

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
May 6, 2013**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Elliot T. Anderson at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, May 6, 2013, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013](http://nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblyman Paul Aizley  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz  
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan  
Assemblyman Andy Eisen  
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore  
Assemblyman Randy Kirner  
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford  
Assemblywoman Dina Neal  
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart  
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None



**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17  
Senator David R. Parks, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Todd Butterworth, Committee Policy Analyst  
Andrew Diss, Committee Manager  
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary  
Ashlynd Baker, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Grant Gabriel, Youth Legislator, Senatorial District No. 16  
Ray Bacon, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association  
Darrin Dykes, representing Friends of ACE Charter High School  
Erin McMullen, representing American Chemistry Council  
Nick Vassiliadis, representing General Motors Company  
Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District  
Joyce Haldeman, representing Clark County School District  
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School  
Superintendents  
Lindsay Anderson, representing Washoe County School District  
Lawrence Matheis, representing Nevada State Medical Association  
Ruben Murillo Jr., representing Nevada State Education Association  
John Middaugh, Interim Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health  
District  
Christopher Roller, representing American Heart Association  
Steve Kutz, Division Director, Community and Clinical Health Services,  
Washoe County Health District  
Kelli Seals, Health Educator, Washoe County Health District

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

[Roll was called. Protocol and procedures were explained.] We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 305 (1st Reprint) and welcome Senator Settelmeyer.

**Senate Bill 305 (1st Reprint):** Revises provisions relating to education.  
(BDR 34-694)

**Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No.17:**

I sent the Committee a one-page walkthrough of Senate Bill 305 (R1) explaining which sections of the law we are seeking to change within the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) and why ([Exhibit C](#)).

The concept of S.B. 305 (R1) came from Grant Gabriel, my youth legislator. I lost him through redistricting and he now belongs to Senator Kieckhefer. He had come up with an idea and brought it forward to the Nevada Youth Legislature. Unfortunately, at that point in time, he did not have the requisite votes for that idea to be picked. He came to me, and I thought his idea had a lot of merit. Therefore, I assigned him a bill draft request to bring this issue forward. Interestingly enough, the bill they chose as their number one idea is terminally dead. So, this is an opportunity for these legislators to have a piece of legislation come out.

I can walk you through this one page of S.B. 305 (R1), or if you wish, I can turn it over to Grant Gabriel.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Senator, whichever you prefer.

**Grant Gabriel, Youth Legislator, Senatorial District No. 16:**

Until my term expires, I am representing my district and the 70 percent of Nevada students who will not be going on to higher education in the sense of a liberal arts college. I am representing those who want higher education in training for a trade, manufacturing, construction, or agriculture. These are the people who make up Nevada's future workforce.

I want to thank Senator Settelmeyer for sponsoring my bill. I thought it had died a sad death last year about this time, but he gave it life. I also thank you for allowing me to present this bill today.

I will walk you through the bill, beginning in section 1, subsection 1, which lays out the basic requirements for an internship proposal. [Read from proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#))].

As I appear before this Committee today to discuss the issues facing the youth of Nevada, the graduation rate from our high schools is at 56 percent, which is 50th in the country. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

In section 1, subsection 2, regarding the qualifications language and the manner that you laid out, what are the qualifications for a pupil going to be? My second question is regarding the manner in which a qualified pupil must apply. You do have the State Board in here as one of the entities who could approve. That is a much higher level than just going to the board of trustees.

**Grant Gabriel:**

What we are trying to do in this section is allow the board of trustees to implement a certain set of rules to benefit their local school district. The basic requirements we have are for the student to be in the eleventh or twelfth grade, be 16 years old, and to have completed not less than 60 hours in a school year. Those are the mandatory requirements used as a base for the program. Each school district could have the ability to say a student must have a 2.0 grade point average (GPA) to participate in this program.

Each governing body, at the board of trustee level, would be able to make those decisions. The board of trustees could lay out a plan, send it to the State Board, then the plan could be implemented. It needs that check to make sure it is a reasonable standard being put into place by the local board.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

This is something I would probably talk with you more off-line. Regarding the question of the manner in subparagraph (3) in which a qualified pupil must apply, why do you not make it principal level for the public/private internship? Sometimes the State Board is disconnected from students. Also, in trades and occupations, there are students out there who are focused on medicine or aerospace. I do not like the limitation that we may put students into other trades. You said there is a resurgence in construction, but we are trying to grow this economy in a different way and to have better-educated students.

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

Within section 1, subsection 2, it is a board of trustees or a governing body. We tried to leave some flexibility. That is language from Legal. The concept of those three trades was without limitation.

We hope and desire that there will be fledgling industries that start up in Nevada that we have not even thought of. I am hoping we have the technology boom in the fields that will be leading our future. There could be a whole discussion of an internship in geriatric care. We know we have a lot of baby boomers who are moving to Nevada. We tried to leave it open. Again, the language came forward in discussions with the Department of Education and other individuals

for those three trades, but we wanted to make sure it was without limitation and with the flexibility to address these issues in the future.

To come full circle, we are not just talking about the ability for individuals to earn one credit. It is not going to be the major course of their study. It just allows them to gain one extra credit toward their graduation.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Thank you for clearing that up. I was wondering as I kept hearing Mr. Gabriel mentioning it being limited, but that is not the way I read it.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

The bill looks interesting to me. It seems to address public and charter schools, but how about private schools such as Sage Ridge?

**Grant Gabriel:**

This bill would be primarily for the schools controlled by the State. Schools like Sage Ridge have the ability to implement their own curriculum and course programs. It really depends on which private school might want to implement this type of program. Legally, it is only a program for public schools, but it is definitely something I would encourage all private schools to do as well.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

On page 2, of S.B. 305 (R1), subsection 2, it says " . . . the board of trustees of a school district or the governing body of a charter school may authorize a qualified pupil . . . ." It sounds to me like the board of trustees or governing body would be making the specific decision to approve a particular student's application in contrast to the board of trustees or the school district setting the standards, and then the approval of a specific pupil's request would be at the school level. Was that the intent? The way I read this is, where I represent in Clark County, every single student who wanted to do an internship would have to get approval specifically and directly from the board of trustees.

**Grant Gabriel:**

This is to say a qualified pupil being in the eleventh or twelfth grade and a minimum of 16 years old, and making sure they pass that level. If the governing body were to issue some requirement that you have to have a 2.0 GPA to qualify for the program, it is not a case-by-case qualified pupil determinate, it is the requirement for the internship as laid out in section 1.

You have to overcome that minimum criteria. Then all students would be able to participate. Does that answer your question?

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

The language we would be looking for is that the board of trustees or the governing body would set the qualifications for a pupil to participate rather than to authorize a qualified pupil, which is the way it currently reads. It seems onerous the way it is written here.

The second half of that paragraph lays out the board of trustees prescribing those standards, but the first sentence seems as though it requires the board of trustees to approve each specific one.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

I appreciate the question. As with all bills, they are now in your hands. If there are any additions or corrections, that one would make it a clarifying one. It will help ensure the local areas understand they have the authority to modify this as necessary for their particular situations. That would make sense.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Thank you for asking that question, Dr. Eisen. The way I read that whole subsection is the State Board authorizes the school district to offer the internship, then if the school district wants to, they prescribe how the approvals are to be done. We could clear that up if you wish, Senator. If you have any language you want to change, just run it by us.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

You probably gained some of your legislative skills from being a youth legislator. Is that correct?

**Grant Gabriel:**

The skills I may have I would definitely say I gained through the Youth Legislature. Remembering to say, "For the record, this is Grant Gabriel," is something I take pride in.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

I think you crafted an excellent bill here. My only suggestion would be to possibly leave it open to the school board to increase it from one credit to one credit per year. If you were to go into the medical field and had an internship, it would be much more beneficial than taking ceramics or something of that nature, particularly in our career and development school.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

I am curious regarding your reference to 60 hours. In all of our public schools, you graduate with a certain amount of credits, so each class is a unit. It is not

like college where some classes are one, two, and three credits. Where do the 60 hours come from?

**Grant Gabriel:**

This came from looking at how much time is generally allotted per class in high school per credit. There are a certain number of hours that are considered standard that make up classroom time in the schools. It is generally about 60 hours designated for one credit. Obviously, some classes need a little more than that, but this is the in-classroom time that would generally be one credit. When a student gains one credit in the classroom, they have generally put in about 60 hours of time.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

Part of the discussion with the 60 hours came from the specific fields of the career and technical education and what they thought would be appropriate. We did not want to create a situation where someone could do two hours in a hospital, come back to school and get a credit. We wanted to make sure it was substantial, and they were putting in some time to actually earn that one credit. Again, it is an elective credit. It is not going to take off any of their required coursework.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

I understand that. The 60 hours seems reasonable. I was just wondering where the 60 hours actually came from because we have 180 days in the school year. If every class is 50 minutes to an hour and you go five days a week, it seems like it would be more than 60 hours. If it was half of a school year instead of a full school year, I was trying to figure it out. I am with you in that it needs to be not less than 60 hours.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

I went to California Polytechnic State University, and in that situation, labs always counted as one-third of classroom instruction. If you took the classroom time frame, as you did, extended it out mathematically, then factored in the concept that most polytechnics use the 3-to-1 ratio, or even more or less than that, you would be in this ballpark area. It comes down to the inequality of lab work compared to course work.

**Assemblyman Aizley:**

It is 15 weeks, 5 days a week, 50 minutes a day. If you divide by 60 minutes in an hour, you get 62.5 hours. You were pretty close.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

Thank you, Mr. Aizley.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I have been thinking for a while about the demand crunch we are going to have in the medical fields. It is something that is on all of our minds as we go into the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act provisions, both with the insurance exchanges and the expansion of Medicaid. Would you be amenable to amending medical/technical professions in the field so we can work toward that demand?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

Are you asking for a multiplier effect, or are you asking for more than one credit? I am trying to figure out which way you are going.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Let me be more specific. In subsection 2, paragraph (a), subparagraph (1), it talks about "The fields, trades or occupations in which a pupil may complete a public or private internship, including, without limitation, agriculture, manufacturing and construction." My suggestion would be, since we are going to be facing this demand, that we provide some guidance to say the medical fields in general be added. Our state is going to be facing that demand and this seems to be the right vehicle to begin developing that.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

We are more than willing to add more trades. We did not want to get too big a list. You are absolutely correct with the importance of the medical field.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

I hope this gets implemented as it is really good; thank you for bringing it forth.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Could we put in some language where any additional field could be implemented such as business or government? It seems like it is endless and without limitation. I do not know if it legally opens that door. It seems like there are all kinds of categories we could put in there. Could we put some language that would include anything that the school district or the charter school board would deem appropriate?

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I think the language right now allows that. I will check with Legal. The only reason I specifically mentioned medical is because I think we are going to face a demand and that would require them, as I read it, to prescribe procedures to describe that as one of the fields. I certainly think it is open and the school districts could add whatever they want to.



Are there any further questions? Seeing none, Senator, do you have anyone you want us to call up? [There was no one.] We will open the table for support of S.B. 305 (R1) here in Carson City or in Las Vegas.

**Ray Bacon, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association:**

We worked with Grant on this a month or so before the session began. We are facing an effort from an economic development standpoint to try to bring jobs across from California. One of our challenges, of course, is the lack of an educated workforce with skills.

This bill forces those of us in industry to define the courses that are needed in order for a person to go into those fields. If we want to train people in jobs to be machinists or welders, they need to be on a path to make sure they have their geometry or algebra out of the way. Potentially, we might even say physics or some level of physical science is necessary as they are all involved in manufacturing jobs. The same is true for the labor unions. They can come in from the standpoint of electricians and plumbers. They can say these are the courses and the pathways the student needs to be on to get into these careers. That would be applicable for other areas you are looking at as well.

Take a look at the health care issue. This was not necessarily focused on people who are going to become doctors and nurses. It would be more focused on those who are going to be looking at straight from high school into maybe a technical program, but clearly focused on the jobs that are not going away. Jobs that will be there indefinitely.

I have an article out of this morning's *The Washington Post* on the whole need for apprenticeships to create jobs and that are going to bring jobs back from China as well as other things ([Exhibit E](#)). I think you will find it a quick read, but it is worthwhile to give it a scan.

**Darrin Dykes, representing Friends of ACE Charter High School:**

ACE Charter High School is a career and technical academy. I would like to express our support for this bill. We have supported it all the way through the Senate and its ups and downs there. We support S.B. 305 (R1) as amended and would further like to commend Mr. Gabriel and Senator Settlemeyer for their work on it.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Are you here for Jeanette K. Belz and Associates or are you here for a client?

**Darrin Dykes:**

I am here for ACE Charter School of Reno.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Is there any further support of S.B. 305 (R1) either here in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there anyone opposed? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Senator, do you have any concluding remarks? [He had none.] Mr. Gabriel?

**Grant Gabriel:**

I want to thank you for hearing the bill today. I appreciate your time and look forward to working with those of you who had suggestions regarding language.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Sounds good, Mr. Gabriel. I was just talking to Legal who said, Mr. Stewart, that the language is technically correct. It would allow the school district to do more if they wanted to. However, I think we do have to clear up a couple of things in terms of the approval. Perhaps putting "pupils" instead of "pupil" to make sure it is more of a general authorization than a specific person. Also clearing up the State Board provision. It sounds as though it will only be small technical things. We will get together and get the mock-up prepared for the Committee.

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 305 (1st Reprint). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 382 and welcome up Senator Parks.

**Senate Bill 382: Revises provisions governing safety standards for school buses. (BDR 34-868)**

**Senator David R. Parks, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7:**

Senate Bill 382 is a clarification of Senate Bill No. 318 of the 76th Session, the bill that was signed by the Governor to implement fire safety standards for engine components in school buses. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I noticed during the interim that there were some of these events. Are you familiar with some of the happenings during the interim?

**Senator Parks:**

Perhaps the most graphic event I can show you is a fire that occurred in a school bus with 14 students onboard ([Exhibit G](#)). It happened at approximately 7 a.m., and this bus was not equipped with fire-suppression equipment. Hence, it was a total loss. This bill is intended to mitigate, at least the loss of life, and hopefully loss of the entire vehicle.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I do not think most Committee members are familiar with the fact this is something that actually happens. During the interim, one of last session's Associated Press reporters tweeted out that this actually happened. It had been something hypothetical last session and then we saw how real it was.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

Why are we postponing implementation of this?

**Senator Parks:**

We are doing this for new buses. We want to make sure we have all the standards in place. There is a long lead-time for purchase of buses. It is not something you just go to the corner bus store and buy off the lot. There is upwards of a one-year lead-time to place the order and get delivery. Because of that factor, as well as some changes in the standards that are still evolving, a greater lead-time is probably needed.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Senator Parks, I had one other question. I know one of the things Clark County School District (CCSD) does is pass along some of their buses to the rural counties. When the rural counties purchase these school buses, would this apply to them when they are buying them used?

**Senator Parks:**

I believe this is only for new construction and new purchases of buses and not for the used buses that are resold. I will say, however, certain things could easily be done in a retrofitted manner such as a fire suppression system mounted inside the engine compartment. The consideration there would have to be whether or not it is cost-effective on an older piece of equipment.

**Erin McMullen, representing American Chemistry Council:**

I would like to thank Senator Parks for working with us over the interim to streamline this bill and give greater options, particularly to the school districts, for purchasing these buses and to budget accordingly. There was a coalition of us who worked on this language during the interim and came to this agreed-upon language. We are very much in support of S.B. 382.

To answer Assemblywoman Fiore's question, I think it was also a budgeting issue, so they could budget for these buses with the different systems, whether they decide to go for the full-suppression system or just one of these engine component qualification standards, and make that decision trending with the industry standards since they buy them in bulk and have to budget and plan accordingly.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

We will open up the table for those in support of S.B. 382.

**Nick Vassiliadis, representing General Motors Company:**

I, too, want to voice our support for S.B. 382. General Motors Company takes the risk of under-the-hood fires very seriously, and we too, have been working with the coalition to ensure this legislation has good, sound language and will make our school buses safe in the future.

**Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District:**

I would like to thank Senator Parks for working with us in the interim to bring forth some additional safety measures that could be options for new purchases.

The extended deadline will allow us to look at the different components and decide which buses and options would be best for our school district.

We appreciate the efforts and we certainly support the safety measures intended to keep our students safe and to allow us time to discern which components are best fitted for certain uses.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Is there any other support in Las Vegas or in Carson City? [There was none.] Is anyone in opposition? [There was no one.] Is anyone neutral? [There was no one.] Senator Parks, do you have any concluding remarks?

**Senator Parks:**

I neglected to mention that this picture of the school bus is a CCSD bus ([Exhibit G](#)). I hope you will consider this bill favorably.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Could you give that picture to our committee manager, Andrew Diss, for inclusion in the record?

**Senator Parks:**

I will send it electronically.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 382 and open up the hearing on Senate Bill 442 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 442 (1st Reprint): Eliminates certain mandates relating to schools.  
(BDR 34-1078)**

**Joyce Haldeman, representing Clark County School District:**

I would like to give you a bit of background regarding the genesis of Senate Bill 442 (1st Reprint) and why we have it in front of you today.

When the superintendents meet in their capacity as the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, they sometimes lament about how much of their time is spent submitting reports as required by state law. It is one thing for a county like Clark County to submit a report because we do have a large number of people working on reports, but for small counties, sometimes the superintendent himself will do the report and sometimes these reports are extremely time-consuming and are difficult for a person to prepare when there is not a lot of staff. It does not matter how big the school district is, some of these reports are onerous for them.

For some time, there has been discussion about making sure these reports are necessary or the mandates that have been added to statute as the years have gone by that are actually beneficial.

Last session, 2011, the Washoe County School District (WCSD) actually used their bill draft to list approximately 28 measures that they would like to have struck from the statutes. Some of them were actual requirements of programs that need to be done, and some of them were requirements for reports. There was a lot of support for that on the school practitioner side of the fence to see these things removed.

When the bill came before the Committee, it was a bill that had a lot of statutes cited in it and there had not been enough work done in advance to help people understand what each of those statutes would do in the elimination of them. I dubbed the bill the sacred cow bill because all of the things that were listed for elimination were things that some legislator in a past session had thought was important, and it was their sacred cow. In one fell swoop, we were trying to remove all of them.

While the Committee had some sympathy and expressed support for removing some of the mandates we listed in the bill, they felt it was too much, too soon, without enough preparation. They challenged us to come back with a smaller bite of the apple. That is what this bill does. We have identified a lesser number of provisions. The way we came up with the specific list, is we took the list of 28 items that had been in the bill in 2011, sent them out to each of the superintendents and told them to pick the top five they would like to eliminate. These are the items that rose to the top from the 17 superintendents in terms of mandated provisions they would like to see eliminated.

We would like to walk you through the bill and help you understand why each of the items are there. Dr. Mary Pierczynski and I will go back and forth as each of us researched different parts.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:**

You will note the bullying prevention issue is dealt with in section 1 of the bill. All of the school districts have adopted a bullying policy, have provided appropriate training for their staff, and have posted their policies for parents. The reporting on bullying in the district is extensive. School districts have to report to the Civil Rights Act every other year and provide information to the federal government. In Nevada, this information is in the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability listed under the harassment section. They are also mandated to provide a second report to the Department of Education and that report eventually goes to the Office of the Attorney General. The human relations departments in the school districts have to respond as well because, if adults are involved, that information has to be provided.

The superintendents suggest that one deposit of this information in the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability is sufficient.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

Section 3 of S.B. 442 (R1) and *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.176 concern peer mentoring. When the peer-mentoring program was adopted, it was required in middle schools and for the trustees to adopt a policy of peer mentoring for sixth graders to assist students who were making the transition from elementary to middle school. It requires the submission of an annual report detailing the specific activities and successfulness of the program.

The requirement for high school is permissive, but if a school decides they are going to participate, it is then mandatory they adopt a policy that includes certain requirements. You can see the requirements for that policy in the language that has been struck out on page 3.

I would like to emphasize that in basically every program we will be talking about, peer mentoring is a program that, in some schools, has been successful and those principals who find it successful will probably continue the program as it is. However, to require it in every school when there are no available resources, nor the interest of students or the administrators, we would like to remove that requirement. The permissive nature is fine for us, but the required nature is difficult.

Additionally, along with all of the emphasis we have had on bullying in our schools, peer mentoring is an idea whose time may have been spent.

Originally, peer mentoring was a good way for students to learn different ways they could work out their differences. Now, because of the bullying issues we face in schools, talking to another friend about issues may not be the right way to go. We would like to strike that from the language also.

**Mary Pierczynski:**

The next report we would like to address is the truancy of pupils. Again, this information is in the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability. Districts already provide that. If they have an attendance council, then the additional reporting that is required is onerous. It is a disposition of each one of the incidents and how they handled the students. The superintendents feel that reporting the information in the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability should be sufficient.

The report in section 5 deals with the Body Mass Index (BMI) Report. This is the height-weight report on students we are required to do. School districts are required to do a sample in Grades 4, 7, and 10 of students' height and weight. Districts report it is a situation that is time-consuming when students are called to the nurse's office to be weighed and measured. It is also an embarrassment for some of the students. Some of the smaller districts have reported some of the parents are not happy with this report.

The information goes to the Health Division and the State Health Officer who also sets parameters for how this particular indexing must take place. Clark County School District has a grant that depends on this information and they are willing to continue to gather this information. However, for some of our smaller school districts, this is onerous and seems unnecessary.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

Superintendent Pat Skorkowsky has had numerous conversations with the Southern Nevada Health District in Clark County regarding a grant application they have applied for where the BMI information is necessary. Superintendent Skorkowsky has indicated to them that he will enter a long-term memorandum of understanding (MOU) agreement with them, so we will continue to collect that information to meet the terms of the grant requirement. For everyone else in the state, the mandate should be removed.

**Mary Pierczynski:**

The school districts are required to prepare information on the latest legislation after every legislative session and whether it has an impact on students or parents. They are required to prepare written notification pamphlets to parents about what has been enacted. The superintendents agree this information is important for people to know, but they would like to eliminate some of the tasks of copying all of this information and mailing it out to parents. In some

cases, if children are from a blended family with two different last names, parents are getting more than one copy of the same information. The districts would like to make that information available on the website, let parents know the information is available, and if parents want the information in writing, the district would provide the information about new statutes in writing.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

We are working our way through the lead lines of repealed sections, we are now down to NRS 388.171, the "Pilot program for small learning communities required in certain schools," which is connected with NRS 388.215, "Program of small learning communities required for ninth grade pupils enrolled in larger schools." This statute was enacted a couple of sessions ago and requires school districts to have a middle school with a population of at least 500 or more to develop a pilot program—I emphasize the word pilot—of small learning communities within 50 percent of their middle schools. Of course, for CCSD we easily had at least one school that had more than 500 students. Fifty percent of our middle schools are required to have this smaller learning program. It requires us to have a separate geographic area for sixth graders, separate reporting of credits, attendance, truancy, and early identification of struggling students, and it requires the assignment of a separate counselor, administrator, and adult mentors. Also required is the submission of an annual report.

Similarly, districts who have at least one high school with an enrollment of 1,200 or more, must adopt a policy to provide a program of small learning communities in at least 50 percent of its high schools. The programming includes those same components I just listed, but for ninth graders instead of sixth graders.

While we think this is a great idea in a perfect world, we would love to be able to continue that program, but in both middle and high schools, this program is dependent upon physical space available and the additional resources. As we have gone through massive budget cuts, we struggle with both space and resources. Cuts of more than \$500 million we have dealt with over the past few years, means we have lowered staffing levels and increased class sizes, which severely impacts the ability for us to offer the program.

I am not sure how many other counties in the state have high schools with more than 1,200 students or middle schools with the capacity of 500 students, but I can tell you this impacts CCSD in a big way, and we would like to see this mandate relieved.



Move now to NRS 388.181, adoption of policy for pupil-led conferences. This is another great idea and they may have the ability to impact students in a positive way. Where there are principals who have the capacity to offer these programs, they will continue to offer them. We have one particular principal who thinks pupil-led conferences are an excellent tool and that principal will probably continue to offer that program. However, the fact is that pupil-led conferences are very time-consuming and require the schools to prepare materials for each student and then prepare the student in how they will approach their parents regarding their progress when the student/teacher conference takes place. It also requires significant time for the school to schedule all of those parent/teacher conferences to have individual time.

When CCSD prepared for the pupil-led conference, they set aside an entire day for middle schools to conduct the conferences. The amount of time that was spent prior to that date to organize and prepare the printed material and reports was significant. The logistics of getting the conferences scheduled were very time-consuming. We found that instead of being something we thought would be a good experience, most of it was more reactive. Parents were not happy having their student lead the conference. They wanted to talk to the teacher about the student. For us, it was a day we had to set aside instruction so we could set up these conferences. Only a few schools found the conferences beneficial.

I will point out to you that many of the small counties think this statute does not apply to them. It does. It is a requirement that for us, is rather onerous.

**Mary Pierczynski:**

I spoke with Rorie Fitzpatrick at the Department of Education and currently, schools are required to report the statewide tests that have been administered as well as the grade level, the cost, and the purpose. This information is superfluous because the Department of Education already has this information. Ms. Fitzpatrick's suggestion was that if they have particular questions about a test administration in a particular area, then they could contact that school district. We are suggesting that this particular testing report be eliminated.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

We are now on section 7 of Chapter 489, *Statutes of Nevada 2003*. This report concerns alternative schedules. Some schools have either a four-day schedule or different configurations of how they use their minutes. This requires the completion of an annual report. The superintendents of small counties indicate the time needed to complete this report varies from one hour to five days. The report is useful the first time someone approaches the Department of Education for an alternative schedule, but until the schedule

changes, it is not useful to report every year. We would like to see that statute repealed.

**Mary Pierczynski:**

The last report I would like to bring to your attention is the report on environmentally sensitive cleaning products. This report was initially requested in 2010. The State Board of Education was going to adopt some regulations on the type of cleaning materials that are used in the schools. At this point, schools are using environmentally sensitive cleaning and maintenance products. The superintendents feel that as long as they are keeping green, it is a mandate that is not necessary.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

With that we hope we have given you a bit of background of the 12 items the superintendents in Nevada suggested to be at the top of their list to be relieved of. They can then spend more of their time working on the core mission which is helping to improve student achievement and making sure students graduate from school.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

I reluctantly voted for some of these and the dynamic duo has done a great job of presenting. I recall, sometime back, meeting with Dr. Keith Rheault where he was doing the same type of thing. Are some of these what he recommended to be removed, or is that a different set of reports?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

When we gave the list to the superintendents, it did include Dr. Rheault's items. Some of Dr. Rheault's items have appeared in different places and in bills this session as well. We are seeing cleanup there too. It does not include everything, but some of his were on the list. We had a long list.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Are we through, or down the road are we going to have a continual revision in trying to eliminate some of these reports that are not necessary?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

That is our goal. We took seriously the challenge we received to put this into smaller pieces, so we brought you a dozen of the recommendations included in the bill last time. If we are successful this year, we will probably come back next session with another dozen or so—whichever ones the superintendents find the most obtrusive. Yes, it is our intent to go through these.

When we were on the Senate side, we were pleased to have some of the senators we thought might be resistant to some of these changes, recognize that it is a good idea to go back through statute on an occasional basis to make sure that what was passed at one time is still relevant. We appreciated that attitude and hope you can see your way to feel the same.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

We had 28 on the list, we removed 12, so we have 16 left. Do we have a rough idea of how many reports a superintendent has to make in addition to those 16?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

I do not know the answer to that. In my office in Clark County, I do have a list of all the reports due and when they are due. I can make sure you have a copy of that. Even for a large district where we have people available, for us to just keep track of the reports that are due, when they are due, and making sure the right person gets it submitted is daunting.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Just give me the total number please.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I am confused about section 1, where you strike the bullying language, and in reading the statute NRS 388.134. You still have NRS 388.1325, which created the Bullying Prevention Fund which is a State General Fund item, but yet you are deleting the adoption of policies and posting policies. It seems like the creation of policies. Yes?

**Mary Pierczynski:**

What we are suggesting is there are additional reports we are not eliminating. We will still have bullying policies, but all of the reporting on those policies is what we are suggesting be eliminated. In other words, the information on harassment is in the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability. That is where the information on bullying is included. Then, there are separate reports on bullying that have to go to the Department of Education. If there is a human resource department in the school district, they have to report on any bullying that has occurred with the adults. We are suggesting the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability should be sufficient to let people know what we are doing with regard to bullying. We are certainly not suggesting we do not have a policy and students do not know there is a policy.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

How much staff time does it take to do these additional reports and what does it cost?

**Mary Pierczynski:**

That is an interesting question. I just spoke to the Carson City School District person in charge of tracking this information. Although it is not the same in every district, people at the high school, deans for instance, are addressing the bullying issue and writing incident reports. That is done on the computer. Time is spent going through each one of those reports and pulling out any of the information that deals with bullying, cyberbullying, and keeping separate track of that information. It is a fairly extensive job and there is one person who is working on just that information for the Nevada Annual Reports of Accountability.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

When we asked the superintendents why they wanted this eliminated, we also asked them how much time and money was involved. I do not have all 17 district responses, but in summary they said this report is fairly expensive to provide. Clark County School District dedicated several full-time equivalent employees to meet the requirement. We have two people who work on it full time, and a couple that work on it as part of their responsibility. A small county like Lincoln spends \$8,500 on it annually. There certainly would be a variance between those two amounts.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Ms. Haldeman, perhaps you could clarify something for me and for the record. I am looking at your lineout in section 1. I believe you have NRS 388.134 proposed to be repealed. I do not see the reporting requirement in there. Can you clarify where it is required to be reported it?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

If you look at page 5, the lead line "Policy by school districts for provision of safe and respectful learning environment and policy for ethical, safe and secure use of computers; provision of training to school personnel; posting of policies on Internet website; annual review and update of policies." It is included in that so it is not listed specifically in this bill. It would repeal NRS 388.134 and the reporting requirement is in that section.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Do you know what subsection of NRS 388.134?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

I do not, but I can certainly come back with that.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I am looking at it now, I am not seeing it. I see policies adopted, but I am getting confused because I have not seen anything regarding reporting in a lot of these sections. We are going to need to clarify that before I am at a comfort level. I certainly do not need to know every single thing you are doing, but when talking about getting rid of policies, I am, for the record, less comfortable. Are there any further questions for Ms. Haldeman before I ask a few more?

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

In section 5, regarding the smaller learning communities and the expiration date of June 30, 2013?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

Section 5 is the section on collecting BMI information. The smaller learning communities are on page 5, NRS 388.171 and 388.215.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

My question is what has happened with the pilot so far? What is the report and what has been the success of the pilots? Do we have that information?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

The reports have been turned in. I do not have them with me today. I will tell you they vary in terms of success depending on the amount of space and resources available in every individual school.

I can think of one high school, for example, where the principal made this a priority and he thinks this is the most important thing he does. I can guarantee that principal will continue this program.

Other schools that simply do not have the geographic space to make a separate wing for ninth graders are frustrated by this policy and the requirement it has.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Ms. Neal got to my concern with the bullying provisions. In section 5 I see that it was former Assemblyman Denis who worked on that provision and set the date to 2015, have you discussed this with him? Whenever I see something that was done by a previous legislator I want to talk with them.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

We did not go back to any of the original sponsors. There was a self-preservation notion preventing that. I will note that this did pass unanimously in the Senate.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I am going to the repealed sections and ask one more question regarding NRS 388.171, "Pilot program for small learning communities required in certain schools." Part of that statute is not effective yet. When I look at NRS 388.171, what we passed last session does not become effective until July 2013. Can you tell us why we need to get rid of that?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

I have it written down as effective July 1, 2011. Perhaps I did my research incorrectly. I believe that statute became effective July 1, 2011.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I am looking at it now.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

We have been doing it since 2011.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

I am looking at current law, NRS online, from the legislative website. It says the portions passed in 2011 that we amended last session are not even effective yet. It says effective July 1, 2013. I am wondering if I could be reading it wrong, but I am reading current NRS. Could you tell me more why we need to get rid of it?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

I am happy to go back and research that. I think that must be applicable to some portion of it because the smaller learning community requirement has been in place for a time. Let me spend some time at the online version and I will come back to you.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Perfect. I think we may need to put this one in the workgroup for the Committee to feel comfortable. There is a lot in here that was put in by the legislators and we would like to have more time before we go forward. I hope you could get more information on that and on other areas where the Committee members have expressed concerns.

**Joyce Haldeman:**

We are happy to do that.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Seeing no further questions, we will open the table for those in support of S.B. 442 (R1).

**Lindsay Anderson, representing Washoe County School District:**

I am sorry I was not part of the dynamic duo, but I am here supporting this bill. My superintendent participated in the survey process to provide feedback on which of these sections were most important to him to eliminate. Those have been incorporated into the bill ([Exhibit H](#)).

I know there is some concern about the elimination of BMI data collection by the school nurses. I can tell you we would continue to support that mandate being eliminated. It is not to say we could not continue the practice if we felt there was a compelling reason to continue. We are not convinced the data is all that accurate, and we were never provided with standardized equipment to weigh and measure children. It tends to be a bit erratic school to school. However, if there were a compelling reason in terms of a grant or some other program that required us to collect that data, we could continue. We just do not want to be forced to.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Ms. Anderson, since you have the name Anderson, you do not need anyone else to be dynamic. It is a dynamic name.

Is there any further support of S.B. 442 (R1)? [There was none.] Is there any opposition?

**Lawrence Matheis, representing Nevada State Medical Association:**

Our opposition is really to section 5, the stopping of the joint project between public health and the school districts on collection of BMI data over a period of time to enable us to more effectively develop any strategy dealing with childhood obesity. There is no formal data set that exists in Nevada except for this one. It took two sessions, and you can tell by how it is being collected, it took a lot of compromise so as to not make it onerous in the schools. It was to collect data that could be used by the public health community in seeking grants for Nevada to be able to address the various elements of childhood obesity.

The project was given a five-year timeline on the assumption that it would provide a sufficient database to at least start from. It is a representative sample

with the State Health Division developing that particular method rather than taking it on all students.

There is no doubt the childhood obesity issue is going to be a huge health challenge—both publicly and individually for the next generation, the next 25 years. It is probably going to replace tobacco use as the principal cause of chronic disease and illness. We know these behavioral-related and sometimes genetic-related issues are best dealt with as early as possible.

We thought this was a worthwhile project and it would be unfortunate if we were to terminate it early and give up on trying to develop a good database that measures where children are and where they should be in terms of normal weight distribution. The reason we went this route was, after a number of meetings over a period of time, there was no better place in which to be able to get that data. I am sure it would be something worth looking at and studying again. I think it would be unfortunate to end this program at this point. That is our position.

**Ruben Murillo Jr., representing the Nevada State Education Association:**

I am speaking in opposition to S.B. 442 (R1). This bill reminds me of the show *Clean House with Niecy Nash*. The show begins with Ms. Nash and her experts invading an overly cluttered home and trying to get rid of all of that, you know, "clutter." While going through clutter, there is a discussion of what is really meaningful, its history, and what role it may play in the future. Eventually, a lot of the clutter is discarded. Some of it is stored and still needed or saved for future generations, a history of sorts. The same can be said of S.B. 442 (R1). While it is commendable this bill would delete reports due to time constraints and redundancy, it is important to carefully note what information these reports contain. While it may be reported to other agencies, how then is that information shared?

Also of concern is the elimination of policies. If you want to reduce testing as reported earlier, reduce the number of tests administered. Go for quality, not quantity. Language pertaining to statute reporting on programs such as peer mentoring, cyberbullying, harassment, and intimidation, and bullying prevention will be eliminated under this bill. We recognize the time that goes into reporting with such programs and would suggest a moratorium on reporting on the activities would be more in order.

Just as teachers are held accountable for the data they harvest and reports they write, so should school districts be held accountable. If you would like a list of reports the school district and the State require teachers to complete annually, we would be more than glad to supply that.



As you clean house, do not throw away the reporting requirement that reports on the progress of programs and reporting systems that hold them accountable.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Could you get us a list of some of the reports that the teachers think are unnecessary? I could probably add to that.

**Ruben Murillo Jr.:**

Absolutely.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

Specifically, what deletions? In whole, are you opposed to them or are there specific reports?

**Ruben Murillo Jr.:**

Overall, as I hear the testimony and read the bill, the questions you have been asking regarding the reporting and policies, I have a concern with that. Some of the reports may be redundant and some may not be found in other areas, but the data is really important and I want to make sure that, as we go forward, we are very careful what we do with that data.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Is there anyone else in opposition to S.B. 442 (R1)? In Las Vegas, are you in opposition?

**John Middaugh, Interim Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District:**

I am testifying to request the Assembly Committee on Education to remove section 5 of the S.B. 442 (R1) in order to maintain the collection of the height and weight measurements in Clark County School District students and students throughout Nevada.

I fully understand the difficulties faced by Nevada's school districts due to the large number of unfunded mandates they must fulfill. I oppose unfunded mandates I have inherited in the Southern Nevada Health District as well.

It is awkward to be here because we only became aware the height and weight measurements were on the chopping block a short time ago. I wish I had a chance to meet directly with our superintendents, who I respect immeasurably, to make a case for how important these data are and why this partnership between public health and education is so important. The importance of these measurements to our joint efforts to protect our children from obesity and chronic disease make me come to ask the Committee to maintain the requirement for height and weight measurements.

We recognize, as you heard, that the current requirement will sunset in 2015. In the interim, we on the health side are committed to try to seek new federal funding to support the collection of these data in the future. We certainly understand that CCSD will oppose extending the requirement after 2015 unless funding is provided.

I have had several very productive conversations with Superintendent Skorkowsky as recently as this morning. I have great respect for him and value our partnership with CCSD. He has offered, and we will do, an extended MOU so we can collect the data here in Clark County. However, it is very important to have these data statewide.

I have sent an email of a 21-page report that we prepared from the data from 2010 and 2011 ([Exhibit I](#)). For example, it shows that 43 percent of our students in Clark County are obese or overweight compared to 33 percent in national data. We have a severe problem here.

We have used these data to support applications to the federal government for competitive funding. We obtained \$3.8 million in 2010, of which \$773,000 was passed through the Clark County School District, and \$186,000 was specifically allocated to support the collection of height and weight data, provide extra staffing and training, and purchase stadiometers and scales in order to improve the validity of the data collected.

We are currently in a partnership with CCSD implementing a new \$2.4 million community transformation grant for a two-year period. That grant has a requirement of our expanded collection of height and weight data. We recently joined with the other counties under the leadership of the State Health Division to submit a chronic disease grant for \$2 million per year for a five-year project period in order to tackle these problems of obesity and chronic disease. The data we had were critical to demonstrate the need for interventions in Nevada and to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed interventions over the project period.

Only half the states are going to be funded. It will be very competitive and we have our fingers crossed. We have a commitment to work closely with CCSD and the other superintendents and other partners to try to provide ongoing technical assistance and to mobilize additional resources in order to continue the collection of height and weight data.

We would be happy to work with the Committee and the CCSD, as well as others, to craft the appropriate language to amend S.B. 442 (R1) and request that you help us do that.

**Christopher Roller, representing American Heart Association:**

We would also support the removal of section 5 and the repeal of the requirement to collect the height and weight data.

Dr. Middaugh and Mr. Matheis made a good case as to why we feel it is important to continue to collect this data. I would want to put in the context of heart disease and stroke. Obesity, as everyone knows, is a major risk factor. We are seeing a tremendous amount of research out there that ties cognitive function to vascular health and to poor health indicators in youth. We are seeing younger and younger cardiovascular disease develop.

There are many health reasons, but also for the cognitive ability and the learning ability of these students to be able to measure and improve their health in any way possible. In order to develop the initiatives, programs, and services that can help tackle the obesity problem, we need to be able to identify the level of obesity and determine what we are dealing with.

We would definitely advocate for funding the height and weight measurement in future sessions. As was stated, this was part of an agreement. As it is currently in statute, it sunsets in 2015, so we ask that you allow the agreement to take place as had been agreed upon and not have it repealed in 2013. In the meantime, we will work in whatever way we can to have this ongoing height and weight measurement data funded for the collection to continue in the future.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Mr. Roller, I have you signed in as neutral. Where do you wish us to categorize you? That sounded more like opposition.

**Christopher Roller:**

Because we were just opposing the one section, I was not quite sure whether I needed to be neutral and oppose that one section or sign in as opposed to the bill altogether.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Per our Assembly rules, we have to categorize you in opposition if you are against any part of the bill and not offering an amendment that is considered friendly by the bill's sponsors. For now, I do have to put you in opposition.

Are there any questions for Mr. Roller? Seeing none, is there any further opposition either here in Carson City or in Las Vegas?

**Steve Kutz, Division Director, Community and Clinical Health Services,  
Washoe County Health District:**

I, like Mr. Roller, signed in as neutral. However, we do oppose the removal of the section regarding height, weight, and BMI, so we would be classified as opposing.

There were a number of questions asked and comments made today and I wanted to let you know how we get and how we use the data. The Washoe County Health District has been partnering with Washoe County School District (WCSD) for about five years to analyze the height and weight data that has been collected ([Exhibit J](#)). [Read prepared testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).]

As Dr. Middaugh mentioned earlier, had we known about this bill earlier as we monitor the health bills closely, we would have liked the opportunity to speak with WCSD administration regarding the value of this data set collection. [Continued reading prepared testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).]

I would also like to point out that WCSD mentioned the standardized equipment for the collection of height and weight and I would like you to know that, through the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, there is some data that is collected, but it is self-reported. That would be considered far less accurate than the use of the equipment that WCSD had mentioned.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Would you be agreeable to smaller studies, like with Washoe County or maybe a school in three or four districts where you could get accurate data of a cross section instead of statewide, which would be much more expensive?

**Steve Kutz:**

Are you saying this would just occur within Washoe County, or within an even smaller subset within Washoe County? Currently, the data is collected in fourth, seventh, and tenth grades and it is not every student in those grades.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

What I am recommending is ten schools statewide, or something of that nature, and collect data from them over a period of time rather than have everyone involved which is much more expensive, and still be accurate in that it is a microcosm of the whole state.

**Steve Kutz:**

I would want to speak with our epidemiology statistician. I know that you need to have a certain level of data collected in order to have it significant and representative. I would want to make sure Washoe County is accurately

represented. I would also like to offer Kelli Seals who is a health educator in our chronic disease prevention program to speak on that as she may have additional information.

**Kelli Seals, Health Educator, Washoe County Health District:**

I would agree with Mr. Kutz. It would be appropriate to have the number of schools and students to be measured recommended by our statistician to ensure the data would be statistically significant, and could be used effectively in our community and the state. Currently, we use our data and compare ourselves both to the state as a whole, and to the nation, which can be very useful.

**Steve Kutz:**

In your packet, you have a copy of our Epi-News showing you exactly what we do with the data in Washoe County ([Exhibit L](#)). It is also part of our annual obesity forum that we conduct in Washoe County to let members of our community know the impact poor physical activity and poor nutrition has in causing a significant burden to our community.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

Is there any further opposition either here in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there anyone neutral? [There was no one.] Ms. Haldeman or Dr. Pierczynski, do you have any concluding remarks?

**Joyce Haldeman:**

We have taken notes. We know that we have some homework assignments to come back with and we will be happy to do so.

**Mary Pierczynski:**

We appreciate the comments from the folks from the State Health Division and we would appreciate more information on their study. We will work together.

**Chairman Elliot Anderson:**

My intent is to create a working group to work through this bill and to see what can be salvaged and what we do not like. If any members of the public wish to be in that working group, please inform my office and we will get something scheduled.

Assembly Committee on Education

May 6, 2013

Page 30

With that, we will close the hearing on Senate Bill 442 (1st Reprint) and open up the tables for public comment either here in Carson City or in Las Vegas. [There was none.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 4:58 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sharon McCallen  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Chairman

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

## **EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Education

**Date:** May 6, 2013

**Time of Meeting:** 3:15 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 305 (R1)	C	Grant Gabriel	Bill explanation and walkthrough
S.B. 305 (R1)	D	Grant Gabriel	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 305 (R1)	E	Ray Bacon	Article from <i>The Washington Post</i>
S.B. 382	F	Senator David Parks	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 382	G	Senator David Parks	Photograph
S.B. 442 (R1)	H	Lindsay Anderson	Highlighted portions of reprinted bill
S.B. 442 (R1)	I	John Middaugh	Clark County report on data from 2010 and 2011
S.B. 442 (R1)	J	Steve Kutz	Washoe County Health Dist. Letter requesting an amendment to the bill
S.B. 442 (R1)	K	Steve Kutz	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 442 (R1)	L	Steve Kutz	EPI-News