

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 20, 2013**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Elliot T. Anderson at 3:15 p.m. on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: 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 Moises (Mo) Denis, Clark County Senatorial District No. 2

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

David A. Byerman, Secretary of the Senate
Todd Butterworth, Committee Policy Analyst
Andrew Diss, Committee Manager
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Steven Sisneros, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Valerie Wiener, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Daniel J. Klaich, J.D., Chancellor, Administrative Services, Nevada
System of Higher Education
Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District
Calli Fisher, representing Washoe County School District
Glenn Myer, Technology and Innovative Programs, Department of
Education
Ray Bacon, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association

Chairman Elliot Anderson:

[Roll was called. Housekeeping, protocol, and procedures were explained.]
We are going to take the bills out of order and open the hearing on
Senate Bill 187.

**Senate Bill 187 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Youth
Legislature. (BDR 34-516)**

David A. Byerman, Secretary of the Senate:

I am here today in a volunteer capacity as the Executive Director of the Nevada Youth Legislature Foundation and I am very proud of that role. This is a labor of love for me and my staff. We adopted this program from the Legal Division a couple of years ago. This program dovetails in with my office's efforts to open up the legislative process to more audiences and especially to engage young people in educational programs. I will be joined by Senator Denis.

Let me give you some background of what is behind this bill ([Exhibit C](#)). We have a Nevada Youth Legislature that is now in its fifth year. We recently had a reunion of our youth legislators from the past five years. There is nothing I do in this job more inspiring than working with these young people and seeing

what they have done after they have left here. It is really striking and heartwarming for me.

Senator Wiener is joining us from Las Vegas. She is the founder of this program and currently serves as Chairman of the Nevada Youth Legislature Board of Directors which is composed of seven current and former legislators, including two members from this Committee. Mr. Stewart and Ms. Dondero Loop are on our board as well as two former legislators, Senator Wiener serving as the Chair of the board and Senator McGinnis.

What has really inspired this bill is a challenge we faced last summer. We currently have legislation in place which gives eligibility for any high school student in grades 9 through 12 to apply to serve in the Nevada Youth Legislature. Because we have two-year terms, and we allow seniors to apply, we had a situation occur last summer where we had 15 out of 21 youth legislators graduate at the same time, opening up a substantial number of vacancies. As we were looking at how we might address that for the future we decided we need to contemplate a change to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) in this regard.

Senator Denis will be taking you step-by-step through what this bill entails.

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Clark County Senatorial District No. 2:

The purpose of Senate Bill 187 is to provide stability to the membership of the Nevada Youth Legislature by revising the eligible grade levels of students for appointment; by revising the appointment process; and by providing for changes to the process of filling vacancies. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

As a side note, the students conduct their own community meetings in the high schools or the legislative building and invite legislators. The process of setting these meetings up as well as the students' growth has been amazing to see. [Continued reading from ([Exhibit D](#)).]

David Byerman:

In this bill, we have moved the appointment window back from March 30 to April 30. The terms for the Nevada Youth Legislators start on June 1 of each biennium and by moving it back to April 30 that still gives us a month in case we have senators who do not make appointments to the Nevada Youth Legislature. In that case, it devolves 2 to 2 assembly members who are nested within that Senate district to make an appointment to the body. That still gives us a month, which we think is sufficient time. In the past, the timing has not worked out for a March 30 appointment. It is the middle of first house passage and the run up to that.

Section 2 of the bill changes the eligibility. We will now allow those going into grades 9, 10, and 11 to apply for the Nevada Youth Legislature. That will ensure, at least in theory, full two-year terms served by each of those youth legislators. We could possibly lose them to other reasons, but at least we will not have a built-in guarantee that they will graduate and become ineligible to serve.

Finally, in section 3, there is a grandfather clause. As explained previously, we currently have 15 out of 21 youth legislators who were appointed to fill only the second half of a two-year term. The youth legislators themselves came to Senator Wiener and to myself and asked if we could put in a grandfather clause because they have only been able to serve one year and there are several of the youth legislators who would like to serve for an additional term. That only seems fair given that they were only able to serve one year. We do not want to change the rules on them and make them ineligible as a result.

Chairman Elliot Anderson:

Senator Wiener, it is good to see you.

Valerie Wiener, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

This particular measure is a passion of mine. I attended a conference in Washington, D.C., on civic engagement and I came back with the idea that Nevada would benefit from such a program. I would like to tell of the boundless effort delivered early on by the Legal Division on a volunteer basis to ensure the program is successful. Thank you so much Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, and R. Rene Yeckley, Senate Legal Counsel and Bill Drafting Advisor, for taking the lead on the Legal Division's management of this program in such an extraordinary way, above and beyond anything I could have expected.

Mr. Byerman, thank you for your willingness to step forward again. We have walked these paths before with another program to take leadership in the success of this program. What was amazing about the success of the reunion Mr. Byerman alluded to, was that we have 85 young people who have been through the program or are currently in the program. We only appoint 21 young people a year and some have served up to three years because these are annual appointments. Probably 35 to 40 percent returned for a reunion due to the effort on Mr. Byerman's part to reach out to people for which we had no current contact information. For young people, five-year-old data is like another century. Wonderful and a dream come true for me as well, was the commitment of many of the alumni to continue to participate in the program in some way as mentors, teachers, and advisors. Even though some of them are now out of college, they want to remain connected. As the majority leader

said, he anticipates seeing some of those youth sitting in some of the chairs that you are sitting in now.

Alex Bybee is the past chair of Nevada Youth Legislature currently serving as a lobbyist for the University of Nevada, Reno. He has been lobbying on issues affecting college students. We also have Haley Johnson who is interning in Senator Brower's office. We have also had interns in the past during session. We already have a movement of our youth legislators into the building wanting to affect policy and change in Nevada. It is an extraordinary program.

The changes being offered today are important for the functionality and continuity of the program. Even the piece at the end for those who are seniors are now asking, "Please, is there any way I can serve another year because I would like the benefit of the two-year term?" That piece is the grandfather for the current group that will be entering the senior year to serve one year, so that we can eventually get this on the two-year track.

I am pleased to be here. I am thrilled you graced us with the hearing on this bill in the timely fashion it needs in order to move forward. Thank you for your consideration.

Assemblyman Stewart:

It has been an honor for me to serve on this board and I commend Senator Wiener for the great job she has done in establishing this and Mr. Byerman for volunteering his time to ensure it succeeds. I was able to attend the alumni gathering, and it was remarkable to see how these young people going on to college and coming out of college are establishing themselves as outstanding citizens. I appreciate the cleanup in this bill that will make it more effective and heartily endorse it.

Chairman Elliot Anderson:

Are there any further questions? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE
BILL 187.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

David Byerman:

We will be back next week with some youth legislators for an opportunity for you to meet them in person. Next week is Nevada Youth Legislature Day, so we will have guests on the floor as well. We are opening the window for application for this body next week, so we will be sending out information by email. We would love your help in identifying the next generation of youth legislators.

Chairman Elliot Anderson:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 187 and assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Stewart. I will now turn the gavel over to Assemblywoman Dondero Loop.

[Vice Chairwoman Dondero Loop assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chairwoman Dondero Loop:

I would like to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 224 and welcome Chairman Anderson to the table.

Assemblyman Anderson:

Would it be alright to begin with Assembly Bill 260?

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

Absolutely. I would like to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 260.

Assembly Bill 260: Revises provisions governing tuition charges assessed against certain students within the Nevada System of Higher Education. (BDR 34-226)

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15:

I would like to thank the Chairman for scheduling this bill to coincide with Veteran's Day at the Legislature that is taking place today. I am here to present Assembly Bill 260, which will amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 396.540 and waive tuition fees for military veterans attending any of our higher education institutions throughout the state. The genesis of this bill began with Senate Bill No. 318 of the 75th Session introduced by Senators Copening and Parks. When this legislation was passed two sessions ago, it waived tuition fees for active duty military personnel and also to service members who were honorably discharged and serving a Nevada military institution at the time of discharge.

I had originally worked with Senator Copening on this concept. This legislation proposes to do away with the Nevada nexus requirement and allow any

honorably discharged veterans who enroll within three years of discharge to receive a tuition waiver. I will be submitting an amendment to change that to two years once it is redrafted.

Veterans who enter college after serving in the military are some of the most disciplined and well prepared members of our student body. If they have served our country honorably it should not matter if they are from another state, and we should welcome them with the same benefits that our home-grown veterans receive.

This bill is very personal to me because I came to Nevada and attended the University of Nevada, Las Vegas after serving in the United States Marine Corps. Even though I was able to take advantage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (G.I. Bill), I did have to wait a year. It did not always cover the cost of the complete undergraduate education. The new G.I. Bill pays up to the maximum in-state tuition for any level of school for a veteran who has the entitlement. This also applies to grad school. If someone wanted to come to Nevada to further their education, we could attract top-tier students and a good deal of federal money into the state.

Currently, the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) is doing a great job of attracting this highly skilled workforce to Nevada. They have opened thriving veteran services offices at their campuses. This piece of legislation will allow them to "be all that they can be." This will enable NSHE to do the best job possible and offer the most they can to veterans who come to Nevada. I have heard from those offices that they get a number of veterans who call into the state asking what the process is or what services are available because a number of states are offering these tuition waivers. The United States Department of Defense supports this bill and has provided testimony for the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) ([Exhibit E](#)) and has told me there are approximately 20 other states that are doing something similar.

We need to make sure we are in a good position because Las Vegas and Reno are places that attract a good number of people who are looking to an excitement level. I grew up in a small town of 3,000, had seen the world, been to 18 countries, and you just could not go back to a town of 3,000. We have cities in Nevada that attract veterans, and if we can add this final piece, we can bring in those productive citizens who have skills they learned in the military and power economic development.

Assemblyman Kirner:

This bill would let any veteran who comes to Nevada have their tuition reimbursed. Would it make sense to give the reimbursement after they have used their veteran's benefits, so we would get some value out of that? Am I reading it wrong?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

As I read and understand the bill and with the amendment, it would be within the two years immediately upon leaving the Service. That is the intent, because we figure two years will give them enough time to decide what they want to do. Maybe they will not move to Nevada immediately, maybe they go back to where they grew up first. We did not want to keep it so open-ended in statute.

Assemblyman Kirner:

There is a cost to the university system to grant free tuition. Is there a way in this bill to tell the veteran to use the benefits under his G.I. Bill first, and then we will grant the tuition?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

This bill would just say that you are getting in-state tuition. That is part of the problem the way the statute was originally worded. It says free. When you say free it just means that you are not getting assessed above in-state tuition. When you look at the definition of tuition charge in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (c), "Tuition Charge" means a charge assessed against students who are not residents of Nevada and which is in addition to registration fees or other fees assessed against students who are residents of Nevada. It is a very convoluted way of saying we are not going to assess that tuition charge against you, but what that means is that we are not charging you as an out-of-state student. You are getting the in-state tuition rate.

The statute is not exactly worded well. I have spoken to Legal with my own suggestions trying to clarify the definition of in-state tuition. We left it the way it is so it would not affect the NRS.

Assemblyman Kirner:

If you are an out-of-state person and come into Nevada as a veteran, you would still be subject to fees, but you would not have to pay the out-of-state tuition.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

That is exactly correct. The way the plain text reads and my very clear intent is that it is in-state tuition. It is not a "you do not have to pay anything" tuition bill.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

What is the number of increased students for our state that you project from this bill?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I have talked to the Office of Veterans Services about that, and they have told me they can remember 50 to 100 people who decided not to come because we did not have that waiver. I have also heard that from UNLV. This is not my personal knowledge, but it is certainly from a trusted source.

Assemblywoman Swank:

In going back to the three-year limit, sometimes people come back from the military and need more time to adjust and may have issues to deal with. I am wondering about extending that even longer than three years. I understand you would like to put an end cap, but sometimes it takes people a little longer to decide where they want to be. Is there any flexibility on the three-year limit?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I will leave that question to Chancellor Klaich. Two is probably better, but I think NSHE has some concerns, as well, with the dates. I am fine with two years. That should be enough time because a lot of veterans are also taking transition classes while they are in the military and already beginning to think about this. I can speak personally that I was thinking about what I was going to do a year into my service and had decided I would move to Las Vegas. You have to remember military members are relatively direct, know what they want to do, and go for it. If you had one subset of a population that was focused, ready, and able to make a decision, it would be veterans. Certainly, we can have that discussion.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I appreciate this bill as I have had several bills dealing with similar situations. I like the three years better. Is there a limit on the time after they begin, of how long they can receive this benefit or other legislation that might apply to this?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

This is just to qualify for the in-state tuition. Once you get started and get the process moving, that would be my intent. You then qualify for in-state tuition as long as you have that entitlement. Did I answer your question?

Assemblyman Stewart:

I believe there was a limit of six years on some of the other tuition waivers. You may want to check on that to see if there is a limit.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

Let me clarify that. When I look at section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (g), "Veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who were honorably discharged..." are in their own paragraph so that requirement would only apply to them. This would be a legal counsel question, but that is the way I read that. I would be interested to hear Chancellor Klaich's answer as well.

Daniel J. Klaich, J.D., Chancellor, Administrative Services, Nevada System of Higher Education:

This is an extraordinary bill, and when there is a bill with the Legislature setting tuition, you would probably expect the chancellor to not speak in support of it. However, we are talking about an extraordinary group of people who deserve the support they have earned and that we must give them. We are proud to be working with you to bring this legislation forward.

I would like to address a couple of questions that have been raised. With regard to Mr. Kirner's question, I believe Mr. Anderson is addressing a real problem in the G.I. Bill which recently deleted out-of-state tuition from the types of benefits that could be paid to veterans. The veterans will still be taking full advantage of their federal rights, but those no longer include out-of-state tuition, so we are trying to cover that to attract these veterans to Nevada and thank them for their service to the country.

To Mr. Stewart's question, the answer is just a clear no. There is no limitation. They are residents of Nevada and are entitled to be classified as residents as long as they are pursuing their degree in any of our institutions.

Though not directly associated with this legislation, we have provided copies of a summary of the numerous benefits that are available to veterans within NSHE ([Exhibit F](#)). We have staffed veterans' offices at all of our campuses and we are proud to serve our returning veterans. This is great legislation, and we urge you to pass it. I do support a two-year limitation, but will leave that to the ultimate judgment of the Committee.

Mr. Anderson included us in the early discussions on this legislation and his collaborations with the Department of Defense and their extensive advocacy and resources. We found in looking at what other states are doing that this is about the period other states were looking at and thought it was a reasonable period of time for people to make a judgment. We want that veteran, when asking what he or she is going to do with the rest of his or her life, to say, "I am moving to Nevada to stay and to raise my family."

Assemblyman Eisen:

This would apply to all programs at all of the NSHE campuses whether they are community colleges, undergraduate universities, or graduate and professional programs?

Daniel Klaich:

That is correct.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

Is there a time limit after that two years if they decide to take part in this?

Daniel Klaich:

Not the way I read the statute and through discussions with Mr. Anderson. There are just a couple of dates. When were you discharged, which is ascertainable from military records; and when did you matriculate to the system? If you fall within that period, you are a resident for as long as you are going to NSHE in any of our institutions.

Assemblyman Eisen:

To make sure we understand the potential implications, what if we have a veteran who matriculated into the NSHE within that two- or three-year time frame we decide on, then leaves the institution and comes back later for another program? That is conceivable, because someone could graduate from an undergraduate program then return to matriculate at the graduate level, and that could potentially be past the two or three years. Would that still apply?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

If you get out of Active Military Service, you could be put on the Individual Ready Reserve list, and there are occasionally students who are called to redeploy and could be gone for a year. Technically, you are still considered to be a legal resident of Nevada. There are other categories to be considered for residency as well.

Daniel Klaich:

There is not the word "continuous" in this statute. That also goes to answer your question. We could think of circumstances where a veteran left the state for an extended period of time and gave up his residence, but we are trying to do the best we can to serve these veterans. Mr. Anderson has tried to draft a broad statute, and we think he has done a good job.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

Is there anyone in the audience who is in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] We will move to opposition. Is there anyone in Carson City in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas? [There was no one.]

Assemblyman Aizley:

I have a question for Dr. Klaich. Are we going to count the veterans who are nonresidents with tuition waivers when we are doing formula funding?

Daniel Klaich:

Yes we will, in one of two ways. Our current formula counts full-time equivalent (FTE) students and the formula that was proposed by the interim committee which is now being considered, counts weighted student credit hours (WSCH). We would count the WSCH of the veteran whether they qualified under this bill or otherwise. If the formula is not changed, we would count them as an FTE student.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you for that clarification. Is there anyone neutral in Carson City? [There was no one.] Are there any additional comments from the Committee? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 260 and will call Mr. Anderson back to present Assembly Bill 224.

Assembly Bill 224: Revises provisions governing the collection and maintenance of certain data relating to public education. (BDR 34-269)

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 224 which encourages the family readiness of our military. We live in a country that spends a great deal of time recruiting qualified members into the military. We have not had a compulsory military for decades. After investing time, talent, and treasure in training our military and developing them as leaders, the military wants to retain them. However, to get a soldier, marine, sailor, or airman to reenlist you have to take care of their family. Family readiness is a key phrase in the halls of the Pentagon and the various services. Our own Senator Spearman spent a great deal of time

focusing on these types of issues before leaving the United States Armed Forces. If you do not take care of a military member's family, that military member our nation has invested in will not stay in the service. Additionally, the military is also focused on family readiness so those members of the military that have families can focus on their mission when they are away from home. This is not hard to understand by members of this body who spend a great deal of time away from their home to serve in the legislature. If your family is suffering it would not be easy to function seven hours away.

This bill is relatively straightforward. It creates an identifier in our existing data systems that track student achievement. This would allow the United States Department of Defense (DOD) to see military children as a subgroup to see how they are doing. This would allow the DOD to adjust their policies and procedures to ensure they are doing everything they can to ensure our military members' families have the best support possible.

I am working with the Department of Education to reduce the fiscal note you see before you. They sent me some updated language and will appear today as neutral. I think we can still make it work. We can craft a measure if we say to the extent money is available and allow districts to report the data directly. The fiscal note really comes into the bridge being established between the data systems of the districts up to the state level. I will work with the stakeholders to make this a reality.

Additionally, the DOD has submitted a friendly amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) that you can see on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). They do not need data on those who have been discharged, so we will be removing that portion. We want to be able to see this data disaggregated to see the difference between the child of an active duty member as compared to the National Guard or Reserve who are activated. They are two different subsets of the military with different challenges.

Assemblyman Kirner:

Is it voluntary that a service member would provide information on their family?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

If you look at existing law in section 1, subsections 4 and 5, none of this data would be personally identifiable. I want to make that clear before I answer. Yes, in terms of who is a military child, that is something that would be done upon registration for school by the parent of the child of an active duty service, National Guard, or Reserve member. That is why Washoe County School District has a fiscal note because they would need to update the hard copy registration forms. Some of the districts do have online registration as well.

That would not require a fiscal note. To answer your question succinctly, it is self-registration. We are not forcing anyone to identify if they are.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

So it will just be a box that they check?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

Yes, that is correct.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

We call those in support of A.B. 224 forward.

Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District:

We want to thank Assemblyman Anderson for bringing this bill to our attention prior to this session and inquiring as to the capability of our systems. We will, in fact, be able to add the identifier to our new student information system. We are happy to assist with this process.

Calli Fisher, representing Washoe County School District:

We also thank the Chairman for this opportunity, and we use the same system that Clark County School District uses, so it will be a relatively simple process for us to add that to our online registration systems. We are here in support.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

Is there anyone else in support in Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in support in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition? [There was no one in Carson City or Las Vegas.] Is there anyone neutral in Carson City?

Glenn Meyer, Director, Technology and Innovative Programs, Department of Education:

I am testifying as neutral on this bill. The Department of Education did submit an approximate \$10,000 fiscal note to this bill, to allow the State to collect this data from the local school districts and make it part of our statewide longitudinal data system. It is not a requirement that we collect this data in our statewide system. It could be reported directly from the school districts circumventing the \$10,000 fiscal note. However, if we want to store this information in our statewide system and make it available for other research purposes, then it would be necessary to bring those data elements into our system. That is what this fiscal note is for.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I know that your testimony is in neutral and you mentioned the fiscal note, but as policy, is this a good idea?

Glenn Meyer:

Again, as the information technology director I am not an education policy expert. The bill is drafted in such a way that it makes good sense from a collection perspective. They are starting at the local level, which is where we need to collect that data. They are working with the local school districts to assure that data is put into their local student information systems. That will make that data available to us should we move forward with this fiscal note or at some time in the future decide we want to collect that information. It will be available in a system that we already exchange data with.

Ray Bacon, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association:

I have served on the State of Nevada P-16 Advisory Council, and getting the student data system right has been one of the goals since its inception. You would miss a substantial amount of data if you do not do this. At what time you fully integrate it into the system, if you want to delay that financially, is not a huge issue because it will take a while to implement. Long-term, you do need this to make the data system complete.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there additional public comments? [There were none.] I would like to thank our veterans in the audience. Thank you for joining us in the Education Committee today.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I asked Mr. Meyer to come up in the neutral position so that we could explain the issues we will try to work through so the Committee has notice. We will try to bring back an amendment that works for everyone. I would note the State is going to be doing additional data work as well as the districts so we could potentially be looking at a way of phasing it in with existing upgrades to the data structure. There will be upgrades that will be paid for in different areas through different vehicles. If Clark and Washoe Counties are able to report that data directly, we could get 83 percent of the population immediately. We could then phase in centralizing that data at the State level.

I have no doubt we will be able to make this work. The Department of Education and the districts are working in good faith on this.

Vice Chair Dondero Loop:

With no further comment, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 224. Is there any additional public comment? [There was none.]

Meeting was adjourned [at 4:07 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Education

Date: March 20, 2013

Time of Meeting: 3:15 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 187	C	David A. Byerman, Secretary of the Senate	Work Session Document
S.B. 187	D	Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Clark County Senatorial District No. 2	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 260	E	Daniel J. Klaich, J.D., Chancellor, Administrative Services, Nevada System of Higher Education	Letter from Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
A.B. 224	F	Daniel J. Klaich, J.D., Chancellor, Administrative Services, Nevada System of Higher Education:	A Summary of Military and Veterans' Education Benefits
A.B. 224	G	Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15	Friendly Amendment from Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense