

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
May 21, 2015**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Melissa Woodbury at 2:48 p.m. on Thursday, May 21, 2015, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Chair
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblyman Derek Armstrong
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblyman David M. Gardner
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Shelly M. Shelton
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Chris Edwards (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

Minutes ID: 1327



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst
Kristin Rossiter, Committee Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeannine M. Sherrick-Warner, M.B.A., Director, Western Interstate
Commission for Higher Education, State of Nevada
Laura Hale, Manager, Primary Care Office, Division of Public and
Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Sean Dodge, Psy.D., Douglas Counseling and Supportive Services, Rural
Community Health Services, Division of Public and Behavioral
Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Constance J. Brooks, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor, Government and
Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Theodore Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association
Michael Barton, Chief Student Achievement Officer, Clark County
School District
Michael Vannozzi, Director, Public Policy, Las Vegas Global Economic
Alliance
Danielle Brown, Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching and
Learning, College of Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Samantha Hager, Lead Consulting Teacher, Clark County School District
Peer Assistance and Review
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of
School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Chelli Smith, representing Southern Nevada Regional Professional
Development Program
Erik Smith, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County
School District
Seth Rau, Policy Director, Nevada Succeeds
John Eppolito, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada

Chair Woodbury:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have
two bills on our work session, and I am going to ask for a motion to reconsider
Senate Bill 463 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON MOVED TO RECONSIDER
SENATE BILL 463 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN EDWARDS AND
SHELTON WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Woodbury:

I will have Kristin Rossiter walk us through Senate Bill 463 (2nd Reprint).

[Senate Bill 463 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to education.
(BDR 34-411)

Kristin Rossiter, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 463 (2nd Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education and was heard in Committee on May 4, 2015. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).] The amendment was considered at a behind-the-bar meeting for a work session. We are discussing the proposed amendments today as identified in the mock-up No. 7218 as prepared by the Legal Division to reflect various amendments and the discussion held at the Committee meeting.

Chair Woodbury:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 463 (R2).

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 463 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

As this is the first time I am reading through the amendment, I would like to understand the intent. In the work session summary document, last paragraph, it states, "Teachers and other licensed personnel are required to annually complete professional development in the use of online school services and the security of student data." I know we do review the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), but I do not know if this is an additional layer that they have to be trained for as well. What does it mean about breaches of security or confidentiality of certain examinations?

Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel:

Section 8 of the bill addresses the professional development piece. Subsection 2 requires each teacher and licensed educational personnel to complete professional development in the areas that you described. That may be already provided. If it is already provided it is not a new requirement. In the event that it is not currently being provided, it would be a new requirement.

With regard to the second piece, existing law authorizes but does not require a teacher to be suspended or disciplined for a breach of the confidentiality of an examination. This change requires that discipline in the event that the breach is willful.

Chair Woodbury:

Did you ask what a breach would be?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

What types of examinations will this address?

Karly O'Krent:

This would address the criterion-referenced examinations in grades three through eight. It would also address the end-of-course examinations and the college and career readiness examination.

Chair Woodbury:

My understanding on the professional development is that you would not have to go out and pay for a class, but it could be provided on your staff development days or through the school district. Is there any further discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Gardner:

Section 3, subsection 2(c), says, "A school service for which a school service provider has: (1) Been designated by a school district, the sponsor of a charter school, the governing body of a university school for profoundly gifted pupils or the Department as a school official pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974." Do you know in what circumstances some school service providers would be allowed to be considered a school official under FERPA?

Karly O'Krent:

The FERPA Act provides certain exemptions from the requirements that personally identifiable information not be shared in the event that it is for academic purposes. For example, an entity that might be considered a school official would be a course portal in which a student was providing their assignments or things of that nature—perhaps an outside entity that was managing the grades of a student.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I will support the measure with the amendment, but I am going to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor because I still do not know how all of the moving pieces would work together.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I am also going to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Ditto.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

Ditto.

Assemblyman Flores:

Ditto.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there any further discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN EDWARDS AND
SHELTON WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

[Senate Bill 432 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Provides for the distribution of money to certain public schools designated as Victory schools. (BDR S-1187)

Kristin Rossiter, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 432 (2nd Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Finance and was heard in Committee on May 19, 2015. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).] There is a mock-up of a proposed amendment. There is no fiscal note for this bill.

Chair Woodbury:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 432 (R2).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 432 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Munford:

The concept is good, and it might help to solve some problems, particularly in my district. However, I spoke with the sponsor of a bill on deconsolidation, Assemblyman Gardner, so I am going to vote yes but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor after I discuss some things in more detail with Assemblyman Gardner.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I want to go on record to say how glad I am that we have this bill in front of us. It is truly a historic day for Nevada education. I am very proud to support this measure.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I am in support of this policy, but I am not sure I am in agreement on the funding.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I want to acknowledge all of the hard work that many community members have put forth into the Victory schools. I would like to recognize my colleague, Assemblywoman Neal, for perfecting much of the language. It is truly a unique piece of policy that will address students in dire need and allows the flexibility to tailor the best interventions for those students. I am in full support of anything we can do to help along the way.

Assemblywoman Dooling:

I am in full support of Senate Bill 432 (2nd Reprint); however, I am struggling with the funding and will work through that.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHELTON VOTED
NO. ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Woodbury:

Assemblywoman Diaz will take the floor statement. I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 76 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 76 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (BDR 34-320)

Jeannine M. Sherrick-Warner, M.B.A., Director, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, State of Nevada:

I am happy to be here with Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) collaborators from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Ms. Laura Hale and Dr. Sean Dodge.

Written testimony has been provided to the Committee ([Exhibit E](#)), and I am happy to address any questions as we go. I would like to begin by briefly sharing information with you about WICHE and then I will summarize the section of the proposed changes found in the bill.

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) was established in 1953 and currently consists of 16 western states and territories under the Western Regional Education Compact. Nevada joined that Compact in 1959. The regional WICHE office out of Colorado is a congressionally chartered organization governed by three gubernatorially appointed commissioners from each state to facilitate resource sharing among higher education systems.

The Nevada WICHE is an independent commission that carries out the goals, objectives, and programs of the Compact and shares resources with higher education institutions and safety net providers to meet the educational and health care needs of our state.

The Nevada WICHE office offers two financial aid programs. The first is a Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP), and that program provides access to schools that are often not found in a home state. For example, we do not have a veterinary medicine school in our state, so this program allows students to access programs out of state for resident tuition. The PSEP gives access to programs that may otherwise not be available and also provides the financial aid to attend those schools. In return, students are required to come back to the state and provide the professional services in those fields.

The second program that the office administers is the state-specific Health Care Access Program (HCAP). The HCAP is very similar to the PSEP in that we provide financial aid for students, and they are required to work in the state in

their professional fields. However, these individuals can attend school anywhere they choose, as long as it is in the field that we are supporting that is high need, and more importantly, they have to provide service with underserved populations.

Both of these programs provide educational and health care assistance, as well as assist the state in recruitment and retention of a high-need health care workforce. The program's benefits for students are to gain access to schools, to expand the number for schools options to meet, and to get financial assistance. For the state, we avoid costly or unnecessary duplication of facilities, guarantee an educated workforce, and provide health services for the people, areas, and in fields in greatest need. Economic impacts are contributed by WICHE's professionals by opening up businesses and offices, hiring employees, buying equipment, and helping to meet the health care needs of Nevadans for a stronger workforce.

In summary, WICHE's impacts to the state are educational development, workforce development, health care needs, and economic development.

Senate Bill 76 (1st Reprint) has been submitted for your consideration. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 397 has not been updated comprehensively since approximately 1997. Since then, modifications to Nevada WICHE's programs have been made in response to the shifting educational and health care needs of Nevadans. Therefore, Nevada WICHE is requesting the following changes to NRS Chapter 397 to update statutes for increased efficiencies and effectiveness of its programs.

In sections 1 and 2, it updates states and territories that have joined the Compact after 1969. Section 3 provides general regulatory language authorizing the Commission to adopt regulations. Existing regulations are located in *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) Chapter 397, but language is not currently in statute, so this section proposes to add that language. Section 3 also authorizes the Nevada WICHE Commission, in an open meeting, to delegate some responsibilities already identified in statutes to the staff. Any binding agreements must be approved by the Commission. This prevents potential delays in administering programs for greater efficiencies.

Sections 4 and 6 through 18, provide changes to update general program language for increased clarity and comprehension. It replaces the term "student" with "participant," "applicant," or "recipient" because WICHE does work not only with students but also with professionals. This provides broader

language to address all individuals accessing the program. It also adds the three Nevada State Commissioners and the Nevada Office of WICHE language. As the Nevada office administers the state HCAP program, this clarifies responsibilities of the Nevada Commissioners, and regional commissions.

It replaces the name of the Nevada WICHE program's account from the "Fund for Student Loans" to its current name, "Loan and Stipend Fund," which has been the name of the program's account for a long time. This simply updates the name of the account.

In section 5, subsection 2, Nevada is requesting to formally include a stipend as a category of funding for the HCAP program. We are excited to tell you that in fiscal year 2016-2017 we have the opportunity and we are proposing a mental health expansion project. This project will actually double the number of American Psychological Association (APA) accredited psychology internships in our state and assist nurses in obtaining credentials for psychiatric nursing throughout Nevada in the next biennium.

Currently, NRS 397.060 identifies HCAP funding as a support fee and it requires all applicants be Nevada residents. Federally, the APA does not allow psychology interns to be selected based on anything other than their qualifications as a psychology intern. That means that we cannot ask them about their residency status. Further, internship funding falls under the category of stipend, and financial repayment for their internship is not allowed. This language is necessary for the implementation of the proposed mental health pilot project. This will make the language consistent with the federal guidelines and allow WICHE to broaden its HCAP program services by including a stipend program for the mental health expansion in our state.

Section 7 expands the definition of the services provided to the underserved to meet the HCAP program's intent. Specifically, it broadens the language for qualifying geographic areas to a health professional shortage area, a medically underserved area, and it also includes populations of people. Our practitioners can see populations that are underserved and not just a specific geographic area. This section will better help identify qualifying services to the underserved requirement.

Section 7 also makes service time required by participants more equitable. Currently, if WICHE provides money to a participant under the HCAP they are required to serve two years. This proposed legislation will eliminate that mandatory two-year service requirement and change it to a year of funding for a year of service with a maximum of two years for everyone in the program.

If an individual receives one year of funding, and another individual receives two years of funding, currently both are required to provide two years of service. This will change it to one year for one year and make it more equitable.

This section also clarifies that if the service is not provided, WICHE will convert the full amount to a loan to be repaid and that money will go to a student or an individual who will provide that service to the state.

Section 8 transfers existing language from its location in NRS 397.050 to NRS 397.062. There has been no change to the language, just the location of the statute.

Section 17 expands the definition of "rural" in NRS 397.0685 to encompass high-need, medically underserved areas and/or populations because we would like to make this section consistent with other areas in the statutes that qualify as underserved.

I sincerely appreciate the Committee's consideration of the proposed legislation and modifications to NRS Chapter 397.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

What does it mean, "acting jointly"? Does that mean all three Nevada State Commissioners have to agree? Or does that mean by taking a vote? Secondly, why do you need regulatory authority? Is there a problem right now that you need regulatory authority to fix or is it just being generally put in?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

It is being generally put in. As far as acting jointly, it does mean that we need a quorum among the Commission. The Commission as a whole needs to come together and make the decisions.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Does that mean they have to take a vote, or does it mean it has to be unanimous?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

They need to take a vote. The open Meeting Law requires a majority vote.

Assemblywoman Swank:

In section 7, subsection 3, we were talking about changing it to say that for one year of support, there is one year of service, correct?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

That is correct for up to two years.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Often in programs like this you have attrition. If we provide support for a student and they do not finish one year, then we have given them the money. How do we recoup that money that we have spent on that student who did not finish one year?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

There is a statutory requirement that they pay back the funds.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Can you give us other examples besides the lack of a veterinary school where our students go to other states? Approximately how many do we serve?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

The number that we serve depends upon the field. For example, veterinary medicine is legislatively approved in our budget. Often it is either four or five in that particular field. Optometry is another profession in which we do not have a school in our state. In some cases we have a private school in our state and not a public school so they can attend in state, but again, at reduced tuition. Generally, we fund approximately two to five individuals per year.

Assemblyman Stewart:

For the total program?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

For the combined total for the next biennium, we will be funding approximately 50 to 55 new students.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I did not realize that high school students were involved in this. How often are high school students involved in the program before they graduate?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

These particular programs are only at the graduate level. High school students do not participate in the PSEP or HCAP program.

Assemblyman Stewart:

It says in the bill 13 years old.

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

I am not familiar with that section.

Assemblyman Stewart:

This is just for students who have graduated from high school?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

That is correct; it is professional schools.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

I am happy to see this program move forward. I have been following these programs for several years, and I think they do incredible work for our students, enabling them to study in ways we otherwise would not be able to offer them. I am also very happy to hear about the mental health internships that we are doubling. I am glad to see that we are keeping the NRS up to date and happy that you brought the bill.

Assemblyman Gardner:

Can you give me an idea of how many are in the PSEP program and how many are in the HCAP at any given time?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

In the next biennium, for PSEP, we proposed 14 new and 31 continuing students in the first year, and 14 new and 34 students in the second year of the biennium. For the HCAP it will be 21 new and 10 continuing in the first year, and will drop to 4 new and 7 continuing in the second year. That is a total of 76 in the first year and 59 in the second year.

Assemblyman Gardner:

Is that a pretty standard number for us? Are we growing, or are we shrinking? I do not know a lot about WICHE and am just trying to get some information.

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

We are shifting a little bit. We were funding some programs under the HCAP, but we are taking that funding and now putting it into the mental health expansion program. The cost for one psychology internship is \$37,500, and we will be funding four of those. We had to do some shifting of slots—we call the individual people we fund, slots. To be able to fund those internships we transferred the money from some fields, such as nursing, into the internship.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Are the three commissioners that we have only involved in Nevada, or do they form a larger commission with the members of the other states to make overall policy?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

They do form the larger commission for the region. Three commissioners from each state oversee their own state, but they come together twice a year at the regional level to do policymaking in higher education for the region.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Who are our three commissioners?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

Currently, we have two and one vacancy. The first commissioner is with the Nevada System of Higher Education. He is the Vice Chancellor of Finance, Vic Redding. Our second commissioner is with Governor Sandoval's Office of Economic Development, Vance Farrow. The third position has been vacant for approximately one year.

Laura Hale, Manager, Primary Care Office, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

We are grateful to WICHE for working with us and helping us support expansion of our mental health programs.

Sean Dodge, Psy.D., Douglas Counseling and Supportive Services, Rural Community Health Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

Ditto.

Chair Woodbury:

I am going to call those who are in support of Senate Bill 76 (1st Reprint).

Constance J. Brooks, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education:

We would like to express our support for Senate Bill 76 (1st Reprint), as well as our support for WICHE. We appreciate the value they bring to our state and to our students in offering programs and other learning opportunities as Assemblywoman Joiner mentioned earlier.

Assemblyman Gardner:

To enable me to understand the process better, could you tell me how the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education work together?

Constance Brooks:

The best person to answer that question would be the director of WICHE, Jeannine M. Sherrick-Warner. It is a Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, so it is a compact with other western states within higher education. Like any other association you would have, maybe relative to youth sports, a group of states who work together for the betterment of higher education. That would be the genesis of it.

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

Ms. Brooks explained that very well unless you have any questions I can expand upon.

Assemblyman Stewart:

You said approximately 50 students from Nevada go to other states. Can you tell us roughly how many come into Nevada?

Jeannine Sherrick-Warner:

I do not have that information in front of me, but the regional office does produce those reports, and we are happy to send those to you.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 76 (1st reprint)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in either location who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 76 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify as neutral to S.B. 76 (R1)? [There was no one.] Would either of you like to make any closing comments? [They declined.] I am going to close the hearing on S.B. 76 (R1) and open the hearing on Senate Bill 332 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 332 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Clark County School District to carry out a program of peer assistance and review of teachers. (BDR S-763)

Theodore Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association:

We are here on behalf of the Clark County School District (CCSD) and Clark County Education Association (CCEA) to give you more information on the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR). You have already received some information during Teacher Appreciation Week. We gave you an apple and

a disc with a video with some basic information. We would like to thank the sponsors of this bill, Senators Roberson, Ford, and Hammond, who are not available to be here today.

Two years ago when I started in this position, one of the issues I noticed was the number of new teachers who were not necessarily getting support. There were teachers who were leaving the district throughout the first five years—particularly the first year. We had many concerns as an association and a district about retaining teachers. The conversation around PAR is about retention of particularly brand-new teachers in the CCSD. We found that the main reason these teachers were leaving is because they did not feel they were getting the support that they needed at the school to be successful.

We received a few grants from the National Education Association to collaborate with the school district and to find an issue that we could address together to solve. We found this issue around teacher retention and have been studying it for almost two years. We have traveled around the country and looked at approximately 15 systems, and we chose a system from Montgomery County, Maryland, which has 15 years' experience. Their system is about one-third smaller than CCSD. We found out that 15 years ago they collaborated with their association to come up with Peer Assistance and Review, which is actually a system that is over 30 years old that started in Ohio. The crux of the support is hiring consulting teachers who are master teachers who go into schools full time and support teachers based upon their instruction. The standards of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework are there to support and help the teacher throughout the whole year rather than just basic intermediate support. They have a constant consultant teacher. Today, I have the lead consulting teacher in the CCSD who will be speaking to you about that work.

One of the reasons we really paid attention to Montgomery County, Maryland, was that their system 15 years ago looked a lot like Clark County where they had a hard time attracting and retaining teachers; they have a highly diverse population; and they have, through this program and other development programs, turned their system around to be one of the best in Maryland. That constant support and vision of having districts, associations, and the teachers' union working together on meaningful reforms and improving the system was key to their work.

One of the grants we received after the first year was for us to look particularly at four different schools to see how we currently support teachers. We found out there is a range of how we support to where there are those who

are supporting teachers regularly in schools, all the way down to having little support. We wanted to make sure we were helping the new teaching professionals. Our system will only be looking at teachers new to the profession, and new to Nevada and to Clark County. I will have Dr. Barton tell you a little more about our first year rollout.

Michael Barton, Chief Student Achievement Officer, Clark County School District:

I would like to reiterate a couple of comments that were made by Mr. Small. Collaboration with all of this has been critical. Approximately 15 months ago we went on a fact-finding mission to Montgomery County, and we learned a great deal. We learned what we needed to do as a system to enhance and increase our teacher pipeline. We know that with all of this work, it has been a collective effort between the Clark County Education Association and the Clark County School District, but it has been more broad-based than that. We have studied work from Harvard University where, with any kind of new reform, you want to ensure coherence and a coherent model around the instructional core on how to improve student achievement. We have built that capacity, not just with the union and the district, but the University of Nevada, Las Vegas has been a partner with this. Businesses, Nevada Succeeds, and other organizations have been critical in ensuring that we study this issue and put something in place that does, again, focus on the instructional core in the Clark County School District.

The "why" of all of this is to ensure a great teacher in all classrooms. We know when we get to that point, we will have a perfect system. To get to that point we need to stop losing people. The reality is that there was a research study put out a few years ago by The New Teacher Project called "The Irreplaceables." "The Irreplaceables" provided some hard facts nationally, though it relates to our district and the state, that within three to five years teachers are leaving the profession. They are leaving for multiple reasons, but one of the main reasons is that they do not feel supported. "The Irreplaceables" report provided by The New Teacher Project gave simple little things like "tell a teacher that they are needed in the system." Peer Assistance and Review goes beyond that verbal commitment with a teacher. It is job-embedded professional development for new teachers in the classroom and ensuring that they have the best practice to put in place on the spot or the next day. This has created thought in our system that professional development models, being job-embedded, are going to give us the most return on our investment.

Again, the pilot for this year and going into next year is focused on our Turnaround Zone. We studied all of the zones that we have in the CCSD, realizing that the largest percentage of our new teachers are in the Turnaround Zone. If we can change the data where teachers leave after 3 to 5 years, but instead increase that number to 15 or 20 years—great teachers with great results staying with us—we know that is how systemically the pipeline will improve. We know there is much to do with the pipeline with the College of Education, at our universities, et cetera, but we know that with this program done well and the right way, our pipeline will get better.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I see we have a million dollars for each of the years of the next biennium. Roughly, how many teachers would each Peer Assistance and Review leader be responsible for?

Theodore Small:

Currently, our consulting teachers would have 10 to 15. Those would be the teachers they would be assigned to for the full year. The cost to the district is actually the salaries for these consulting teachers and the lead consulting teacher. We support a lot of the financial support around the professional development.

Assemblyman Stewart:

The CCSD would pay part of the costs?

Michael Barton:

There is a commitment from the district and we are currently, in this first year of implementation, focused on the training of those consulting teachers who work with the new teachers. There is that commitment that we have had in salaries. Of course, this would be helpful for expansion and to enhance the current program.

Assemblyman Stewart:

How many consultant teachers do we currently have?

Michael Barton:

With the pilot we have in place right now, we have one lead consultant teacher, and the lead consultant teacher is responsible for the professional development of the consultant teachers who are in the field working with the new teachers.

We have ten consultant teachers at this time. For next year, we have had other schools enter the Turnaround Zone in our district as a result of underperformance, so we would ask for an increase in consultant teachers. We would be at 16 total positions, 15 being consulting teachers, then still having that one lead consulting teacher position.

Assemblyman Stewart:

That would be roughly between 160 and 200 teachers you would be working with?

Michael Barton:

That would be roughly accurate.

Chair Woodbury:

I would ask for those in support of Senate Bill 332 (1st Reprint) to come up.

Michael Vannozzi, Director, Public Policy, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance:

Mr. Barton and Mr. Small talked about how businesses and other groups were intimately involved with the crafting of the Peer Assistance and Review program or are at least familiar with it. I come here on behalf of the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, which is the Regional Economic Development Authority, to say we are in full support. One of the reasons why is, of course, as you have heard, we need about 2,600 teachers in the CCSD, so anything that could help retain our best teachers and put them in positions to stay in their job longer than two or three years is a good thing for our county.

Danielle Brown, Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning, College of Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

We have been working collaboratively with the CCEA and the CCSD over the past 18 months to actually develop the PAR program, ensuring it was based around best practices related to professional development, new teacher induction and support, and those types of issues. Our role over the next one to three years will be to evaluate the program both formatively and summatively to provide data for them to make meaningful decisions and improve the program as they go, and then to provide meaningful data to the Legislature to say how the program did in the long term.

Samantha Hager, Lead Consulting Teacher, Peer Assistance and Review, Clark County School District:

We hope to add 2,600 new teachers this next year, and as we have talked about, the pipeline is shrinking. We really want to make sure we retain the teachers that we do hire.

I worked with a teacher in one of our high-needs schools, who after getting a four-year degree did not last four months before walking away. Every teacher that we lose has a story to tell about how they have not been supported—they have come to our state, our district, our schools, and not been supported. We want to make sure that story changes. We can talk about how we are attracting, retaining, and supporting great teachers in our district.

I have been a coach in some of our high-needs schools for the past three years and since stepping into this role, I have had a chance to visit principals at schools in the Turnaround Zones that we are talking about. Some of our elementary schools have 20 or more brand new teachers. I talked to one principal this week at a high school that will have upwards of 60 probationary teachers. We know that brand new teachers at those schools may be looking to someone with a year or two of experience to teach them. We need that support to come from outside the school but still from inside the district. The principals that I have spoken to are excited to have consulting teachers in their building. They have used coaches in many different ways. Coaches are used for professional development, committees, to gather resources, as testing coordinators, and other administrative duties. To have a consulting teacher who will come in and specifically work with instruction is exciting to principals.

To give you a little background on the process, the consulting teachers will work with a group of 10 to 15 new teachers, specifically to support their instruction. They will conduct formal and informal observations throughout the year and help the teacher to see his or her instruction through the lens of the Nevada Educational Performance Framework. They will also have constant dialogue with that teacher about how to improve instruction. The consulting teacher will be accountable for sharing reports with the PAR panel made up of a group of an equal number of teachers and administrators, each from their respective unions, who will then, at the end of the year, make a recommendation to the superintendent about what to do with that new teacher. Either that teacher may have shown some growth and will get another year of support, or maybe that teacher will not be renewed because they will show that they have been supported and have not improved, or they will just be renewed for another year. Our ultimate goal is to work directly with the teacher all along the way, show that we have supported them, and that they will stay.

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

I am also speaking on behalf of the Nevada Association of School Administrators. We strongly support passage of this bill. This will be an outstanding program moving forward. I would like to acknowledge and

compliment the work of the Clark County Education Association, those administrators that participated in the planning of this program, and the district as well. It has been a nice collaborative effort and we look forward to great things coming from this.

Chelli Smith, representing Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program:

We also stand in support of this bill. We think it is an essential piece for our new teachers, for the retention, and for their overall professional development. We think it will, in fact, increase the content knowledge that these teachers have within the next several years.

Assemblyman Stewart:

It seems that this coach/teacher would have a delicate situation while they are observing and helping the teacher and not being threatening.

Samantha Hager:

That is part of the training we are doing with the team right now in going over coaching practices. Having the teachers coming from the classroom, which they are this year, is a very nonthreatening approach because the teachers in the classroom are getting support and coaching from a peer.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I think it would be a delicate situation.

Erik Smith, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a nationally board-certified teacher. To follow up on what Assemblyman Stewart had mentioned, that is a delicate situation but it is a much-needed one. The reason is that teachers need an immediate feedback mechanism. They need "in the moment" instructional support from someone who is there with them to not only comment on their practice but provide mentorship and in-the-moment coaching to model certain things. The research is unequivocal. The number one factor that is going to help a novice teacher and improve a struggling teacher is getting feedback on their instruction on a day-to-day basis. This is a practice that is very challenging to find in the district and districts across the nation due to limited resources. By having this model in place, a professional teacher can be in the classroom in a nonthreatening manner that works hand in hand with them so that individual can see what they are doing right or what they need improvement on, and other things such as filming their sessions to help them evaluate what they need to do to impact their day-to-day practices. This mechanism is very important because

it gives that number one thing they need the most, and that is timely feedback. Whatever can be done to support this would be greatly beneficial for all of the teachers involved.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in support of Senate Bill 332 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in either location who wishes to testify in opposition to S.B. 332 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify as neutral to S.B. 332 (R1)?

Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District:

The only reason I am not here in support of the bill is because the bill does not impact or give access to the program to the Washoe County School District. We have invested through a federal grant into a PAR program that we currently have. We have ten consulting teachers who are also very vested. It has been great. We have had a 78 percent success rate with our teachers with 33 percent of our veteran teachers moving from minimally effective and ineffective to the effective category, and 45 percent of those veteran teachers who were identified left the profession. We have been very heavily vested in this. The policy presentation you have just heard was wonderful, and I agree completely with everything that was said. I just think it should be available to every district in the state.

Seth Rau, Policy Director, Nevada Succeeds:

We are very strongly in support of the program. We have been working in Clark County with all the stakeholders to ensure the program is being done effectively. We have also observed the program in Washoe County and have seen that they are a couple of years ahead of Clark County and they have been doing fairly well as a result. We just want to insert a slight amendment into the bill because, as we heard earlier in the presentation from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, they are evaluating the program. We would like to make sure that evaluation is submitted back to the Legislature so you can decide whether you want to continue supporting this program after this year. We are in support of the program but would like to see the amendment to make sure you see the evaluation and can act upon that evaluation in the future.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone else in either location who would like to testify as neutral on S.B. 332 (R1)? [There was no one.] Mr. Small, would you like to make closing comments?

Theodore Small:

First of all, I want to recognize the Washoe County School District. Not only was their Peer Assistance and Review program also modeled after Montgomery County, Maryland, but we were able to access the director of their PAR program, Mike Paul. When he came to Clark County, we were able to send our consulting teacher there, so we want to recognize and appreciate our fellow educator colleagues in Washoe County. As we go through this program in the next year, we would invite all legislators when you are in Clark or Washoe Counties to actually go into schools and see the work that is going on, particularly in our performance zone 14 in the Clark County School District.

Chair Woodbury:

I am going to close the hearing on Senate Bill 332 (1st Reprint). Is there anyone here for public comment?

John Eppolito, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:

I want to make a comment on Senate Bill 463 (2nd Reprint). It seemed like a pretty good bill and somehow it was gutted. The biggest thing is the student data. The bill used to say personally identifiable information of the pupil belonged to the pupil and/or his parent or legal guardian. Now that it has been taken out, who does the student data belong to? Again, I am surprised that not one of the 14 legislators here questioned that. Who does the student data belong to if it does not belong to the parents? This is the personal information that we are talking about. You are the last line of defense and, in my opinion, it is slipping. As a parent, I do not feel that secure with what is happening. The rest of the bill was gutted also.

Chair Woodbury:

I will take a motion to suspend Rule 57 of Assembly Resolution 1 to wait 24 hours to vote and to do a work session on the bills we heard today.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO SUSPEND RULE NO. 57
OF ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Woodbury:

I would like to consider Senate Bill 76 (1st Reprint). There were no amendments. I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 76 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON,
ARMSTRONG, DIAZ, EDWARDS, HICKEY, AND SWANK WERE
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Woodbury:

I am going to recess because there were some proposed amendments on Senate Bill 332 (1st Reprint) that we will need time to consider. I am going to recess in case we come back today, and that will be at the call of the Chair.

Meeting recessed [at 3:50 p.m.].

Meeting adjourned [at 4:10 p.m., May 22, 2015].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Assembly Committee on Education

Date: May 21, 2015

Time of Meeting: 2:48 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 463 (R2)	C	Kristin Rossiter, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 432 (R2)	D	Kristin Rossiter, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 76 (R1)	E	Jeannine M. Sherrick-Warner, M.B.A., Director, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Nevada	Written Testimony