

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-sixth Session  
March 25, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Mo Denis at 3:39 p.m. on Friday, March 25, 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

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst  
Mindy Martini, Policy Analyst  
Sandra Small, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Alison Turner, Nevada Parent Teacher Association  
Eva Melendrez, Parent Services Coordinator, Clark County School District  
Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Dotty Merrill, Ed.D., Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards  
Mendy Elliott, United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra  
Craig Hulse, Washoe County School District  
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Tami Berg, Nevada Parent Teacher Association  
Christopher Roller, American Heart Association

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 2

Irene Smith, Advocacy Chair, American Diabetes Association  
Nicole Bungum, Southern Nevada Health District  
Barbara Paulsen, Partners for a Healthy Nevada  
Scott Lamprecht, Ph.D., American Heart Association  
Keith Ahrens  
Donnell Barton, Director, Office of Child Nutrition and School Health,  
Department of Education  
Jennifer Hadayia, Washoe County Health District  
Danielle Bowen, Nevada Afterschool Network  
Bart Mangino, Clark County School District  
Sheila Ward, Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee  
Sharon S. Kientz, National Right to Read Foundation  
Gloria Javreguy  
Ralph E. Reynolds, Ph.D., Educational Psychology, University of Nevada,  
Las Vegas

CHAIR DENIS:  
I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 229.

[SENATE BILL 229](#): Revises provisions governing the policy adopted by the State Board of Education to encourage parental and family involvement in supporting the education of their children. (BDR 34-475)

VICE CHAIR KIHUEN:  
Senator Denis is one of the sponsors of S.B. 229.

SENATOR MOISES (MO) DENIS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 2):  
Parental involvement is the number one factor in student success. Senate Bill 229 revises the parental and family involvement policy requirements the Board of Education (SBE) must adopt. Section 1, page 2, beginning with line 18, revises the elements and the goals of the policy. Studies performed by the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) resulted in these updated policies. The Committee has received a copy of the "History of Parental Involvement Legislation in Nevada" ([Exhibit C](#)).

VICE CHAIR KIHUEN:  
Some parents are never seen in their child's school. My parents were involved in my education through college.

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 3

CHAIR DENIS:

I became involved with the Nevada PTA 20 years ago. I am a past president and serve on the national endowment board.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Will the Department of Education's (DE) Superintendent of Public Instruction inform all 17 counties and all school principals of the contents of S.B. 229 upon its passage? This bill encompasses all grade levels.

CHAIR DENIS:

Yes, that is the intent of S.B. 229. Previous legislation has required adoption by the SBE and all 17 school districts.

ALISON TURNER (Nevada Parent Teacher Association):

The Committee has received a copy of my testimony ([Exhibit D](#)). The Nevada PTA supports S.B. 229 which updates the original six standards for parental involvement. Our hope is to bring the single greatest predictor of successful student outcome, effective family engagement, to every school and every family across Nevada. Each member of the Legislature has been provided with a brief overview of the National Standards, Goals, and Indicators for Family-School Partnerships ([Exhibit E](#)). One of the challenges continues to be implementation. There are variables between Nevada's 17 school districts. Clark County has 1.5 staff positions to support family engagement for over 300,000 students; Washoe County has 3 staff positions for 63,000 students. Most rural districts do not have family engagement staff positions.

EVA MELENDREZ (Parent Services Coordinator, Clark County School District):

The Clark County School District (CCSD) supports S.B. 229. We work closely with the PTA and other parent organizations to provide families with the training and resources needed to support students academically.

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

The DE supports S.B. 229. It makes sense to keep Nevada's standards up to date. The DE's Advisory Council on Parent Involvement is helping to draft a policy. The districts will implement the new policies.

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 4

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

The Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) supports S.B. 229. Section 1, subsection 2, line 18, is an important first step.

MENDY ELLIOTT (United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra):

The United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra (United Way) supports S.B. 229. The United Way recently provided \$100,000 to the Washoe County School District (WCSD) to begin a parent university.

CRAIG HULSE (Washoe County School District):

The WCSD supports S.B. 229.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) supports S.B. 229.

TAMI BERG (Nevada Parent Teacher Association):

As a parent, I support S.B. 229.

VICE CHAIR KIHUEN:

There being no further testimony, the hearing on S.B. 229 is closed.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 229.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

VICE CHAIR KIHUEN:

The Committee will now hear S.B. 230.

SENATE BILL 230: Prohibits the sale or provision of foods containing trans fats at public schools within this State. (BDR 34-666)

CHAIR DENIS:

This bill applies to foods sold during school days on school grounds including the cafeteria, vending machines and fund-raisers. Senate Bill 230 also applies to

extended school day activities as defined in section 1, subsection 5, page 2. Trans fats are defined in section 1, subsection 4, page 2. This bill, as shown in section 1, subsection 3, lines 26 through 29, does not apply to food made available under the federal School Breakfast Program or the National School Lunch Program. This exemption is not necessary because foods provided by these programs do not contain trans fats. The Hispanic community has the largest number of childhood obesity and childhood diabetes cases. We know healthy children will do better in school. There is no intent to turn the schools into "trans fat police."

SENATOR BROWER:

The goal of this bill is laudable. Would S.B. 230 prevent a student from bringing foods containing trans fats into the school?

CHAIR DENIS:

The bill could apply to what a student brings to the school. Hopefully, guidelines will be given to parents with respect to foods such as birthday treats.

CHRISTOPHER ROLLER (American Heart Association):

There is no trans fat enforcement mechanism in S.B. 230. The intention of this bill is not to turn school teachers and administrators into "trans fat police." There is no requirement to ask each parent or fund-raiser if trans fats are included in their foods. The enforcement and compliance of this law could be performed through each school's wellness policy and the individual school's nutrition, vending and food sales policies.

The American Heart Association (AHA) focuses its community child health efforts on promoting physical education, health education, increased physical activity, nutrition and research. We support S.B. 230. Trans fats are contained in foods prepared with partially hydrogenated vegetable oil. Recent science links the consumption of trans fats to an increased risk of cardiovascular disease due in part to the negative effects of these fats on our good cholesterol. Consumption of trans fats have negative effects on our ability to metabolize healthier fats that increase our good cholesterol and can cause inflammation and atherosclerosis lesions. Increased awareness of the dangers of trans fats have led to a significant reduction in their use. Foods containing trans fats do exist in schools. Due to the relatively recent widespread use of artificially produced trans fats and rising childhood obesity rates, we are seeing younger children and youth diagnosed with diabetes and heart disease. There is no reason, with the

availability of alternative fats such as olive oil, walnut oil and canola oil, we should be feeding trans fats to our children. The federal government recently took steps to eliminate trans fats from school meals through the Child Nutrition Act. This bill helps remove trans fats from the schools. I have provided the Committee with additional information regarding trans fats ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATOR WIENER:

Has the AHA, or similar organizations with nutrition as a substantial component, considered working with the school districts, schools or PTAs to develop basic educational information such as simple recipes or newsletters to change the culture of items brought into the schools? Statute changes often require a culture shift. Posting recipes throughout an ethnic grocery store, for instance, using ingredients which are culturally appropriate, easy to prepare and taste good may help people change their habits. Many cancers are linked to nutritional issues.

MR. ROLLER:

The AHA is part of the school wellness program in Clark County. We develop some outreach and educational information. The AHA has educational materials on its Website and publishes heart-healthy cookbooks for a variety of cultural foods. I will work to find a way to get those books to parents and children. The challenge is providing the information the best way possible. The market has done a good job of removing trans fats from most foods.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

What are the consequences if a school district does not adhere to S.B. 230? Some rural schools are concerned with S.B. 230 because, due to school size, they prepare their own food. Does the bill take that situation into consideration? Should the bill be permissive?

CHAIR DENIS:

The language in S.B. 230 was developed before the federal guidelines removing trans fats were implemented. The bill is not perfect; there are some items which need to be addressed.

IRENE SMITH (Advocacy Chair, American Diabetes Association):

I have submitted a position statement ([Exhibit G](#)) on behalf of the American Diabetes Association (ADA) in support of S.B. 230. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, one in three Caucasian and one in

two minority healthy children born in 2000 will develop diabetes. As a consequence, parents may outlive their children. The ADA has many pamphlets and promotions at health fairs. We also work with pharmacies in grocery stores to point out what is healthy and what is not. The ADA's Website has educational tools especially for parents and children.

I have also provided the written testimony of Asheesh Dewan, M.D., Pediatric Endocrinology ([Exhibit H](#)), in support of S.B. 230.

SENATOR WIENER:

Are simple recipes available through the ADA?

MS. SMITH:

Yes, the ADA has recipes as well as nutritional information.

NICOLE BUNGUM (Southern Nevada Health District):

Last year the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) commissioned a community survey concerning a variety of issues related to nutrition, physical activity and obesity. We are in the process of finalizing the data and preparing a report. The preliminary data indicates 71 percent of Clark County respondents would support banning trans fat in the school environment. A small percentage indicated they would oppose such an effort. It makes sense to improve the nutritional profile of foods offered within the school environment. The SNHD supports S.B. 230 ([Exhibit I](#)).

SENATOR WIENER:

How many and who participated in the survey?

MS. BUNGUM:

We surveyed 1,200 people in Clark County and are in the process of surveying another 300 outside Clark County. New technology allowed us to use cell phone numbers to reach people without landlines. The survey was conducted in English and Spanish. We tried to get a representative sample of the community.

BARBARA PAULSEN (Partners for a Healthy Nevada):

I am a registered dietician and a part-time instructor in the Department of Kinesiology and Nutrition Sciences at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). I am also a member of the Advisory Council to the State Program on Fitness and Wellness and the Partners for a Healthy Nevada. I have provided my

written comments in support of S.B. 230 ([Exhibit J](#)). Children eat a significant portion of their food at school. It is important schools assist in the development of healthy eating patterns and taste preferences by providing healthy food choices. There are a number of nutrition students and interns, many of whom are bilingual, at UNLV looking for projects. They may be helpful in developing materials for parents and students to make cultural changes.

SCOTT LAMPRECHT, PH.D. (American Heart Association):

I am the chairman of the Southern Nevada Working Group for the AHA and a cardiac arrest researcher for adolescents. I support S.B. 230. I have developed a screening program to assess youth between the ages of 11 and 17 for heart issues. Trans fats cause inflammation creating fat and plaque inside the artery walls causing them to become brittle and rough and leading to narrowing of the blood vessels.

KEITH AHRENS:

I am from Henderson, Nevada, and am 49 years old. I support S.B. 230. Every 33 seconds, someone dies in the United States of cardiovascular disease. Four years ago, I came close to being one of those statistics. I weighed over 414 pounds, had a heart attack and underwent open heart surgery. Since 2007, I have lost over 200 pounds without weight loss surgery by following an AHA diet and exercise program. I have become a certified fitness trainer, a specialist in fitness nutrition and a credentialed basic life support instructor for the AHA. I am a best-selling author and a national advocate for prevention, awareness education and lifestyle changes related to heart disease. Trans fats played an important part in my cardiovascular disease.

MINDY MARTINI (Policy Analyst):

As staff, I neither advocate nor oppose any legislation. I have prepared a summary of data collected from Nevada school districts, "Quick Poll of School Districts" ([Exhibit K](#)), regarding trans fats in schools. The two largest school districts, CCSD and WCSD, do not purchase products with trans fats; however, neither has a policy banning them. The CCSD and the WCSD indicate they would support a policy banning the use of trans fats in school meals. Of the 12 rural school districts responding to the poll, 8 currently purchase some food products with trans fats. Access to vendors not using trans fats is a problem in the rural areas. Cost is an obstacle in Douglas, Elko and Humboldt Counties school districts.



SENATOR LESLIE:

Are the trans fats in foods referred to in Ms. Martini's survey provided by the schools outside of the federal food programs?

MS. MARTINI:

The Purchasing Division, Department of Administration, indicated food commodities purchased directly from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), contain no trans fats. These commodities represent approximately 10 percent of the foods purchased by the school districts.

DONNELL BARTON (Director, Office of Child Nutrition and School Health, Department of Education):

The previous federal Child Nutrition Act did not ban trans fats. The 2010 act does ban trans fat. The USDA is in the rule-making process regarding nutrition standards for "competitive foods." Competitive foods are in direct competition with the National School Lunch Program. At this time, I do not know if competitive foods include all foods sold in all schools. The new menus must be in place for the 2012 school year. These menus will significantly change the foods in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs. A fruit and vegetable must be served every day at lunch and a fruit at breakfast.

The DE has a Child and Adult Care Food Program which often serves after-school snacks to children on the school campus. Most of these products are purchased from the school's food authorities. Some schools have developed a list of foods not containing trans fat.

JENNIFER HADAYIA (Washoe County Health District):

The Washoe County Health District (WCHD) supports S.B. 230 ([Exhibit L](#)). The WCHD has an opportunity, in our chronic disease prevention program, to utilize the parent engagement strategies of the WCSD to communicate with parents about healthy nutrition. We use infinite campus, virtual prekindergarten, newsletters, parent coordinators at each school and school nurses. The WCHD could include trans fat alternatives in our programs.

I have also provided letters from Tabor Griswold, Washoe County Chronic Disease Coalition ([Exhibit M](#)) and John Packham, Nevada Public Health Association ([Exhibit N](#)), supporting S.B. 230

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 10

DANIELLE BOWEN (Nevada Afterschool Network):

All the afterschool programs surveyed by the Nevada Afterschool Network support S.B. 230.

MS. MERRILL:

The NASB supports the intent of S.B. 230. The NASB is concerned with the word "ensure" in section 1, subsection 1, line 5, page 2. School board members do not believe they can ensure with 95 percent or 100 percent certainty all trans fats are eliminated from schools and school activities. School board members agree more can be done to limit trans fats. Some of the wellness policies could place greater importance on trans fats, such as in student handbooks and letters to parents. There is a concern parents may feel unwelcome bringing treats to the classroom, which is in conflict with S.B. 229. Some Title I schools have business partners providing food products which may contain trans fats. Letters of intent could be provided to these business partners. Students bring lunches from home and may share their lunch with other students. Extended school activities are another concern. The NASB will work with the bill's sponsors to address our concerns.

BART MANGINO (Clark County School District):

The CCSD supports the intent of S.B. 230. Our food service has not included trans fats for the last two years. The CCSD wellness policy does not prohibit trans fats; however, with minor modifications, that would not be a major obstacle. Once the shelf at Bonanza High School is clear of the remaining three items with trans fats, those items will not be replaced. The CCSD will work with you on the bill's language to monitor the existence of trans fats

MS. PIERCZYNSKI:

The NASS supports the spirit of S.B. 230. The NASS is concerned with the enforcement of the bill and looks forward to working with the sponsors to address this issue.

SENATOR WIENER:

What were the three brands with a short life at Bonanza High School?

MR. MANGINO:

There were two types of Lunchables and Cheez-Its.

MR. HULSE:

The WCSD supports the idea of no trans fats in school meals and does not offer foods with trans fats. We do have concerns regarding liability and with not allowing hot dogs, popcorn, etc., at after-school activities. The WCSD will work with the Committee to limit trans fats in our schools.

CHAIR DENIS:

I would like a group, led by Mr. Roller, to resolve the issues raised today.

MR. ROLLER:

I will coordinate with the interested parties and get back to the Committee.

VICE CHAIR KIHUEN:

There being no further testimony, the hearing on S.B. 230 is closed.

CHAIR DENIS:

The hearing is now open for public comment.

SHEILA WARD( Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee):

My prepared testimony ([Exhibit O](#)) opposing S.B. 216 focuses on statistics from President Bush's President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education. Explicit systematic phonics instruction is the method which should be used to teach reading.

**SENATE BILL 216**: Establishes Reading Skills Development Centers. (BDR 34-1098)

SHARON S. KIENTZ (National Right to Read Foundation):

I am a retired kindergarten and reading teacher and am also representing my four grandchildren who attend Reno schools. The 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress indicates 76 percent of fourth graders read at basic or below basic level. Senate Bill 216 does not remedy the problem of ineffective beginning reading instruction in kindergarten through second grades. Proven phonics-intensive reading programs must be implemented in all primary grade classrooms. My comments in opposition to S.B. 216 and support for phonics-based reading instruction have been provided to the Committee ([Exhibit P](#)).

GLORIA JAVREGUY:

I oppose S.B. 216. I am embarrassed with the low reading ability of Nevada's children. Adding another layer of remediation will not be effective. Nevada schools have curriculum specialists, reading and literacy specialists, professional development opportunities and Title I schools. Would S.B. 216 create wasteful duplication and problems of coordination? A budget proposal in the CCSD included elimination of many staff positions, including literacy specialists. This bill would allocate \$2 million for reading development and improvement. The bill has no provisions for accountability, reporting, staff hiring or specific criteria for the professional development program. Technology costs required in S.B. 216 could consume a substantial portion of the allocated funds. Is it necessary to budget funds for the most current research-based knowledge about reading and reading instruction? This information is already widely available. It is time for micromanaging on the part of the Senate Committee on Education and the Legislature. The funds allocated in this bill would be better spent training all elementary school teachers in research-based and proven methods of reading. Teachers hired from out of state should have specific training in effective and proven reading programs. In 1999, Utah created a reading skills development center. Two years later it was changed to a clinic situation—more remediation. I recommend Committee members read *Why Johnnie Can't Read, Why Johnnie Still Can't Read* and the National Reading Panel's report, *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment*.

CHAIR DENIS:

At a previous meeting, the Committee heard testimony about the Utah program.

The public comment portion of this meeting is closed. The Committee will begin the work session on S.B. 196.

**SENATE BILL 196**: Revises provisions governing empowerment schools.  
(BDR 34-86)

PEPPER STURM (Policy Analyst):

The Committee heard S.B. 196 on March 9, 2011. This bill proposes four major changes: the ability to carry forward State funds; a timetable for converting public schools to empowerment schools; removes the sunset; and eliminates the cap on the number of empowerment schools ([Exhibit Q](#)). A proposed amendment was received from CCSD, [Exhibit Q](#), pages 1 and 2.

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 13

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

Will the \$75,000 fiscal note be required if the CCSD amendment is accepted?

MR. MANGINO:

The amendment does address the fiscal note. The empowerment schools would be phased in as necessary.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The Committee has not received any reports from empowerment schools. We have not seen a progress report; we do not know if students have improved through this process or if graduation rates have been affected. There are many questions about empowerment schools needing to be answered. Must every school use the same empowerment model? Some schools struggle. I need additional information before supporting S.B. 196. We should look at other options for the CCSD; every school district and neighborhood is different.

SENATOR WIENER:

Are the criteria to identify schools referenced in the CCSD amendment to section 4, the same criteria schools would integrate in the empowerment model?

MR. MANGINO:

The criteria to become an empowerment school could be voluntary. The CCSD has a range of models. The CCSD has some successful schools which are not empowerment schools. The governance in those schools is effective. The CCSD is concerned with becoming an empowerment school just for the sake of empowerment. The proposed amendment provides the individual school districts with the opportunity to determine what is best for each school.

CHAIR DENIS:

Does the DE have data or additional information on empowerment schools?

DR. RHEAULT:

Section 4 of S.B. 196 references *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 386.700 through NRS 386.780 which includes a number of criteria to be addressed by empowerment schools, such as staffing. There is no reporting requirement. The report by the DE should be a summary of what has happened with the empowerment schools initiated during the biennium using the criteria

established in the NRS. This is the first time I have seen the CCSD amendment, and I have not reviewed it.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

My question does not relate to the amendment. I am concerned with the general lack of information about empowerment schools. I want to know if the funding benefits staff and students. What was the cause of the high schools' issues? We need to know the results achieved by the current empowerment schools. We need to compare the empowerment schools to public schools. Are the restrictions on empowerment schools beneficial to the schools and students?

I do not like using a cookie-cutter approach with the empowerment schools; empowerment schools do not have to look alike.

CHAIR DENIS:

Were these issues discussed during the interim?

MR. STURM:

Two principals from empowerment schools in Clark County gave an overview of what they were doing, the funding impact on their schools and having the autonomy to move funds between categories. The principals were able to contract and had freedom to hire. They were pleased with the model. The Committee received information March 9, 2011, from the CCSD on the impact of empowerment schools.

MR. MANGINO:

The CCSD has several empowerment school models. One school Mr. Sturm referenced chose to hire support staff to work with children under the guidance of a licensed teacher on such things as reading fluency and math skills. This school also increased the length of the school day.

DR. RHEAULT:

I understand the DE would collect information from all the school districts as to the plans and criteria established for empowerment schools and that empowerment schools would not be mandated.

CHAIR DENIS:

Is there any discussion from the Committee regarding the concept of S.B. 196? Staff will research the information Senator Cegavske has requested.

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 15

MR. MANGINO:

The Committee is looking for performance results or achievement results from the empowerment schools in the CCSD. I will provide the information within the week.

SENATOR LESLIE:

I am uncertain with carrying forward funds as outlined in section 2, subsection 5.

SENATOR WIENER:

Could the CCSD provide the Committee with the number of empowerment schools, when they were established, what grades are taught at each school and any performance measures? The two schools in my district use different empowerment models.

MR. MANGINO:

I will provide that information.

CHAIR DENIS:

My intent is to hold S.B. 196 until we have more information. I will close the work session on S.B. 196 and open the work session on S.B. 216.

MR. STURM:

Senate Bill 216 was heard in Committee on March 2, 2011 ([Exhibit R](#)). Reading Skills Development Centers would be established at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and UNLV. There is a professional development component in this bill. An amendment was proposed by Bill Hanlon, [Exhibit R](#), pages 1 and 2, to shift certain responsibilities from the Reading Skills Development Center to the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDPs). The Literacy Studies faculty at UNR generally supports S.B. 216, [Exhibit R](#), page 4.

CHAIR DENIS:

The money portion of this bill will be heard in the Senate Committee on Finance.

RALPH E. REYNOLDS, PH.D. (Educational Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

I am a Lincy Fellow from the College of Education at UNLV and past president of the international Society for the Scientific Study of Reading (SSSR). The SSSR focuses on the child's ability to read and the instructional techniques

supporting those abilities. I have not had a chance to study the proposed amendment. We plan to collaborate, to the degree possible, with the RPDPs.

CHAIR DENIS:

This is a different way of looking at literacy. This Session is about reform.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The information from Bill Hanlon indicates a willingness to work with Dr. Reynolds' group. I recommend Mr. Hanlon and Dr. Reynolds look at child development over the next two years then revisit this concept next Session.

CHAIR DENIS:

If there is a model working in other places that will work in Nevada to help our children learn to read, we need to implement it now.

DR. REYNOLDS:

Our model is the same as the one used at the Florida Center for Reading Research which has shown excellent results. We also have a model similar to the University of Utah Reading Clinic. The Utah Clinic was changed from a center to a clinic due to political issues over the title. I can provide data on both centers. The intervention strategies and the research orientation we use is that of the National Reading Panel which is the most up-to-date approach for reading instruction and reading intervention. The accurate diagnosis of reading problems in children is an important issue. There are children who do not learn to read because they have been misdiagnosed and sent to inappropriate intervention strategies.

CHAIR DENIS:

Diagnosis is an important part of this bill. Is there a set method of diagnosis or is the diagnosis individualized?

DR. REYNOLDS:

There is not a set method; there is a group of tests. Some of the tests are not on the market because they are research-based. We can accurately diagnose the child's problem, such as word identification, comprehension or sounds. Intervention addresses those problems. For example, there is a type of struggling reader, a "word caller." This reader decodes and identifies words but does not comprehend. The standard school district intervention is to send the child to comprehension strategy instruction. When tested accurately, decoding



is a problem, and providing comprehension instruction intervention is the worst thing for this child. The only way to get an accurate diagnosis is through the computer-based testing done in my research laboratory and what we propose to do in the new center. Teachers misidentify these students 100 percent of the time. A "word caller" in the CCSD never receives the appropriate intervention.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

This bill creates another bureaucracy to teach teachers how to teach children to read. Why have teachers not received the appropriate education? Why does social promotion still exist? I do not think this bill is going to solve the problem.

CHAIR DENIS:

Diagnosis is the important part of this bill. Students are wrongly diagnosed, resulting in inappropriate teaching. The reading centers will provide the diagnosis. This program has been successful in both Florida and Utah. The RPDPs do not diagnose. Dr. Reynolds should collaborate with the RPDPs.

SENATOR LESLIE MOVED TO REREFER S.B. 216 TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR LESLIE:

The parties should work together before S.B. 216 is heard in the Finance Committee.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR BROWER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\*\*\*\*\*

CHAIR DENIS:

Will Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Hanlon work together on the Committee's concerns?

DR. REYNOLDS:

We have already started that discussion.

Senate Committee on Education  
March 25, 2011  
Page 18

CHAIR DENIS:

There being no further business, we are adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sandra Small,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Mo Denis, Chair

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

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>			
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 229	C	Senator Denis	History of Parental Involvement Legislation in Nevada
S.B. 229	D	Alison Turner	Written testimony
S.B. 229	E	Alison Turner	National Standards, Goals, and Indicators for Family-School Partnerships
S.B. 230	F	Christopher Roller	FACTS
S.B. 230	G	Irene Smith	Written testimony
S.B. 230	H	Irene Smith	Asheesh Dewan, M.D. letter
S.B. 230	I	Nicole Bungum	Written testimony
S.B. 230	J	Barbara Paulsen	Written testimony
S.B. 230	K	Mindy Martini	Quick Poll of School Districts
S.B. 230	L	Jennifer Hadayia	Written testimony
S.B. 230	M	Jennifer Hadayia	Tabor Griswold Letter
S.B. 230	N	Jennifer Hadayia	John Packham Letter
S.B. 216	O	Sheila Ward	Written testimony
S.B. 216	P	Sharon S. Kientz	Written testimony

S.B. 196	Q	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 216	R	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document