss those amendments later. We would like to hear discussion on the proposed amendment 7182, [Exhibit E](#).

DR. RHEAULT:

The information included in proposed amendment 7182, [Exhibit E](#), is included in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) which was modified in 2008. These changes will strengthen our review of educational management organization (EMO) contracts with new charter schools (CS). These are items we have seen that have been taken from best practices and include what should not be in a contract.

MR. STURM:

The items included in [S.B. 212](#) are shown in my summary, [Exhibit F](#).

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

What services are being provided by the schools for the money provided by the State? Has this been discussed?

CHAIR DENIS:

The State Public Charter School Authority (Authority) will make that determination.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

There are no minority leadership appointments mentioned in [S.B. 212](#). The majority leader has stated the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) does this.

CHAIR DENIS:

Normally, there are three appointments with the majority receiving two appointments. In this case there are only two appointments.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

This omission is consistent this Session. I have not seen a lack of minority leadership appointments as often as in this Session.

CHAIR DENIS:

In this case, I do not know how we would include a minority appointment. If we can work it out, we should try to do that. Mr. Sturm, would you review what the Committee has done with [S.B. 212](#)?

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 5

MR. STURM:

The Committee had a work session on S.B. 212 which resulted in the first reprint of S.B. 212. The bill was rereferred to the Senate Committee on Finance to discuss the fiscal issues. Today, S.B. 212 was rereferred to the Senate Committee on Education.

CHAIR DENIS:

The Committee has already voted on the policy portion of S.B. 212. The Committee will now hear the proposed amendment Dr. Rheault referenced.

STEVE CANAVERO PH.D. (Director, Office of Charter Schools, State Board of Education and State Board for Career and Technical Education, Department of Education):

Following the passage of S.B. 212, a work group was convened. In the course of the discussion, we identified cleanup items to make the consistency in S.B. 212 stronger. The Committee has received a copy the working group's proposed changes to S.B. 212, sections 29, 43 and 46 of ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

The Committee wanted the Authority to adopt regulations, not the SBE as indicated in the working group's proposed changes, section 43, page 3, [Exhibit G](#).

DR. CANAVERO:

There was no conviction in the work group regarding who should have the power to promulgate regulations. The issues we considered were the cost associated with developing regulations and the statewide benefit of regulations. School districts cannot promulgate regulations; other sponsors may not agree with the regulations, forcing the SBE to arbitrate.

CHAIR DENIS:

How would regulations be created?

DR. CANAVERO:

We envision the Authority presenting the SBE with potential regulatory changes. The SBE would act on the potential regulations during a hearing. All parties would have the opportunity to address the SBE on an equal footing.

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 6

CHAIR DENIS:
Would the SBE set the regulations?

DR. CANAVERO:
Yes, if this amendment is approved.

CHAIR DENIS:
The SBE could promulgate regulations other than those presented by the Authority.

DR. CANAVERO:
That is correct.

We interpret the definition of an EMO as shown in proposed amendment 7182, page 2, subsection 2, [Exhibit E](#), to include comprehensive EMOs, not temporary staffing agencies or other smaller contracted services that CSs use, such as special education providers, administrative personnel and janitorial services.

CHAIR DENIS:
That is correct.

SENATOR WIENER:
Who provided the proposed amendment 7182, [Exhibit E](#)?

CHAIR DENIS:
The proposed amendment 7182, [Exhibit E](#), came from the majority leader.

SENATOR WIENER:
How were the formula and percentage derived in proposed amendment 7182, section 35.7, page 1, lines 12 through 14, [Exhibit E](#)?

DR. RHEAULT:
They are in regulation. When there is an application for a CS, we have an estimated number of students and a budget. Limiting liabilities is an attempt to prevent a contract which cannot be supported from being placed. For example, a contract with 25 percent of the total revenue might not be supported.

SENATOR WIENER:
How was the 15 percent determined?

DR. RHEAULT:
I will ask my fiscal staff.

CHAIR DENIS:
I would like some feedback on Dr. Canavero's proposal. There will be CSs not under the Authority. If the regulations are the SBE's responsibility, all CSs would be treated equally.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:
I would like additional information.

KATHLEEN CONABOY (K-12 Inc.):
The K-12 Inc. is an EMO working with the Nevada Virtual Academy. The working group included people from EMOs, individual CSs and the school districts. There was some ambivalence about having regulatory authority because not all CSs would be covered by the Authority. The stakeholders feel comfortable with the opportunity to bring forward ideas and issues needing consideration in the regulatory process. The Authority does not need the authority to promulgate regulations. If the Authority were to promulgate regulations, it would incur a fiscal note for fees to the LCB and the Office of the Attorney General. Since the school districts do not have this authority, we did not feel the Authority should have that authority.

CHAIR DENIS:
Is there any discussion regarding the 2 percent sponsorship fee as presented in Dr. Canavero's proposal, page 1, [Exhibit G](#)? There does not appear to be a downside to doing this. Is there any concern regarding the appointment of a member of the Charter School Association of Nevada (CSAN) to the Authority, page 2, [Exhibit G](#)? What does "pursuant to subsection 3" section 29, subsection 1, paragraph (d), page 48 of S.B. 212 mean?

MR. STURM:
At the bottom of page 2 in Dr. Canavero's proposal, [Exhibit G](#), subsection 3 is deleted. The Authority was going to prepare a list of all the associations in the states that represent CSs and appoint a member from that list. Dr. Canavero's proposal, [Exhibit G](#), makes subsection 3 unnecessary.

CHAIR DENIS:
Are all of the CSs represented by the CSAN?

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 8

DR. CANAVERO:

It is a voluntary membership organization. I cannot say all CSs belong to the CSAN.

CHAIR DENIS:

Why would you want to name the CSAN rather than having the Authority create a list?

DR. CANAVERO:

We intended to use the CSAN in both sections. Otherwise, the language should be around the list. Section 2, page 11, S.B. 212 also references the CSAN.

CHAIR DENIS:

We could change page 11, S.B. 212, or make the change recommended in your proposal, [Exhibit G](#), page 2. If we decide to use the CSAN, we would also want to add "or its successor organization."

DR. CANAVERO:

The proposed amendment, page 1, [Exhibit G](#), makes the request for a reduction in fee consistent with the annual performance audit exemption.

CHRIS FERRARI (Imagine Schools Nevada):

This is the first time I have seen proposed amendment 7182, [Exhibit E](#), and have not had adequate time to review it. Imagine Schools Nevada is an EMO. There are some items in this amendment which are outside the scope of the NAC and cause some operational concerns for performing services in this State. I will provide information during the Assembly hearing on S.B. 212.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 212 WITH AMENDMENT 7182 AND THE AMENDMENTS
PROPOSED BY DR. CANAVERO.

SENATOR LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

MR. STURM:

The Legal Division, LCB, may need to change some of the language when they draft S.B. 212. Is the process for the Authority to submit regulations to the SBE included in this amendment?

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 9

DR. CANAVERO:

The procedure is not specified in the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#). The working group did not want a specified procedure, just the ability to go to the SBE to request changes to regulations.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

The Committee will now hear Assembly Bill (A.B.) 171.

ASSEMBLY BILL 171 (3rd Reprint): Revises provisions governing charter schools. (BDR 34-812)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TERESA BENITEZ-THOMPSON (Assembly District No. 27):

The Committee has received a copy of my PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit H](#)). Section 1 of A.B. 171 changes the composition of a CS's formation committee, page 3, [Exhibit H](#). Changing this section will provide CSs with the discretion needed to assemble a good formation committee. Language is added in subsections 5 and 6, section 1, A.B. 171, to allow the Department of Education (DoE) to take a qualitative look at the application to determine if the application is compliant. If the application is not compliant, the DoE is required to assign staff to the formation committee for that CS to resolve any deficiencies.

The changes to section 2, pages 6 through 8, A.B. 171, streamline the application process. The law does not speak to the situations in which the SBE has a stalemate on an application. The intent is to allow the sponsors of a CS the opportunity to work with the DoE to correct reasons an application is denied or not acted on.

Sections 3 and 4, pages 8 through 12, A.B. 171, address amendments to written charters. The intent is twofold. First, if a sponsor denies an amendment to the school's charter, it must provide the reason for denial in writing. Secondly, it requires the DoE to set a process regarding amendments.

Reporting required in section 5 and governing board changes, section 6, A.B. 171, pages 12 through 15, are described in my presentation, [Exhibit H](#), pages 7 and 8.

Section 7, subsection 1, paragraph (e), page 16, A.B. 171, adjusts the criteria by which a CS may apply to the DoE for funding referenced in my presentation on page 9, [Exhibit H](#). As an example, a senior who transfers from a public high school to a CS and does not pass the proficiency exam reflects negatively on the CS because that is where the test was taken. That process is not an accurate reflection of the quality of instruction the CS actually gives; it is more a reflection of the school previously attended.

Section 8, pages 16 and 17, A.B. 171, allows students who attend a CS to participate in extracurricular activities provided by the school district in which the students are zoned.

Section 9, subsection 1 and subsection 4, A.B. 171, contain substantive changes, as summarized in my presentation, page 11, [Exhibit H](#). The related fiscal note has been removed.

Clarification of enrollment changes appear in section 10, page 28, A.B. 171, and in my presentation, page 12, [Exhibit H](#).

I worked with the CSs to assure this bill would help with the formation and amending process and their governing committees.

SENATOR WIENER:

Are the measures the Committee previously heard complementary to A.B. 171?

CHAIR DENIS:

Assembly Bill 171 is complementary to S.B. 212.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

During our drafting of A.B. 171, we were mindful of the fact the Nevada Charter School Institute would come into place.

DR. RHEAULT:

The DoE supports A.B. 171. Many of the items in A.B. 171 were agreed to in 2009. The DoE testified on the fiscal note which has been removed.

MS. CONABOY:

We are in support of A.B. 171.

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 11

MR. FERRARI:

We are in support of A.B. 171.

CHAIR DENIS:

Does A.B. 171 conflict in any way with S.B. 212?

DR. RHEULT:

I do not see any conflict except that in S.B. 212, there is a 2 percent administration fee. If A.B. 171 is passed, the fee would not change. If S.B. 212 is passed, the fee would change and correct the problem.

LEIGH BERDROW (Friends of ACE High School):

Although ACE High School supports A.B. 171, we have submitted testimony and a proposed amendment ([Exhibit I](#)). The change to section 6, subsection 1, paragraph (c), page 14, A.B. 171, requires a parent member on the governing body. The ACE High School is not against having a parent on our board. The ACE High School proposed amendment, pages 1 and 3, [Exhibit I](#), changes section 6 to make an exception for career and technical high schools. The proposed amendment by ACE High School, pages 2 and 4, [Exhibit I](#), also recommends a minor change to section 7 to add Grade 13. The ACE High School has an extremely involved parent advisory group. We would appreciate not having a mandate to change our model.

SENATOR WIENER:

Most schools go through Grade 12. How do we draft a bill adding Grade 13?

MS. BERDROW:

Section 7, A.B. 171, addresses the high school proficiency exam. If a school did not have a Grade 13, it would not matter. Both Grades 12 and 13 should be included in the statistics; otherwise everyone is not counted.

DR. RHEULT:

I am not familiar with Grade 13. Under the new graduation requirements, for example, students are measured when they enroll in Grade 9 and four years later, in Grade 12. We would need to include them in our graduation rates. For the requirement to be consistent, the proficiency exam would need to be passed by Grade 12 and to be considered a graduate under the new graduation rate calculation. I would need to discuss this further, but would probably support leaving the language in as Grade 12.

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 12

SENATOR WIENER:

Would it work to say "Grade 12 or its equivalent" because Grade 13 could be the final grade?

DR. RHEAULT:

Grade 13 is not defined in statute. The bill stipulates all course work requirements must be met.

MS. BERDROW:

The ACE High School does not have a problem with what Dr. Rheault is saying. The Washoe County School District (WCSD) accounting system, which we are required to use, lists students at Grade 13. We will work with the WCSD to assure the students are included in the graduation calculation.

CHAIR DENIS:

I have always supported a parent being involved on a board where policy decisions are made.

The Committee will close the hearing on A.B. 171 and will now hear A.B. 224.

ASSEMBLY BILL 224 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing parental involvement in education. (BDR 34-859)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TERESA BENITEZ-THOMPSON (Assembly District No. 27):

The two most important factors for student success are qualified and skilled teachers and family involvement in the student's learning process. The Committee has received a copy of my written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)). This is not a bill mandating parents spend time at school or that they need to be involved in education. Assembly Bill 224 acknowledges the fact we are asking our schools, school districts and teachers to do more with less. As I have indicated in my written testimony, page 7, [Exhibit J](#), this bill asks our school districts and schools to develop a plan to leverage and engage parents to improve student achievement. New teachers do not know how to reach out effectively and engage students. I am a social worker by profession. All of my professional training and graduate work was based on interpersonal relationships. I assumed teachers received education on how to work with families. Teachers know their curriculum, but everything dealing with families is unfamiliar. This bill should address this situation. Real family engagement is data driven. It is about research and using best practices.

Section 2, A.B. 224, establishes the Office of Parental Involvement and Family Engagement within the DoE. One staff person will go to the school sites and school districts to develop a plan to engage families more in their child's student achievement. The staff person will serve as a clearinghouse for teachers and families on best practices of family engagement. Resources and data are available. Professional development is available. The Southern Nevada RPDP has provided the Committee with a letter supporting A.B. 224 ([Exhibit K](#)).

Section 3, A.B. 224, establishes guidelines to assist families to help their children achieve standards in content and performance. The DoE will help bring together the school districts and schools to establish parent advisory councils.

Measurements will be established and evaluated to gauge the effectiveness of family engagement. We will want to look at this data in two years to reevaluate the time and energy involved in this legislation.

SENATOR WIENER:

How would you encourage and promote engagement in establishing an advisory council, mentioned in section 4, A.B. 224?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

Schools and school districts want this bill. Schools funded through Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 must put this plan in place. This bill provides staff to coordinate these efforts. The WCSD has one person who is a resource to coordinate this type of work.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The fiscal note is of concern. The Douglas County School District has said funds for this program would come from the RPDP. Teachers need training for things other than a new program.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

We do have a letter of support from the Statewide Council for the Coordination of the Regional Training Programs. We did not want this bill to go forward if it imposes any unfunded mandates. The key to this bill is having a person in the DoE responsible for spearheading and carrying out all the provisions of A.B. 224. I spoke with a regional professional development program about different ways they envision carrying out A.B. 224. They have curriculum and programs focusing on parental involvement and family engagement. They do not

have the time to get it to every teacher, school district or parent. It may be possible to look at practicum hours in terms of teacher licensing.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

There are many fiscal notes related to A.B. 224. How will the bill be financed?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

The Assembly Committee on Ways and Means reduced the fiscal note, and funds were appropriated.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

What was the amount of the fiscal note?

CHAIR DENIS:

The fiscal note is \$67,126 plus \$20,000 for the Parent Advisory Council. The funding is available. The Senate Committee on Finance will look at the fiscal note. This Committee needs to determine if A.B. 224 is good policy.

CRAIG HULSE (Washoe County School District):

Parental involvement has been a priority for the WCSD. Parental involvement plays a huge part in a child's education. Unfunded mandates and undue burdens on school districts have been addressed. The WCSD supports the final draft of A.B. 224.

NICOLE ROURKE (Clark County School District):

The Clark County School District (CCSD) supports A.B. 224. The CCSD has a parent involvement coordinator who recently worked on a grant with United Way of Southern Nevada and the national United Way to open five family engagement centers in our most at-risk high schools. The CCSD has a Parent Engagement Forum with which we consult on a regular basis.

DOTTY MERRILL, ED.D. (Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards):

The Nevada Association of School Boards supports A.B. 224. Many school boards have moved forward with specific activities related to family and parent engagement. The problem this bill will remedy is the lack of statewide coordination so each school board, school district and set of teachers within a district will have appropriate options and strategies to stimulate and develop greater parent involvement.

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 15

LONNIE SHIELDS (Nevada Association of School Administrators):

The Nevada Association of School Administrators supports A.B. 224. Only by working together can we help students and their parents.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents supports A.B. 224. Especially in the 15 rural school districts, there are many volunteers who coordinate with parents in our schools. A statewide coordinator will be helpful. We know the SBE cannot provide a dedicated coordinator without a paid position.

DR. RHEAULT:

The DoE supports A.B. 224. A staff person dedicated to the activities of A.B. 224 is necessary. The amendment provides State appropriations to support A.B. 224.

CRAIG STEVENS (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association supports A.B. 224.

SENATOR WIENER:

The one thing high-achieving students have in common is having meals with their families at least three days each week. That too is a type of parent involvement.

ZHAN OKUDA-LIM (Nevada Association of Student Councils; State Board of Education and State Board for Career and Technical Education):

Anything we can do to provide incentives and encouragement to parents, guardians and communities to become involved in education is positive. I support A.B. 224.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 224.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

I will not vote on A.B. 224 until we have more information on the funding.

CHAIR DENIS:

I am surprised we do not have the information.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CEGAVSKE ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE AND SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. OKUDA-LIM:

The members of the Committee have received a copy of my testimony regarding S.B. 197 on behalf of the Nevada Association of Student Councils (NASC) ([Exhibit L](#)). The language in section 6, subsection 2, paragraph (d), S.B. 197, is not logistically feasible for our volunteer association. If the current process is not an option, the NASC encourages the Committee to allow the Nevada Commission on K-12 Public Education to make the decision with recommendations from the NASC, the Nevada Youth Legislature and other statewide youth organizations. Proposed language for an amendment is included in my testimony, page 1, [Exhibit L](#).

The NASC is recommending the term of a student commissioner run parallel to the school year, S.B. 197, section 55, subsection 6, as stated in my testimony, on S.B. 197, page 1, [Exhibit L](#).

The NASC supports an amendment to S.B. 197 to include the language from A.B. 548, section 4, subsection 2, paragraph (c) as shown in my written testimony, page 1, [Exhibit L](#). This procedure would be similar to the procedure in Maryland.

ASSEMBLY BILL 548: Revises provisions governing the system of governance of K-12 public education. (BDR 34-741)

CHAIR DENIS:

Does the NASC have a priority for their proposed amendments?

MR. OKUDA-LIM:

The NASC supports the process for selecting a student to the SBE. If that is not possible, making the changes to section 6, subsection 2, paragraph (d), S.B. 197 as recommended in my testimony, [Exhibit L](#), would be the first priority. The second priority would be adding the language from A.B. 548 as shown in my written testimony, page 1, [Exhibit L](#).

Senate Committee on Education
June 1, 2011
Page 17

MR. STEVENS:

The proposed amendment 7349, A.B. 197, section 6, subsection 2, page 2, [Exhibit C](#), lists the recognized bargaining agents. Section 6, subsection 5, paragraph (a), page 3, [Exhibit C](#), states a commission member must be a teacher at a public school. As the other members are recognized bargaining agents, the NASC asks, as the representative of educators, to have a say in who is appointed to the SBE.

CHAIR DENIS:

There being no public comment or further business to come before this Committee, we are adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sandra Small,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mo Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 197	C	Pepper Sturm	Proposed Amendment 7349
S.B. 197	D	Pepper Sturm	K-12 Public Education Governance
S.B. 212	E	Pepper Sturm	Proposed Amendment 7182
S.B. 212	F	Pepper Sturm	State Public Charter School Authority
S.B. 212	G	Steve Canavero	SB 212 Charter Schools proposed amendments
A.B. 171	H	Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez Thompson	PowerPoint Presentation
A.B. 171	I	Leigh Berdrow	Written testimony and amendment
A.B. 224	J	Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez Thompson	PowerPoint Presentation
A.B. 224	K	Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez Thompson	So. NV RPDP Letter from Bill Hanlon
S.B. 197	L	Zhan Okuda-Lim	Written Testimony