

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
April 10, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 4:21 p.m. on Wednesday, April 10, 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 Ruben J. Kihuen  
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske  
Senator Donald G. Gustavson

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senatorial District No. 2  
Senator Joseph P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12  
Senator David R. Parks, Senatorial District No. 7  
Senator Tick Segerblom, Senatorial District No. 3  
Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17  
Senator Debbie Smith, Senatorial District No. 13

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst  
Asher Killian, Counsel  
Diana Jones, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Grant Gabriel, Youth Legislator, District 16, Nevada Youth Legislature  
Craig M. Stevens, Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association

Senate Committee on Education  
April 10, 2013  
Page 2

Darrin J. Dykes, Friends of Academy for Career Education Charter High School  
Ray Bacon, Nevada Manufacturers Association  
Jennifer Batchelder, Nevada Women's Lobby  
Peter D. Krueger, Northern Nevada Development Authority  
Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation  
Heather Dye  
Don Noorda, Agriculture Teacher, Elko County School District  
John Kohntopp, Agriculture Teacher, Elko County School District  
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District  
Dotty Merrill, Ed.D., Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards;  
Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Stan Hall, Director, Career and Technical Education, Clark County School  
District  
Craig Statucki, Teacher and Community Partnership Coordinator, Southwest  
Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School District; Nevada  
Association of Career and Technical Education  
Mike Raponi, Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education, Department of  
Education  
Susan J. Chambers, Federal Programs Facilitator, Churchill County School  
District  
Erin McMullen, American Chemistry Council  
Mike Draper, General Motors Company  
Nicole Rourke, Executive Director of Government Affairs, Clark County School  
District  
Ruben Murillo Jr., Nevada State Education Association  
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School  
Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees  
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of  
Education

**Chair Woodhouse:**

I will open the hearing with Senate Bill (S.B.) 305, which revises provisions relating to education.

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

**Senator James A. Settelmeyer (Senatorial District No. 17):**

This bill encourages high school internships. It was developed for presentation as a bill from the Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL) by Youth Legislator, Grant Gabriel, from my district. The NYL did not choose to present the bill, but I felt it merited attention and allowed Mr. Gabriel to bring it forward here.

**Grant Gabriel, Youth Legislator (District 16, Nevada Youth Legislature):**

I am presenting you a prepared statement ([Exhibit C](#)). I will review a bill walk-through ([Exhibit D](#)), which details S.B. 305 changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) and Proposed Amendment 7893 for this bill ([Exhibit E](#)).

Senate Bill 305 creates an internship program for high school students in the fields of agriculture, construction and manufacturing. Participating students would receive one unit of high school elective credit for completion of not less than 60 hours of internship work. This aligns with the hourly requirement for classroom credit. In keeping with federal labor laws, students would be required to be at least 16 years of age to participate in the internship. To allow the maximum opportunities for participation, internships would be allowed in the public or private sectors. Participation in this program would not earn a student credit toward required high school graduation requirements. Section 1, subsection 1 of S.B. 305 proposes to allow in-classroom training prior to participating in an internship.

Section 1, subsection 2, contains permissive language to allow local school district boards of trustees to determine the best types of internship programs for their districts. The focus areas of manufacturing, agriculture and construction are defined in this area. Paragraph (b) of subsection 2 requires creation of a list of possible internship opportunities. This would make students aware of the available choices for internships. In Proposed Amendment 7893, section 1, subsection 3 and all of section 2 of S.B. 305 are deleted. These deletions remove the tax credit for employers and would remove the fiscal note from this bill. Section 3 of S.B. 305 states an effective date of July 1 or upon passage and approval.

**Senator Ford:**

Why is the language in section 1, subsection 1, which discusses duplication of requirements for a course of study, proposed to be struck?

**Mr. Gabriel:**

Concern was expressed if a student took a class with specific requirements, such as welding, this might prohibit him or her from participating in a welding internship having similar requirements. In reality, the internship would increase the student's knowledge and practical skills. On paper, requirements for the internship might appear to duplicate those of the course the student has already taken. We want to eliminate this concern.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

This amendment was requested by students and industry experts.

**Senator Ford:**

Does the amended bill allow a student who has taken a welding class also to receive credit for a welding internship? Would the student receive credit twice for one class labeled "welding," or would the classes be identified differently?

**Mr. Gabriel:**

Section 1, subsection 1 of S.B. 305 would allow a student to receive one unit of elective credit for an internship. Credit for participation in an internship would be in addition to credit earned for a traditional course such as welding.

**Senator Cegavske:**

What decisions were made about this bill in the Senate Committee on Finance?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

We realized the fiscal note was harmful to passage of this bill. We decided to amend out the aspects of the bill that caused the fiscal note. This caused S.B. 305 to be rereferred to the Senate Committee on Education.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Have amendments been made so this bill will not be rereferred to the Senate Committee on Finance?

**Chair Woodhouse:**

Yes, the necessary amendments have been completed.

**Craig M. Stevens (Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association):**

The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) supports S.B. 305. This bill will help our students focus on careers.

**Darrin J. Dykes (Friends of Academy for Career Education Charter High School):**

The Academy for Career Education Charter High School is a career and technical academy specializing in construction trades. We support this bill.

**Ray Bacon (Nevada Manufacturers Association):**

The Nevada Manufacturers Association (NMA) collaborated with Mr. Gabriel on development of this bill. The skill areas identified are ones we know will require new employees in the future due to the aging of our workforce. The NMA supports this bill. There will need to be modifications made to this program as it is implemented. Some students will be participating as interns during their senior year of high school when they are 18 years old. They will be looking for jobs immediately after completing their internships. I have provided a letter of support from NMA ([Exhibit F](#)).

**Jennifer Batchelder (Nevada Women's Lobby):**

The Nevada Women's Lobby originally opposed S.B. 305. With the proposed amendment that removes the fiscal note, we are now in support of this bill.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 305 and bring it back later in this meeting for a vote. I will now open the hearing on S.B. 328.

**SENATE BILL 328**: Makes various changes relating to education. (BDR 34-937)

**Senator James A. Settelmeyer (Senatorial District No. 17):**

Senate Bill 328 deals with career and technical education (CTE). A funding concept or formula was previously established to ensure the involvement of Nevada businesses in CTE fields. This formula has not been used in recent years. I will review this concept and provide an overview using the S.B. 328 walk-through document ([Exhibit G](#)). The Committee has received a copy of Proposed Amendment 8073 ([Exhibit H](#)).

The areas being addressed by this bill are listed in section 2, subsection 1. These are basically the same as those identified on the Department of Education

(NDE), Career and Technical Education programs Website. It is important to have highly qualified teachers for these programs. Section 2, subsection 2 of S.B. 328 proposes to mandate a minimum requirement of 3 years of secondary education experience in teaching agriculture for the program specialist in that subject area. The remainder of section 2 defines the requirements for instructors in the area of agriculture.

Section 3 restricts CTE fund use of federal funds for leadership purposes unless federal law requires it. Over the last several years, up to 10 percent of CTE funds have been used for leadership purposes. Positions within the NDE have been created, and funds have been taken away from students. This bill would limit the use of State funds for this purpose to 5 percent. Section 3, subsection 3 requires any funds remaining after disbursement of the 5 percent for leadership and training purposes be equally divided among the six CTE focus areas. Section 3, subsection 5, discusses distribution of funds if more than \$1.5 million will be distributed.

Section 4 provides details of the grant application process for school districts. Applications for these grants would first go to the industry sector council. This is important because private sector involvement is critical to the success of our students. In the past, the industry sector council was involved in determining criteria for disbursement of CTE grant funds. This created buy-in and a willingness from those in industry to assist schools. It is important we revitalize this relationship.

Section 5 identifies rules for distributing CTE funds in excess of \$1.5 million. Section 6 requires school districts or charter schools to match the amount of grants received under this program. In section 6, subsection 2, there is an exception clause for schools financially unable to meet the match requirement.

Section 7 ensures any funds remaining at the end of a fiscal year will remain with the program by being held back instead of reverting to the State General Fund. This would allow districts to save for the purchase of items having an excessive cost that might require more than 1 year of funding resources. Section 8 contains procedures to ensure funds are spent appropriately. We want to continue to encourage buy-in from the area sector councils and ensure that all CTE focus areas are funded adequately and fairly.

**Peter D. Krueger (Northern Nevada Development Authority):**

I will read my testimony ([Exhibit I](#)). The Northern Nevada Development Authority believes the future of our State and its future workforce depends on passage of this bill and the correct alignment of funds it promotes.

**Doug Busselman (Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation):**

The Nevada Farm Bureau supports vocational education, especially agricultural education. Passage of S.B. 328 is necessary to bring about the appropriate direction the NDE needs to give CTE program areas the required attention. We encourage passage of this bill. We recommend industry representatives be involved in the process of grant evaluation. The real-world experience brought by these representatives is important to this process.

**Heather Dye:**

I was formerly a CTE lobbyist. During the 2007 Session, I worked with a diverse group of people to promote the impact of CTE and to obtain line item funding for CTE programs. My testimony relates to discussions regarding this bill that occurred at that time. I have summarized key sections of this bill in my prepared materials ([Exhibit J](#)).

The structure of CTE fund disbursement by the 2007 Legislature was created as a compromise between several Legislators. Some wanted a competitive process; others wanted the allocation to be on a per-pupil enrolled basis. The compromise that resulted was to divide the \$1.5 million equally between the CTE program areas. Funds were to be used to start new programs and expand those currently in operation. Remaining funds were to be granted on a per-pupil allocation. The intent of this compromise was to create equitable programs across the State. Funding was not intended to be divided on a per-student basis. It was to be used as seed money to begin implementation of programs in all CTE areas. Due to an emerging need for workers in this field, discussions focused on increasing programs related to the health occupations.

Some Legislators were opposed to the NDE being allowed to withhold 10 percent of the CTE funds for administrative purposes. After discussions, this amount was lowered to 5 percent. These funds were to be used to help the NDE fund statewide CTE initiatives. A diverse group of participants contributed to the final funding structure, but the process was not included in the final allocation of funds. Funds for CTE programs were ultimately included under a line item within NDE budget account 101-2699.

The impact of CTE programs on Nevada students can be enormous. Funding for these programs provides a wide variety of opportunities for students. Some structure must be put in place for disbursement of funds, or they may not have the impact we want. This is an opportunity to support CTE long into the future. We must set up a structure. I agree with the structure proposed in this bill. The voices of business and industry are vital. They need to be included in determining the disbursement of competitive funds. This will help us ensure we are preparing students for the workforce of the future.

Agriculture education is important to our State. The agriculture education program professional must be able to work with teachers on all three areas of agriculture education: the classroom; work-based learning; and the leadership development component, Future Farmers of America (FFA).

**Don Noorda (Agriculture Teacher, Elko County School District):**

I support S.B. 328 as amended. I have taught agriculture in Nevada for 20 years. Section 2 of this bill defines the work assignment for the program professional. The bill reinstates the tasks required by this position prior to 2011. Agriculture education is defined in public law as including classroom instruction, work-based learning and FFA. If the program professional does not equally represent these three areas, students and teachers will not receive the resources they need. By defining the work assignment of the program professional in statute, we will ensure he or she provides these opportunities to teachers and students. The *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) Chapter 389 confirms that participation in FFA and supervised agricultural experience is approved for course credit.

I support section 3 because it restores CTE funding to the original intent of the 2007 Legislature. State CTE funds should be used toward workforce development in our State. These funds should not be used to offset federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act funding. I support the allocation of 5 percent of CTE funds for NDE leadership and training purposes. To ensure the greatest impact, the majority of this money should go to classrooms and students

The equal division of funds between the six CTE focus areas is intended to encourage development of each area. Students in the Clark County School District (CCSD) may have many opportunities to take business or trade classes, but few opportunities to pursue interests in agricultural science or



natural resources. Providing each CTE area an equal portion of the funding will build equity in each.

Section 6 requires a district to match CTE grant funds. I am concerned that if this requirement does not exist, districts might reduce their investment in CTE programs and use funding from this program to supplant other funding.

I support section 8 of this bill because it returns accountability to CTE programs. It allows program professionals to be involved in the competitive grants given to their areas. It lets them review the effectiveness of grants and requires a report of findings be made to the State Board for Career and Technical Education.

Senate Bill 328 as amended would provide direction on how funds should be spent. It improves accountability through oversight by the program professionals. It returns CTE programs to the original intent of the 2007 Legislature by maximizing the funds going into our classrooms. All CTE areas are encouraged to be more equitable under this legislation. This bill minimizes leadership costs. It brings businesses back into the disbursement process, which is greatly needed.

**John Kohntopp (Agriculture Teacher, Elko County School District):**

I will read my prepared statement ([Exhibit K](#)).

**Mr. Bacon:**

The NMA supports this bill. It will fully support many of the CTE programs in our State. I have provided a letter of support from NMA with additional comments ([Exhibit L](#)). We recommend section 4, subsection 3 be amended to add a paragraph (k) that would read, "(k) Program leads to national credential certification or not." This language should also be added to section 5, subsection 2.

**Lindsay Anderson (Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District):**

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) opposes this bill. Less than 1 percent of the students in our district study agriculture. Under this bill, this small group would receive the same funding as students in skilled and technical sciences who account for 44 percent of our CTE program. This would impede our ability to support and maintain more highly attended programs.

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

The Nevada Association of School Boards and the Nevada Association of School Superintendents oppose S.B. 328 for three reasons. The primary reason is this bill equally divides the funds from CTE into six identified areas. In 2011 and 2012, there were nearly 56,990 students enrolled in CTE classes in Nevada. Of this number, only 1,879 students participated in CTE courses in agriculture and natural resources. With this legislation, the students in each of the other five areas would receive the same funding as the 1,879 students enrolled in agriculture. We do not feel is equitable.

Our second concern relates to section 3, subsection 1, on page 3, which appears to limit funding for leadership and training activities. This would impact students in organizations that are related to the six CTE areas. Student organizations such as DECA; the Future Business Leaders of America; the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America; the FFA; HOSA and SkillsUSA would all be impacted by this reduction in funding. These organizations provide competitive- and leadership-growth opportunities for students and are important to them. We would not like to see these groups impacted.

Our third concern begins in section 4, subsection 1, and is also found in section 5. We feel the grant application process would be unfair to smaller districts that may not have personnel assigned specifically to do this job. From the perspective of the school board of trustees, this adds an additional dimension to the workload of personnel who may already be overburdened.

Subsection 1 of section 6, addresses the need for matching funds stating that funds must be matched in order to qualify for a CTE grant. Section 6, subsection 2 provides an option for the Executive Officer of the State Board for Career and Technical Education to waive this section for districts or charter schools that are financially unable to match the amount to be allocated. This is problematic. The budget priority of a school board of trustees may be focused on other areas it feels are more important to improving student achievement. This could result in a reduction of services under this bill because matching funds would not be available.

**Stan Hall (Director Career and Technical Education, Clark County School District):**

Students in the CCSD comprise over 70 percent of the enrollment in Nevada's CTE programs. I am advocating for those students and their teachers. Although we have the largest percentage of students participating in CTE programs, the CCSD has never received more than 34 percent of CTE funding. Senate Bill 328 proposes changes to the current distribution process. I oppose this bill.

There is a wide disparity between the six program areas that make up the career and technical education program. The amount of student participation in each does not guarantee these areas should each receive an equal share of the funding. The current process meets the needs of our teachers and students. I have confidence the competitive process we currently have will continue to be fair and equitable. In Clark County, the economic sector is involved in CTE activities. Our grants are written based on input from our business partners.

**Craig Statucki (Teacher and Community Partnership Coordinator, Southwest Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School District; Nevada Association of Career and Technical Education):**

The Nevada Association of Career and Technical Education does not support this bill. I will read my prepared statement ([Exhibit M](#)).

**Mike Raponi (Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education, Department of Education):**

I will read from my prepared statement ([Exhibit N](#)). I have also provided the Committee a document providing background information on State enrollment and the funding history of CTE programs ([Exhibit O](#)).

**Susan J. Chambers (Federal Programs Facilitator, Churchill County School District):**

I will provide the Committee the perspective of how this bill might impact a rural school district. In Churchill County, there is a lack of industry sector representation from all six CTE areas. Our local advisory committee reviews and approves our CTE applications. Programs from the six areas are not equally represented in our district. Under this legislation, the agricultural program would receive a significant amount of money, but we do not have a need for business and marketing programs to be funded at the same level. We have identified

district priorities we would like to fund. If this bill takes effect, we would be required to rewrite our grant applications for these funds. I am the only grant writer in our district, and I manage 30 grants. I like the fact the current process combines the application process for the six areas. This decreases my workload and provides an opportunity for teachers to work as a team to prioritize their funding goals. I am not sure the proposed process would benefit the Churchill County School District. For this reason, I am neutral on S.B. 328.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

This bill is designed to promote equity and involve the business and industry communities in CTE programs. Proposed Amendment 8073 specifies that State CTE funds may not be used to provide leadership and training activities for the sole purpose of federal CTE programs. It also states that up to 5 percent of the funds received from the State may be used for this purpose. If a district does not need funding in one of the six CTE areas, it should not apply for it. The \$250,000 allocated for each area would be divided according to the proposed grant process. Additional funds would be allocated on a per-pupil funding basis. This is designed to help the program be more equitable.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 328. I will reopen the hearing on S.B. 305.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 305.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

I will open the hearing on S.B. 382.

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

**Senator David R. Parks (Senatorial District No. 7):**

I will read my prepared statement ([Exhibit P](#)).

**Senator Gustavson**

How much would implementation of these standards increase the cost of a new school bus?

**Senator Parks:**

I do not know the specific amount. These costs are considered minimal. Installation of a fire suppression system on a bus costs only a few hundred dollars. The potential damage that could be caused by a fire would be much higher.

**Senator Gustavson:**

On page 3, line 34 of the bill, why are the measurements given in millimeters instead of inches?

**Senator Parks:**

I do not know.

**Erin McMullen (American Chemistry Council):**

I represent the American Chemistry Council. Metric is a standard unit of measurement when working with engines. We worked with Senator Parks on developing ways to make the proposed requirements of this bill cost-effective for school districts.

**Mike Draper (General Motors Company):**

I am speaking on behalf of the General Motors Company (GM). It is a priority for GM to address under-hood fire risks, and GM has long taken this into account when designing school buses. This bill includes options required to meet the needs of all the engine designers and auto manufacturers that currently design engine parts for school buses. In its design process, GM has worked to avoid placing plastic parts near flammable areas. This bill leaves the design process open and includes technology similar to what GM has been using in recent years. We support S.B. 382.

Millimeters are a standard unit of measurement when discussing engine parts. Many of these parts are designed outside the United States. That is why the metric system is used. Because GM has been implementing fire suppression technology for the past several years, costs incurred by this bill would be nominal in regard to our vehicles.

**Nicole Rourke (Executive Director of Government Affairs, Clark County School District):**

The CCSD supports S.B. 382. The extended deadline for purchasing buses with these components allows school districts additional time to determine the best option.

**Ms. Anderson:**

The WCSD supports S.B. 382 because of its extended deadline, cost-effectiveness and implementation of safety components.

**Senator Ford:**

I would like to disclose that one of the witnesses works at my law firm.

SENATOR KIHUEN MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 382.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 382 and open the hearing on S.B. 392.

**SENATE BILL 392:** Requires reporting of certain gifts and bequests relating to education. (BDR 34-147)

**Senator Tick Segerblom (Senatorial District No. 3):**

This bill relates to the individual or organizational donation of money to school districts that comes with spending restrictions. Senate Bill 392 addresses a concern about donated funds having requirements for hiring specific individuals or companies to perform specific scopes of work that fall outside of the regulatory scope of the school board of trustees or other governing authority. Recently in the CCSD, concerns were expressed when the spouse of a high-level district administrator was hired by the CCSD's Public Education Foundation outside of normal district procedures. It was felt this was done to avoid district procedures regarding nepotism. There was no transparency to this process. We would like to prohibit actions like this from happening in the future. Highlights of the bill are in my presentation ([Exhibit Q](#)).

**Senator Cegavske:**

Will S.B. 392 prevent donors from anonymously leaving money to a school district in a will or from donating in other ways?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Contributions will still be allowed. What will not be allowed is earmarking contributions for the hiring of a specific person or organization to perform a specific task.

**Mr. Stevens:**

The bill discusses transparency. It provides guidelines for school districts and the State Board of Education to follow when they receive a gift. The NSEA has proposed amendments to this bill ([Exhibit R](#)). The first amendment in section 1, subsection 4, proposes only gifts exceeding \$100,000 which are received from an individual or group over a 12-month period must be reported. Section 2, subsection 2, provides guidelines for donations accepted by a district or the State Board.

Transparency is crucial for acceptance of funds. Donations from private, nonprofit and for-profit organizations are important to our school systems. We do not want to prevent these donations. This bill creates a more open and accountable process. Taxpayers have a right to know where their tax money is going. They should have a right to know where donated funds are being spent as well.

Stipulations sometimes come with donated funds. This bill and the proposed amendment allow for this. If a donor wants to provide a gift to implement a library reading program, he or she should be allowed to do so. More private money is coming into schools by way of grants, and this can influence policy decisions. This is why we brought this bill forward. We do not want to burden school districts. Donations below \$100,000 do not need to be reported. Gifts above this level could influence the policy decisions of a district. Because these are donations, there is now no accountability attached to their use. We feel there should be.

**Senator Cegavske:**

I have a concern about the reporting amount. Placing a limit on the amount that can be anonymously donated without being reported could limit someone who wishes to remain anonymous. Could this bill be worded so it addresses your

specific concern relating to hiring practices? I do not want to limit someone who wants to give a large gift, but also wants to remain anonymous. That is what your proposed amendment does.

**Mr. Stevens:**

We feel a donation of \$100,000 or more could greatly influence policy decisions and that a name should be attached to a donation this large. Taxpayers should know who donated money and why it was donated. A person's desire for anonymity does not supersede the taxpayers' right to understand the impact a donation might have on the decisions a school district is making based on that donation.

**Senator Cegavske:**

There is no minimum dollar amount listed for reporting in S.B. 392. Is this idea important to you, Senator Segerblom?

**Senator Segerblom:**

We want to eliminate small donations from the reporting requirement. The original bill required reporting all donations. The proposed amendment raises the reporting requirement to only those donations above \$100,000 total.

**Senator Cegavske:**

In the CCSD example, was the donor anonymous?

**Senator Segerblom:**

The CCSD's nonprofit foundation hired the wife of the high-level administrator using grant funds. The foundation then contracted with the CCSD for her to perform services throughout the district. The CCSD contracted with the foundation, not directly with the wife, which avoided the nepotism rules of the CCSD.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Was the donation given to foundation specifically to hire this person? I must disclose I am on the board of this foundation.

**Senator Segerblom:**

I do not know if that was stipulated in the donation.



**Senator Gustavson:**

If someone wants to donate money for a specific cause and wishes to remain anonymous, I do not want to restrict it. I understand not wanting to allow funds to be donated to hire a specific person for a specific task, but I do not want to prohibit someone from making a large donation that is earmarked for something other than a salary.

**Senator Segerblom:**

We are trying to avoid loopholes.

**Ruben Murillo Jr. (Nevada State Education Association):**

I support this bill. Districts are depending more and more on grants. These often have restrictions placed on them for use of the funding. In CCSD, this has dictated who has been hired or how a program will be run. This may not fit the needs of the school or the community. Programs may be implemented that are not a philosophical match for schools. Grant funds to hire specific consultants tend to restrict the supervision of the consultant to the superintendent. These consultants have sometimes behaved outside the traditional scope of a consultant. In our original Race to the Top application, specific vendors were mentioned. When we met with the district to refine this application, these vendors were removed, allowing others to have the opportunity to participate with the district. For this reason, we support this bill.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Is this bill only for school districts?

**Senator Segerblom:**

It also applies to the State Board of Education.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Are you aware of concerns about State Board practices in this area? I am concerned that federal grants can be rejected if a district does not have matching funds or if the program is not approved. I am unaware of examples where districts have been forced to implement programs that were not wanted. Usually, programs are funded for a limited time and funds cease, causing the program to end. Do you have an example where a district was forced to implement a program it did not want to implement?

**Mr. Murillo:**

I am not saying the district was forced to accept a grant. One example is a \$2 million grant for early childhood students. It stipulated who would be hired, how the programs would run and how many programs would be opened. We would like the flexibility to determine how to apply grant funds such as these.

**Senator Cegavske:**

I think you are going too far with this proposed amendment. You want to address hiring specific people. I do not want this to be too broad and lose donors. Can the language of this bill be made more specific?

**Mr. Stevens:**

We would like to be as specific in this legislation as possible. We do not want school districts or the State Board to refuse gifts that could benefit them.

**Asher Killian (Counsel):**

It would be possible to include that sort of language. We would need to be specific about how we want to describe what is being excluded from a general carve-out.

**Ms. Rourke:**

The CCSD supports transparency, but is opposed to the NSEA proposed amendment to this bill because it limits the control of local school boards of trustees to accept gifts for specific needs and programs. The CCSD has a school-community partnership office that works with community organizations and businesses that donate funding, goods and services to at-risk schools. The limitations established in the proposed amendment would prevent the board of school trustees from accepting many of these donations, including \$25,000 to support the arts from the Electric Daisy Carnival; \$25,000 from Siegfried and Roy to support student activities; \$25,000 from IBM to support science, technology, engineering and math programs; and \$20,000 from Wells Fargo Bank to support a specific program called "Do the Right Thing," to name a few. All of these donations were earmarked for specific programs or purposes. This legislation is far-reaching and would have detrimental impact on numerous programs that fill specific needs for students. This is why we oppose the proposed amendment to S.B. 392. In the original bill, there is a provision for reporting. In CCSD, we have a policy that requires reporting district gifts and bequests to our board of trustees.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Did you report the donations used by the CCSD nonprofit foundation to hire the administrator's spouse? Was this part of public record?

**Ms. Rourke:**

Any gifts that are received by the district are reported. I believe those funds were given to the foundation, not the school district.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Was the consultant hired and paid by the school district? Was this public knowledge?

**Ms. Rourke:**

She was hired by the foundation. She worked as a consultant in the school district and was paid by the foundation.

**Ms. Anderson:**

The WCSD is opposed to this bill for the same reasons as the CCSD. We have recently set up the Washoe K-12 Education Foundation to raise money for the implementation of our strategic plan. It is difficult to imagine this group would raise money for an activity or need that would not be a priority of our board of trustees.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Does the WCSD approve of S.B. 392 without the proposed amendments? Do you disclose donations? Do you have anonymous benefactors?

**Ms. Anderson:**

The WCSD opposes the original bill as well as the amended bill. We disclose donations and have anonymous benefactors.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Do donors tell you where donations must be used?

**Ms. Anderson:**

I am not aware of any circumstances in which this has occurred.

**Ms. Rourke:**

The CCSD complies with the bill as written. We report gifts and donations over \$1,000. We agree there should be a minimum amount for reporting.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Do you have donors who wish to remain anonymous? Do you know of donations that have specific restrictions attached to them?

**Ms. Rourke:**

I am not aware of specific situations where a donor has requested anonymity. The donations previously discussed had requirements for use attached to them.

**Senator Cegavske:**

When a request is made to use a donation for a specific purpose, is the donor anonymous?

**Ms. Rourke:**

No, we have the donor's name.

**Dr. Merrill:**

The Nevada Association of School Boards does not want to discourage gifts for specific purposes. Mining companies in some of our rural districts have been generous in contributing to the schools. Donations are typically made for specific purposes based on discussions with superintendents and school boards of trustees. Examples of such gifts would be funding for replacing all of the library books used on a regular basis or replacing all of the computers in the computer lab. Discussion precedes the donation, which is then given for a specific purpose. Most school boards of trustees have these discussions with donors of large amounts of money or materials. We do not want to discourage these opportunities to provide improved resources for students or teachers.

**Stephen Augspurger (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):**

This topic needs to be explored. This bill needs adjustment. Districts hire consultants. It is important these consultants operate within the federal guidelines for consultants, not as district employees. This bill does not specifically address the problem of consultants. We do not want to create additional problems in the process of attempting to solve this problem.

**Senator Segerblom:**

The donations mentioned by Ms. Rourke would not be impacted by this legislation because they are below the \$100,000 reporting threshold given in the bill. It may be correct that more attention should be paid to the issue of consultants working as employees. This bill addresses that issue somewhat. We do not want to discourage donors from donating funds to build buildings, but we do not want gifts to dictate policy. We are open to improving the language of S.B. 392.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 392. I will open the work session with S.B. 320.

**SENATE BILL 320:** Revises provisions governing medical care in schools.  
(BDR 34-831)

**Pepper Sturm (Policy Analyst):**

I have a work session document regarding Senate Bill 320 ([Exhibit S](#)). In [Exhibit S](#), Senator Joseph P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12, and Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senatorial District No. 2, proposed amendments to this bill. Section 8, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of the bill would replace the word "attending" with "enrolling in." Section 9, subsection 9 proposes to require school nurses, not the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop the diabetes training program for "unlicensed assistive personnel" (UAP) in accordance with nationally recognized best practice standards of diabetes care. The term UAP would replace "diabetes care aide" throughout the bill. The term "diabetes management plan" would replace the term "individualized health plan" throughout the bill. The bill also proposes to shift the authority from the school principal to the school nurse. This includes providing notice to seek volunteers to be UAPs, processing requests to become UAPs and receiving parental authorization required by the bill. Sections 19 through 23 and 25 through 32 of S.B. 320 make parallel changes to apply these amendments to sections of the bill concerning private schools. Section 34 would require the State Board of Nursing to revise the Nurse Practice Act of the NAC as needed to comply with provisions of the bill.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Does the proposed amendment remove the fiscal note?

Senate Committee on Education  
April 10, 2013  
Page 22

**Senator Joseph P. Hardy (Senatorial District No. 12):**

Every school has this requirement now; it is not new. There will be costs incurred, but this bill provides the impetus for schools to do something. We are required by federal guidelines to provide these services.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 320 WITH AMENDMENTS 1 THROUGH 7 AS PROPOSED BY SENATORS DENIS AND HARDY.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

We will go to S.B. 504.

**SENATE BILL 504**: Enacts provisions providing English Language Learning for Our Students. (BDR 34-1099)

**Mr. Sturm:**

This bill provides a comprehensive program targeting the needs of English language learners (ELLs). I will review my work session document ([Exhibit T](#)). Senator Denis has submitted a mock-up of Proposed Amendment 8103 in [Exhibit T](#).

SENATOR KIHUEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 504 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 8103 AND REREFER TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Senator Cegavske:**

We do not have enough teachers holding Teachers of English as a Second Language (TESL) endorsements to meet the requirements of this legislation. I am concerned we will end up with substitute teachers in classrooms where we should have qualified teachers. I support sending this bill to the Senate

Committee on Finance. I would like to see this legislation implemented in several schools as a study. I do not think we can attain full implementation of this bill.

**Senator Moises (Mo) Denis (Senatorial District No. 2):**

I included funding for TESL training in this bill to address the issue of needing teachers qualified to work with ELL students. Teachers who receive education degrees from Nevada colleges and universities to teach kindergarten through Grade 12 have TESL certification. This bill provides funding for teachers at highly impacted school sites to obtain this certification. The bill also provides funds to lower class size at highly impacted schools. This will create an incentive for teachers to teach at these schools. This bill includes all of the ideas we would like to implement to improve instruction for ELL students. It reduces class size, provides funding to ensure teachers are highly qualified, provides resources to teachers and provides specialized training to educators.

**Senator Ford:**

I support S.B. 504; it is necessary. It should be funded at an appropriate level.

**Senator Gustavson:**

We do not have enough qualified teachers. It is poor public policy to pass a law requiring action we know cannot be funded or staffed. I cannot support this bill.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

There are thousands of children in our schools who would benefit from additional instruction delivered by highly qualified teachers having TESL training. We need to take a big step to address the needs of these children. That is what this bill does. I support S.B. 504.

**Senator Kihuen:**

This bill provides solutions from our wish list of strategies to meet the needs of ELLs. I encourage the Senate Committee on Finance to give it the attention it deserves. Making an investment in our ELL students is making an investment in our State. I support this bill.

**Senator Cegavske:**

I support sending this bill to the Senate Committee on Finance. I reserve my right to support the bill after it is processed by that Committee. I am concerned about the number of teachers needed to implement this legislation fully. We do not have enough qualified teachers now; many classrooms are being taught by

substitute teachers. Students are being shortchanged in all areas by not having qualified teachers.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS CEGAVSKE AND GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

We will move to S.B. 164.

**SENATE BILL 164**: Revises provisions governing safe and respectful learning environments in public schools. (BDR 34-454)

**Mr. Sturm:**

This bill requires the SBE and the board of trustees of each school district to include certain information about bullying incidents in their annual accountability reports, including incidents of bullying, cyber-bullying and harassment or intimidation. I have submitted my work session document ([Exhibit U](#)).

Several amendments were proposed to this bill. The CCSD proposed amending NRS 388.122 to add to the definition of bullying. The proposed language would establish that a bullying action occurs over time and that it exploits an imbalance of power between students.

The Nevada Association of School Boards proposed three amendments. The first would amend section 3 of S.B. 164 to allow each district board of trustees to specify the method of delivering the objectives of the "Week of Respect." In section 6, subsection 2, the NASB proposes extending the time line for training new members of a school board of trustees from 90 days to 6 months. In section 7, it proposes changing the title "principal" to "school-based administrator" and requiring this person to participate in the mandatory training specified in this section once every 3 years as opposed to annually. Section 7 additionally proposes charter school personnel be included in this training and in the provisions of section 3 of the bill.

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) proposed an amendment to change the wording in section 8. This was designed to protect the gender identification of a student who may not have discussed this issue with his or her parents.



Senate Committee on Education  
April 10, 2013  
Page 25

**Senator David R. Parks (Senatorial District No. 7):**

The language change requested by the CCSD would amend NRS 388.122. Section 3, on page 22 of the bill, would contain the first amendment proposed by the NASB. This would allow local districts to determine the best way to provide anti-bullying instruction. Proposals by the NASB in sections 6 and 7 would modify the language regarding site administrators and training schedules. The proposed amendment from the ACLU was not included in the revised bill. The CCSD and NASB consider the wording on page 25 of the bill appropriate without amendment.

**Senator Gustavson:**

The amendment from the ACLU is not included in the amended bill. Is that correct?

**Senator Parks:**

Yes, that is correct. If this section requires further revision, it can be done when the bill goes to the Assembly.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 164 WITH THE AMENDMENTS FROM THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

We will move to S.B. 182.

**SENATE BILL 182**: Expands full-day kindergarten in public schools. (BDR 34-138)

**Mr. Sturm:**

Senate Bill 182 revises the age of compulsory attendance for public schools, and requires the establishment of full-day kindergarten in each public elementary school in Nevada school districts. I will read from my work session document ([Exhibit V](#)). Senator Debbie Smith submitted a proposed amendment

to this bill allowing parents the option to elect not to send a child to kindergarten. Frank D. Schnorbus proposed an amendment from the Nevada Homeschool Network to provide an exception to the compulsory age of school attendance of 5 years of age. This proposal would allow a parent to notify the local school district that he or she does not believe a child is mentally, physically or emotionally prepared to attend school. The parent would then be able to delay the child's school attendance until age 7.

**Senator Debbie Smith (Senatorial District No. 13):**

When this bill was originally presented, numerous testifiers expressed concern there was no waiver process included for parents who felt their children were not ready to attend kindergarten at the age of 5. Proposed Amendment 8150 provides this process. The majority of 5-year-old children in Nevada already attend kindergarten. This waiver process allows parents of children who are not ready for instruction the opportunity to wait before sending their children to school. It keeps the process in place we have for assessing the readiness of students who have not attended kindergarten before they are placed in first grade.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

It is critical for young children to receive the readiness experiences they need to be prepared for first grade. Retaining the assessment component of this legislation is important to this process.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 182 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 8150 AND REREFER TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Senator Cegavske:**

I will vote no on this bill because I am concerned about the lack of teachers we have in our State. We do not have enough qualified early childhood teachers. I cannot support placing substitute teachers in our classrooms to meet the requirements of this legislation. I appreciate the amendment allowing parents to opt out of the mandatory attendance requirement.

**Senator Kihuen:**

This will improve education in Nevada. I support S.B. 182.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

As a retired first grade teacher, I support this bill. It is critical to take big steps forward to provide appropriate education for our children. Children are ready for school by age 5. We need to have the resources and teachers in place to provide programs for them.

**Senator Gustavson:**

I will not support this bill for the same reasons as Senator Cegavske has mentioned.

**Senator Ford:**

We must do this, and we must do it in conjunction with properly funding our schools. If we pay our teachers more, it will be easier to recruit highly qualified teachers.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS CEGAVSKE AND GUSTAVSON  
VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

We will move to S.B. 407.

**SENATE BILL 407**: Revises provisions governing the statewide performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators. (BDR 34-143)

**Mr. Sturm:**

Senate Bill 407 revises the timetable for implementation of the statewide performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators in order to delay implementation of the evaluation system and the associated performance pay program for an additional year. I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit W](#)).

Senator Debbie Smith proposed five conceptual amendments. I will review these using the summary in [Exhibit W](#).

**Senator Cegavske:**

What is the source of the funding that is referenced in Senator Smith's proposed amendment 4?

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

The NDE will request proposals from vendors to perform the validation of the educator evaluation system. This vendor will create a report for the Interim Finance Committee, which will make the determination as to whether this system is ready for full implementation.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Do we now have a system to evaluate educators?

**Ms. Fitzpatrick:**

This is a new program for teachers and administrators. These funds will ensure they have been trained and fully understand how to implement this new system of evaluation. The fifth amendment proposed by Senator Smith would provide an appropriation to the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDPs) to enhance the funds they receive to provide training on this system. In the second year of the biennium, up to 25 percent of this appropriation could be held back to cover expenses if an additional year is required for validation. This process was placed with the Interim Finance Committee because the Committee meets during the interim and could therefore make the decision to delay implementation of the evaluation system for a year.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Are there concerns about the evaluation systems we are now using?

**Ms. Fitzpatrick:**

The evaluation systems we are currently using do not provide the information we need. The data do not yield specific enough information to drive the professional development required to improve instruction. They also are not useful in making human capital decisions such as tenure and dismissal. Nevada, like other states, has a disproportionate number of educators who have been rated very effective or what was previously called satisfactory. Like other states, our current evaluation system is ineffective and requires improvement. Our concern is implementing the change to a new system too quickly. We do not want to make changes that negatively impact districts or educators.

**Mr. Sturm:**

Craig Stevens, representing the Nevada State Education Association, proposed an amendment to include a new subsection, possibly in section 17. This is

related to peer assistance and states that a pilot program employing peer assistance and review teams be established at certain schools. The peer review team would consist of teachers certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, or those classified as highly effective. The purpose of the peer assistance program would be to assist all teachers in meeting the standards of effective teaching. The peer review process would be evaluated annually. This proposed amendment also revises provisions of the bill to allow educators access to peer review, if available, at their school sites.

Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASA) proposed an amendment related to educator assignment. This contains a provision stating that a teacher or administrator may be assigned to a particular school only with the consent of the hiring administrator after a review of the educator's demonstrated effectiveness and qualifications pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS. Additionally, the proposal provides for transfers to other vacancies for certain categories of educators who cannot secure a mutual consent assignment.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Is there a fiscal note attached to this bill? Will peer review activities take teachers out of the classroom?

**Craig M. Stevens (Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association):**

We are attempting to obtain grant funding to cover the expenses of the peer evaluator process.

**Ms. Fitzpatrick:**

The amendment proposed by the NSEA is mirrored by the third amendment proposed by Senator Smith that allows for peer review. The Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) has expressed a concern about administrators having enough time to perform the evaluations required by the new system. There may be circumstances when an evaluator does not have a deep understanding of a subject area, making it difficult for him or her to perform an appropriate evaluation. Science and mathematics teachers may be particularly impacted, and the TLC would like to develop a cadre of peer reviewers to assist in these areas. The NSEA and the NDE have partnered with the National Board Certified Teachers program to submit a Supporting Effective Educator Development grant to the U.S. Department of Education. This would provide funding to increase the

number of nationally certified teachers in our State. It would help build capacity for the evaluation system while also improving instruction for our students. We need to consider the impact of these teachers being removed from their classrooms. The ideal would be to do these evaluations during break times and intersessions for the evaluators when their absences would have a minimal impact on students. Training for this evaluation program is part of the enhancement to the RPDP budget. There is no additional expense beyond what has been committed in the Executive Budget.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

Representatives from WCSD and CCSD indicate they approve this bill.

**Stephen Augspurger (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):**

The amendment proposed by the CCASA addresses current practice in districts across the State related to reassigning teachers. We feel a principal should have some say in who is moved into his or her school. In our proposal, if a teacher is rated effective or highly effective, the district may place that teacher in any school, and the principal must accept the placement. If the teacher is not rated at one of those levels, the principal would have the right to refuse the placement, and the district would find other duties for the teacher.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 407 WITH THE AMENDMENTS FROM THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE NEVADA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND REREFER TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

We will move to S.B. 446.

**SENATE BILL 446**: Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-1077)

**Mr. Sturm:**

This bill relates to reciprocity agreements for certain postsecondary institutions. I will read from the S.B. 446 work session document ([Exhibit X](#)).

SENATOR CEGAVSKE MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 446.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Woodhouse:**

We will conclude with S.B. 269.

[SENATE BILL 269](#): Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-892)

**Mr. Sturm:**

Senate Bill 269 requires students to attend school and maintain their grades in order to obtain or keep a driver's license, tying school performance to the privilege to drive. I will read from my work session document ([Exhibit Y](#)).

Eight amendments were proposed to this bill. These are summarized on pages 1 and 2 of [Exhibit Y](#). Senator Ford proposed amendment 1, removing the academic requirements from the legislation throughout the bill. The attendance requirement for maintaining or obtaining a driver's license would remain in the bill. Ms. Haldeman of CCSD proposed amendment 2, which changes the effective date of the legislation to January 1, 2015. Dr. Merrill proposed amendment 3 and 4. Amendment 3 would delete sections that allow parents to pursue judicial review of decisions in district court. Amendment 4 would change the effective date to January 1, 2014. This conflicts with the January 1, 2015, date proposed by Ms. Haldeman.

**Senator Cegavske:**

Does the sponsor of the bill have a preferred starting date?

**Senator Ford:**

I would prefer the January 1, 2015, starting date.

**Mr. Sturm:**

Four additional amendments were proposed by Stephen Augspurger of CCASA. I will read these to the Committee.

**Senator Cegavske:**

I am concerned about the impact of this legislation on students who have poor grades because they have ineffective teachers.

**Senator Ford:**

The academic requirements for this bill are removed by my proposed amendment. School attendance would still be required.

**Chair Woodhouse:**

Since you have chosen an effective date, we have resolved proposed amendments 2 and 4 on [Exhibit Y](#). How do you feel about proposed amendment 3 and the amendments proposed by the CCASA?

**Senator Ford:**

The only amendment I respectfully decline is amendment 7. I accept the other amendments, with a starting date of January 1, 2015.

SENATOR KIHUEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 269 WITH ALL AMENDMENTS EXCEPT AMENDMENT 7 AND  
JANUARY 1, 2015, AS THE EFFECTIVE DATE.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*



Senate Committee on Education  
April 10, 2013  
Page 33

**Chair Woodhouse:**

Seeing no further business, I adjourn the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Diana Jones,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

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

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>		<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	7		Attendance Roster
S.B. 305	C	2	Grant Gabriel	Testimony
S.B. 305	D	2	Grant Gabriel	S.B. 305 Walk-through
S.B. 305	E	2	Grant Gabriel	Proposed Amendment 7893
S.B. 305	F	1	Ray Bacon	Letter of Support
S.B. 328	G	5	Senator James A. Settelmeyer	S.B. 328 Walk-through
S.B. 328	H	5	Senator James A. Settelmeyer	Proposed Amendment 8073
S.B. 328	I	1	Peter D. Krueger	Testimony
S.B. 328	J	3	Heather Dye	Section Summary
S.B. 328	K	2	John Kohntopp	Testimony
S.B. 328	L	1	Ray Bacon	Letter of Support
S.B. 328	M	1	Craig Statucki	Testimony
S.B. 328	N	8	Mike Raponi	Testimony
S.B. 328	O	5	Mike Raponi	CTE Enrollment Background and Funding History
S.B. 382	P	1	Senator David R. Parks	Testimony
S.B. 392	Q	11	Senator Tick Segerblom	Presentation
S.B. 392	R	3	Craig Stevens	NSEA Proposed Amendment
S.B. 320	S	32	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document with Amendment
S.B. 504	T	19	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendment 8103 and Fiscal Notes
S.B. 164	U	20	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendments

S.B. 182	V	15	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendment 8150 and a Proposed Amendment
S.B. 407	W	14	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendments
S.B. 446	X	2	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 269	Y	9	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendments