

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 8, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 3:26 p.m. on Wednesday, May 8, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Vice Chair
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Senator Donald G. Gustavson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Ruben J. Kihuen (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Assembly District No. 5
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Assembly District No. 28
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Counsel
Sara Weaver, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

James G. (Greg) Cox, Director, Department of Corrections
Joyce Haldeman, Clark County School District
Kim Petersen, Department of Corrections

Senate Committee on Education
May 8, 2013
Page 2

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education

Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District

Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District

Pedro Martinez, Superintendent, Washoe County School District

Mike Patterson, Lutheran Advocacy Mission in Nevada

Dotty Merrill, Ed.D., Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., Nevada Association of School Superintendents

Peter Krueger, ACT

Scott J. Frein, ACT

Craig M. Stevens, Nevada State Education Association

Ray Bacon, Nevada Manufacturers Association

Chair Woodhouse:

The Committee will hear Assembly Bill (A.B.) 17.

ASSEMBLY BILL 17 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the conditions under which the access of a school district employee operating a program of education for incarcerated persons at a facility or institution operated by the Department of Corrections may be restricted. (BDR 34-319)

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank (Assembly District No. 16):

Section 1 of A.B. 17 proposes to allow the director of the Department of Corrections to restrict a teacher's access to a prison or educational facility within a prison for up to 30 days for good cause. When there is a violation of protocols by a teacher working in a correctional facility, the director would be allowed to exclude the teacher from the facility. The violation will be resolved by an interagency panel within 30 days.

Section 1, subsection 4 defines "good cause," and excludes disagreements over course content.

Section 2, subsection 8 refers to programs pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.573 to 388.583, inclusive.

James G. (Greg) Cox (Director, Department of Corrections):

As the Director of the Department of Corrections, I support A.B. 17.

Chair Woodhouse:

Could you provide the Committee more insight as to the need for this bill?

Mr. Cox:

We have had some issues with school district staff and teachers pertaining to violations of protocols and procedures. We have conducted investigations involving school district staff and teachers corresponding and communicating with the inmate population.

We have had several issues regarding the process of restricting access to facilities for school district staff or teachers. Section 1 expedites the process. In addition, section 1, subsection 4 explicitly states the definition of good cause. There have been security violations by school district employees in the past. Our operational procedures were being compromised by inmates.

Section 2, subsection 8 addresses protection of the health and safety of persons employed by a school district. Our Department is always concerned about the health and safety of school district employees. The vast majority of educators in our facilities do a fantastic job for the State and for the Department of Corrections. The services the school district employees provide are very good. This issue is certainly not something that occurs routinely, but there have been a number of instances we think we can address with this bill.

Senator Gustavson:

Have wardens not reported these incidents? Why is it necessary for this to be the responsibility of the director?

Mr. Cox:

There has not been a problem with reporting. Currently, the warden advises the director for the need to restrict access to a certain educator working in the warden's facility. However, there have been disagreements about the process itself. There have been discussions about the interagency panel having oversight of security issues of the Department, but I believe this bill clarifies the process for Department staff and for educators. By acting based on good cause and by proceeding through the interagency panel, people can air their grievances. The Department provides the interagency panel investigative materials including the reason for restriction of the educator. The restriction of an educator is generally associated with an inmate. This bill clearly defines the process and clearly defines access and restricted access for good cause. As the director, I will make

the determination to restrict access to our institutions until the interagency panel discusses the issues associated with the investigation.

Joyce Haldeman (Clark County School District):

The Clark County School District (CCSD) supports A.B. 17. We are distressed when incidents happen that require teachers to be removed from the classroom at a facility. In the event there are incidents in the future, the CCSD would likely run a parallel process to determine if disciplinary action is appropriate.

Kim Petersen (Department of Corrections):

I support A.B. 17. I have worked for the Department of Corrections for over 4 years. This bill is helpful to the Department because it clarifies processes and defines good cause. In the past, the restriction of access has taken as many as 90 days. The bill expedites this process either to get the teacher in the institution's classroom where he or she belongs or to find another teacher who can teach inmates. This academic year, we have not had any issues prompting a hearing. Our instructors from all the districts have been stellar this academic year.

Chair Woodhouse:

The hearing on A.B. 17 is closed. The hearing on A.B. 460 is open.

ASSEMBLY BILL 460 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the statewide system of accountability for public schools. (BDR 34-195)

Rorie Fitzpatrick (Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

Assembly Bill 460 includes recommendations in the "Report to the 77th Session of the Nevada Legislature" made by the Legislative Committee on Education. The Assembly and Senate Committees on Education received a presentation early in this Session on the new Nevada School Performance Framework. This bill relates to that presentation.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was the first attempt at defining school and district accountability. All elements of the NCLB were incorporated into NRS. The Legislature made clear at that time there were the same expectations for schools that receive Title I school funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as for those schools that did not receive Title I school funding.

The school accountability efforts have evolved over the last decade. Nevada, along with many other states, has pursued more robust accountability systems through the ESEA waiver process offered by the U.S. Department of Education in 2011. This bill seeks to create alignment in the State's federally approved accountability system and the NRS.

This bill proposes to eliminate the prescriptive details of the NCLB and to replace those provisions with requirements for schools and school districts in the State to implement our federally approved accountability system.

We know the accountability system will evolve over time to inform us about instruction as more data become available and as assessment systems grow. We need to have statutes nimble enough to accommodate these systems' improvements while maintaining a fully articulated accountability system based on what is learned over time.

Assembly Bill 460 proposes to make changes to the requirements for calculating school, school district and State performance. The bill includes the methodology for calculating performance and includes the contents and mechanisms for producing report cards for each school, each school district and for the State. In addition, the bill makes changes in the requirements for support and consequences following school-performance ratings. Without these changes, the State would be required to implement dual systems of accountability.

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank (Assembly District No. 16):

Section 6, subsection 2, paragraph (gg) provides for data collection of the number and percentage of students who have code-of-honor violations, the consequences of code-of-honor violations, and the process used to address code-of-honor violations.

Lindsay Anderson (Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) supports A.B. 460. We were influential during the ESEA waiver authorization process. We support updating our statutes to reflect changes in the school performance framework.

The WCSD is able to track code-of-honor violations. We can provide data to determine if violations are an issue.

Nicole Rourke (Clark County School District):

The CCSD supports A.B. 460. We supported the ESEA waiver authorization process. We believe we can comply with data collection for code-of-honor violations. We are in the midst of developing and implementing a new student information system that will enable us to track these violations.

Chair Woodhouse:

We are aware that the CCSD is implementing its student information system. Will A.B. 460 delay tracking of code-of-honor violations?

Ms. Rourke:

The CCSD is in the early stages of implementing our student information system. The full implementation is slated for August 2014. There is no indication the process will be delayed.

Chair Woodhouse:

The hearing on A.B. 460 is closed. The hearing on A.B. 288 is open.

ASSEMBLY BILL 288 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing graduation from high school. (BDR 34-524)

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores (Assembly District No. 28):

Assembly Bill 288 removes the required high school proficiency exam. The bill replaces the high school proficiency exam with end-of-course exams. In addition, the bill mandates that high school juniors take a college entrance exam. The bill does not specify which college entrance exam must be given. The Department of Education (NDE) will determine which college entrance exam is best for students. The students' performance on the college entrance exam will have no bearing on whether or not students graduate from high school. We believe a college entrance exam is a student assessment. This enables high school juniors to be either college or career ready.

The high school proficiency exam is not aligned with what is being taught in the classroom. As a result, many of our students are failing the high school proficiency exam. In addition, the test is not administered until late in their junior or senior high school year. There are so many students focused solely on passing the high school proficiency exam that many drop out of school. Those students who have all their required credits but who cannot pass the high school proficiency exam are allowed to participate in graduation

ceremonies. Following the ceremonies, students are given a certificate of attendance, not a high school diploma. Unfortunately, many students believe the certificate of attendance is the equivalent of a high school diploma.

We are no longer testing students on what is actually taught because we are adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).

Senator Ford:

Is there a provision in the bill addressing a student's inability to pay for the college entrance exam?

Assemblywoman Flores:

The college entrance exam will be mandatory, so the burden is on the school districts to pay for the exam.

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop (Assembly District No. 5):

Assembly Bill 288 is an effort to strengthen Nevada's system of student assessment.

Section 43 eliminates the high school proficiency exam. Section 19 requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction, NDE, to select a college entrance exam to be used to determine the achievement and proficiency of high school students enrolled in Grade 11. All school districts and charter schools are required to administer the exam in Grade 11.

Section 33 requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to prescribe new criteria for the receipt of the standard high school diploma and includes a requirement that students successfully pass end-of-course exams. This section requires the SBE to prescribe the courses of study for which these exams will be required, including the subject areas for which the State has adopted the CCSS.

The remainder of the bill makes conforming changes related to the elimination of the high school proficiency exam.

Assembly Bill 288 recognizes that student proficiency in a given subject is best measured immediately at the end of a course rather than months or years after taking a course. The bill also recognizes that regardless of the high school proficiency exam, colleges and universities use other tools to measure student

readiness. Our students and our schools would be better served by using similar exams.

Assemblywoman Flores:

The Committee has received mock-up Proposed Amendment 8711 ([Exhibit C](#)). This proposed amendment calls for the college entrance exam language to be generic to enable school districts to decide which test they prefer to use.

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

Section 12.3, subsection 1 of Proposed Amendment 8711 states:

The State Board shall select an assessment which enables a person who has not graduated from high school to demonstrate that he or she has achieved an educational level which is an acceptable substitute for completing a high school education.

Throughout the proposed amendment, the term “high school equivalency assessment” is used instead of citing a specific exam that must be taken.

Chair Woodhouse:

Is the new language consistent throughout the proposed amendment?

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

That is correct.

Senator Ford:

Is it appropriate for the proposed amendment to include a definition of “high school equivalency assessment”?

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

I believe the term is a general term, and there is no need to define high school equivalency assessment.

Asher Killian (Counsel):

High school equivalency assessment is not defined in the proposed amendment because it is generic, and a definition is not necessary.

Senator Cegavske:

Are you saying that each of the 17 school districts can select any assessment it chooses?

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

The high school equivalency assessment would be selected by the board of trustees of each of the 17 school districts, including those in the corrections system, and the governing body of all charter schools.

Senator Cegavske:

How many states are using the ACT or SAT?

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

I do not have that information. Each state may use a different description than what we have chosen. Some states may designate a specific test. We have left that language general.

Senator Cegavske:

Nationally, how will this shift affect Nevada's education ranking?

Assemblywoman Flores:

The college entrance exam is required, but the results of the exam would have no bearing on whether or not the student graduates. This should not have an effect on Nevada's education ranking.

The components of the new graduation requirements are to satisfy credit requirements, to take and successfully pass end-of-course exams in Grades 9 and 10 and to take a college entrance exam. There are two reasons for this proposed change. First, this provides an additional assessment tool for school districts. Second, this provides school districts the opportunity to identify students who are deficient in certain subject areas. This will help our students to be either college ready or career ready.

Senator Cegavske:

I am concerned about the end-of-course exams. Will these exams be standardized?

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

With the implementation of CCSS, the exams will be standardized.

Senator Cegavske:

Will they be standardized by the NDE?

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

Yes.

Pedro Martinez (Superintendent, Washoe County School District):

I support A.B. 288. I believe this a first step in setting a strong vision for our children.

I have been in Nevada for 4 years. I have sought to determine the reasons for Nevada's last-place ranking in graduation rates. I have discovered we have misalignment issues in our State. One of my missions has been to understand and fix the high school proficiency exam. In the WCSD, we are leading the State in children graduating with advanced diplomas. However, we have students who take and pass advanced placement courses, but who cannot pass the high school proficiency exam on their first try. This confirms that the high school proficiency exam is well-intentioned, but that the exam is not aligned to what is taught in the classroom. We are mandated to use the high school proficiency exam. The exam is used as an exit exam.

We spend millions of dollars helping children graduate. Over the past 5 years, WCSD and CCSD have had their highest graduation levels. We are creating teachers who are experts in helping students pass the high school proficiency exam. However, there are problems. Over two-thirds of WCSD students go on to postsecondary education, yet we have a higher percentage of students in remediation courses than ever before. Even though many students are passing the high school proficiency exam, many students still have to take remedial courses.

This bill creates a stronger alignment in our education systems. The CCSS are being implemented. We are aligning assessments to the CCSS. We want to catch students in Grade 9 and Grade 10 to ensure we have systems in place to have them ready for graduation. The CCSS are part of students' grades, and the CCSS are part of the subject matter students are being taught. This bill will allow us to use dollars currently used to provide student interventions toward investment in our teachers to ensure the CCSS are implemented correctly. There is no state in the Country that uses a high school proficiency exam as an exit exam. The high school proficiency exam was designed to give us data.

Employers want the exact same skill sets colleges want. The WCSD sees all components of the bill creating stronger alignment and creating a stronger vision.

Senator Ford:

The testimony shows that all stakeholders have been at the table. I am pleased we have developed a bill that addresses a better system for student assessments.

Ms. Haldeman:

The CCSD supports A.B. 288. We feel strongly this is a good bill for our students. This bill changes the focus for students in high school. Currently, high school students believe if they pass the high school proficiency exam and receive all required credits, they are ready for college or career. By moving to the end-of-course exam, the focus is changed from passing a single exam to passing end-of-course exams to be ready and prepared for college or career. Schools will be allowed to tailor curriculum specifically for junior-year students so they will not need remedial classes in college.

There was concern that by removing the high school proficiency exam, we were removing an exam that was important. End-of-course exams will be more strenuous and more rigorous than the single high school proficiency exam.

Senator Gustavson:

Is there any guarantee A.B. 288 will improve the outcomes for our students?

Ms. Haldeman:

For the first time, we are seeing alignment in the curriculum and the assessments. When the high school proficiency exam was introduced, it was aligned to the curriculum. However, the curriculum changed over time while the high school proficiency exam did not. As the State has adopted the CCSS, there is a different approach to education which will lead to the change that is sought. By using end-of-course exams, there will be alignment with curriculum and CCSS.

Mr. Martinez:

Employers and colleges are embracing the initiatives in A.B. 288. We cannot state today that we will see higher graduation rates. Graduation rates may even go down somewhat because rigor will be increased. By catching students earlier

than we have in the past, we have a better chance to ensure that students graduate. Our employers are having difficulty finding the employee skill sets they need. Presidents of universities and community colleges are struggling to keep students in school because students lose hope and drop out.

Ms. Fitzpatrick:

The NDE supports A.B. 288. We believe this is the right direction to go for our students. The purpose of public education is to graduate students who are college and career ready. To meet that end, we must provide a rigorous set of standards and an aligned system of accountability on assessments. The system of assessments must provide us with instructive feedback for students and educators. This bill moves the State forward and gives us meaningful feedback. This bill is a collaborative effort of stakeholders and the Legislature. A shift away from the high school proficiency exam is necessary to move to components of next-generation assessments.

Chair Woodhouse:

What will be the process between the NDE and the SBE in determining which college entrance exam will be required?

Ms. Fitzpatrick:

We will have a series of public workshops and public hearings. The SBE will need to appreciate fully and understand the issues coming before them. It is likely that in advance of holding workshops, the NDE will convene a task force of stakeholders to establish criteria to guide the SBE. I anticipate the task force will include members of the school districts' population and others so the Board is ready to do the work in a meaningful way.

Senator Gustavson:

How long will this process take? We will be starting the new school year in a few months, so I hope the process will begin before the new school year.

Ms. Fitzpatrick:

We will develop a list of stakeholders and will bring the task force together in early summer to midsummer. The implementation of a college- and career-readiness assessment to replace the high school proficiency exam will not happen in the upcoming school year. The implementation will happen in the subsequent school year. Some transitory elements are in this bill to allow for the phasing in and the phasing out of the high school proficiency exam. The work

will be completed in time for contracts to be issued in the 2014-2015 school year.

With regard to the end-of-course assessments, possibly we will be guided by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium which anticipates having end-of-course tests for our availability. We will not have to create new tests if sufficient tests already exist, rather than expending the time and money to develop new assessments.

Mike Patterson (Lutheran Advocacy Mission in Nevada):

The Lutheran Advocacy Mission in Nevada supports A.B. 288. I am a retired schoolteacher. The day the high school proficiency test was introduced, my colleagues and I were troubled because we knew we could not teach to the exam. Our curriculum did not align with the high school proficiency exam.

A recent newspaper article stated that 167 students in WCSD did not receive their high school diplomas last year because they did not pass the high school proficiency exam.

There have been concerns about accountability. I believe the end-of-course exams will give us the accountability we seek and that administering the ACT or SAT to students in Grade 11 will increase the numbers of our college entrants.

Dotty Merrill, Ed.D. (Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards):

The Nevada Association of School Boards supports A.B. 288. The sponsors of the bill were open to questions, and they were responsive to those questions. The bill has an appropriate emphasis on rigor and accountability. The end-of-course exams will be tied to the future of students' college or career paths. There will be evidence from end-of-course exams that will assist with needed remediation before graduation.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D. (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents supports A.B. 288.

Peter Krueger (ACT):

The Committee has received a letter ([Exhibit D](#)) from ACT Vice President, Scott Montgomery, in support of A.B. 288.

Scott J. Frein (ACT):

The ACT supports A.B. 288. The goal of this bill is aligned with our mission to advance lives by helping people achieve educational and workplace success.

We support this bill for three reasons. First, ACT has long defined college and career readiness as the acquisition of knowledge and skills students need to enroll in and succeed in credit-bearing, first-year courses at a postsecondary institution without the need for remediation. Second, Nevada is not unique in this endeavor. The need to assess students' college and career readiness statewide is an important one. The ACT is currently working with the Governor of Wisconsin in an effort similar to the effort in A.B. 288. Third, statewide testing is an equalizer. Statewide testing allows exposure to those students who might not otherwise be college bound. Statewide test administration has brought more minorities and more low-income students into the college admissions process. In 2001, Colorado and Illinois provided the ACT statewide testing to all Grade 11 students. Five years later, based on our research in 2002 and 2006, there was an increase of 13 percent and 18 percent in college-bound students, respectively. For example, prior to taking the ACT exam, 1,000 Colorado students who did not intend to go to college later decided to go to college after taking the ACT exam.

Your approval of A.B. 288 will signal your support for students to reach their full potential.

Craig M. Stevens (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association supports A.B. 288. We believe in students taking ACT or SAT exams to prepare for college.

Ray Bacon (Nevada Manufacturers Association):

The Nevada Manufacturers Association is neutral on A.B. 288. We support the goals of the bill, but there are some concerns.

The academic standards were created in 1997. We contracted with various companies to develop testing programs to match academic standards. In theory, we should have been teaching to the academic standards. In 2009, we set a cut score for our revised math standards at 48 percent. The standards were wrong, the assessment was wrong or the curriculum did not match the standards. That is a problem we created. We now have a cut score of 60 percent for math, and we are seeing a drastic increase in students who are

failing. If students had been taught to the academic standards and if there had been an exam that matched our academic standards, students would not be failing.

We have stated we want college- and career-ready students. We have stated we are focused on the ACT and SAT. I agree with those goals. However, employers believe the ACT National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) is the standard measurement all employers can use. The NCRC evaluates reading, math and problem solving. These are the skills employers need in employees. Perhaps the SBE should be given latitude to offer the ACT to all students while simultaneously allowing students to take the NCRC. This gives employers a standard tool to match an employee to the job. The NCRC will be available in every employment office.

I grew up in a state which had end-of-course exams. Our exams were tied to every academic course taken. In the testimony, it sounds like we are stopping the end-of-course exam with the CCSS. How will we do that and continue to engage students for the remaining 2 years? The criteria of the ACT alone may not do that. We will continue to have seniors taking two or three courses. There needs to be some level of end-of-course testing for every core academic course in this State. End-of-course exams should be criterion-referenced tests. We need to be raising the academic rigor, demanding excellence from our students and our teachers and setting and sticking to firm criteria.

As a State, 30 percent of our students are going to college. We have had outstanding State leaders who rose out of poverty. How do we develop a system to catch and lift students out of poverty? This is a key issue and one that I am not sure A.B. 288 addresses.

The greatest single problem in our State is youth unemployment. The NCRC becomes a standard document an employer can use to determine if a person can do a job. Career Technical Education (CTE) schools are developing students for careers. The CTE students do not have a youth unemployment problem. Those students graduate with the skills they need. I am hopeful this becomes the long-term goal and the standard in our State.

Of the combined State and federal funding for education, only 5 percent goes toward apprenticeships. Apprenticeships lead to great jobs. The issue is we

have a shortage of people ready for the workplace. The focus needs to be on developing a productive workforce that is ready to work.

Assemblywoman Flores:

Thank you for hearing A.B. 288. This effort has been hard work with collaboration that has paid off. We need to focus on what can be done to improve education in the State. While I appreciate the ACT support for this bill, I do not endorse a given exam. We are not the education experts. The experts are the SBE, the superintendents and the local school boards. We left the language regarding college entrance exams generic. The SBE will make the determination of what exam is appropriate for students.

Chair Woodhouse:

The hearing on A.B. 288 is closed. The hearing on A.B. 459 is open.

ASSEMBLY BILL 459 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to school property. (BDR 34-203)

Ms. Haldeman:

Assembly Bill 459 has two distinct parts. First, sections 1 and 2 give school districts the ability to donate surplus property to other school districts. Second, section 4 addresses oversight panels specific to the CCSD and WCSD.

In 2012, the Legislative Committee on Education sent a letter to all interested parties to solicit recommendations for consideration. In accordance with a suggestion from the Pershing County School District, pages 17 and 18 of the "Report to the 77th Session of the Nevada Legislature," made by the Legislative Committee on Education recommended that NRS 332.185, subsection 2 be amended to allow school districts to accept donations of surplus property from another school district within the State. Currently, a school district may donate surplus property to charter schools only. Sections 1 and 2 of this bill would expand that ability to include the donation of items to other school districts.

In 1997, the Legislature approved two new revenue sources for the CCSD to be used for school construction. In addition, an oversight panel for school construction was created. There was a concern as to the amount of revenue that would be generated by the two new revenue streams. The oversight panel could stop the revenue streams if it believed there was more revenue generated than the school district needed. Section 4 allows the oversight panel for school

facilities to become dormant during periods when there are no active construction programs supported by bond proceeds.

Section 4, subsection 1 of A.B. 459 requires 11 members of the oversight panel. Section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (a) states that six members represent local government. Section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraphs (1) through (5) require one member with structural or civil engineering expertise, one member with public works expertise, one member with construction finance expertise, one member with gaming industry expertise and one member from the general public with an interest in education.

Since the 1998 building program was approved, the CCSD oversight panel has met and provided the required reports. The last program report provided was in July 2012. The oversight panel concluded the report by recommending that report be the last report. Section 4, subsection 3 recommends the oversight panel remain dormant except at the call of the board of trustees or if bond proceeds were being spent by the district for school construction.

Dr. Pierczynski:

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents supports A.B. 459. In addition, I speak on behalf of WCSD in support of A.B. 459.

Senate Committee on Education
May 8, 2013
Page 18

Chair Woodhouse:

The hearing on A.B. 459 is closed. The meeting is adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sara Weaver,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
A.B. 288	C	32	Assemblywoman Lucy Flores	Proposed Amendment 8711
A.B. 288	D	2	Scott Montgomery	Letter