

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 8, 2015**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Melissa Woodbury at 3:23 p.m. on Wednesday, April 8, 2015, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at 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 Chris Edwards
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:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7
Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus, Assembly District No. 29

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Geoffrey Lawrence, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Matthew M. Chingos, Ph.D., Senior Fellow and Research Director of the
Brown Center on Education Policy, Brookings Institution,
Washington, D.C.
Lauren Hulse, representing Charter School Association of Nevada
Andrew Diss, State Director, StudentsFirstNV
Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County
School District
Traci Davis, Interim Superintendent, Washoe County School District
Lisa Noonan, Superintendent, Douglas County School District, and
President, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District
Vikki Courtney, representing Nevada State Education Association
Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association
Dawn Miller, Member At Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association
Tina M. Leiss, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System
Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement,
Department of Education
Pedro Martinez, Superintendent in Residence, Department of Education
Ivet Santiago, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Nicole Rourke, Executive Director, Government Affairs, Community and
Government Relations, Clark County School District
Sylvia Lazos, Vice Chair, Latino Leadership Council
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School
Superintendents

Luis Valera, Vice President for Government Affairs and Diversity Initiatives, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Constance J. Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Michael Flores, Communications and Government Affairs Director, College of Southern Nevada
Omar Saucedo, External Affairs Coordinator, Nevada System of Higher Education
James Campos, Senior Advisor to the President on Economic and Business Development, Office of the President, Nevada State College
Craig M. Stevens, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District
Kimberly Regan, Executive Director, Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School
Kaiden Regan, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Chair Woodbury:

[Roll was called. Protocol and procedures were explained.]

Before we get started on our bill hearings and our work session, I would like to refer a couple of bills for consideration. In the interest of time, I will accept a motion to report Assembly Bill 299 to the floor without recommendation and rerefer to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. The bill has a potential fiscal effect, so we will let the money committee work that out. Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MADE A MOTION TO REPORT ASSEMBLY BILL 299 TO THE FLOOR WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION AND REREFER TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will also accept a motion to report Assembly Bill 375 to the floor without recommendation and rerefer to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. After staff and legal reviewed A.B. 375, it was determined that Judiciary has a clearer nexus to the subject matter. Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER MADE A MOTION TO REPORT ASSEMBLY BILL 375 TO THE FLOOR WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION AND REREFER TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We will not hold our work session until we have all of our Committee members here, so we will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 378.

Assembly Bill 378: Makes various changes relating to education. (BDR 34-807)

Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling, Assembly District No. 41:

I am pleased to be here today to present Assembly Bill 378 for your consideration. I would like to open my testimony by providing members of the Committee with a brief introduction to the bill and the highlights of the bill's key provisions. I have proposed a conceptual amendment to the bill ([Exhibit C](#)) that will rewrite the entire structure of the bill, so I will be working from the conceptual amendment posted as a handout on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). The conceptual amendment provides that any money appropriated or made available from the state to reduce class sizes must be made equally available to school districts and charter schools for any programs designed to maximize the achievement of pupils. These programs could include the reduction of class sizes, pay-for-performance plans, or signing bonuses for teachers and other licensed educational personnel, among other uses. A school district or charter school would be required to submit an application to the Department of Education for a grant and include a description of how the money would be used by the school district or charter school to maximize pupil achievement. Finally, a school district or charter school would be required to submit an annual report to the Department of Education on how the grant money was used to maximize pupil achievement in the school district or charter school. A charter school would also be required to submit its report to the State Public Charter School Authority.

I have with me Mr. Geoffrey Lawrence, who has helped with this bill. I would like to have him go over the key points and make his presentation.

Geoffrey Lawrence, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

Nevada first implemented its program of class-size reduction in the early 1990s. It followed the first large-scale, class-size reduction program that was implemented in Tennessee beginning in 1986. The idea behind that experiment, called the Tennessee Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) program, was that if you had a smaller class size, you gave the teacher more one-on-one time with each student. It allowed students having difficulties to overcome them and catch up, eliminating achievement gaps. In the 30 years since large-scale, class-size reduction programs have been in place, scholars have continued to research the impact of programs such as Nevada's. They have found that while these programs can yield positive results for student achievement, they do so in a relatively cost-ineffective way. For instance, Nevada currently spends about \$350 million per budget cycle on its class-size reduction program. Cumulatively, we have spent more than \$2.5 billion over the program's lifetime. This is money that could potentially be used for alternative programs that would also boost student achievement, perhaps even more cost-effectively. Some of those programs might include things like increased teacher pay—either across the board or focused into areas of special needs or through merit pay. That is what this bill is attempting to accomplish.

The conceptual amendment that we have proposed would allow the current categorical allocation to be used for any purpose that a school district believes will increase student achievement including, but not limited to, programs of enhanced teacher pay. The conceptual amendment, once put in place, will drastically alter the language of the bill in front of you. I am sorry to say that it is really hard to judge the language there, because the language in the bill as it is now entirely eliminates the current program of class-size reduction. That is not the intention. The intention is to allow districts to set their own class-size ratios and have those approved by the Department of Education.

The very specific program supported by the Fund for Master Teachers that is embodied in the bill could be a path that is followed by school districts, or they could engage in some alternative use of that money. There is an issue that came to my attention in section 14 of the existing language that would make the annual stipend created for the recruitment and retention of master teachers pensionable income. That was not the intention of the bill. We anticipate that once the conceptual amendment is implemented, that section will not exist anymore. Even if it does exist, we intend for that stipend to not be pensionable income but to be a one-year stipend if districts choose to pursue that course.

The research on class-size reduction as a relatively cost-ineffective means of enhancing student achievement is something that has not been a partisan or ideologically driven effort. In fact, there are scholars from left to right who have

come to the same conclusion over recent years when looking at the 20-plus-year track record that we have with large-scale, class-reduction programs. They range from people like Eric Hanushek at Stanford University to the man I am going to introduce now, who joins us by telephone from Washington, D.C., Dr. Matt Chingos. He is the Research Director of the Brown Center on Education Policy at the Brookings Institution. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard University. He has a number of handouts ([Exhibit D](#)) that are attached as exhibits on NELIS, including a PowerPoint presentation that is titled "Class Size and Student Outcomes: Research and Policy Implications" ([Exhibit E](#)).

Matthew M. Chingos, Senior Fellow and Research Director of the Brown Center on Education Policy, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.:

I am delighted to share some of my research on class size as well as a broader review of the existing high-quality research literature on class size. I want to begin with a simple observation that I do not think will surprise anyone in the room. Pretty much everyone likes smaller classes. [Referred to PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit E](#)).] Parents like smaller classes because they want more individualized attention for their children. Teachers find smaller classes easier to manage. If you surveyed the American public whether they preferred smaller classes or higher salaries for teachers, 77 percent would say they prefer the small classes, and 81 percent of teachers say they would rather teach fewer students than get paid more.

Politically, small classes have been a winner for a long time. That has resulted in at least 24 states mandating or encouraging class-size reduction in recent years. Some of the better-known policies include California's, providing over \$1 billion a year for districts to reduce class size in the late 1990s. The state of Florida amended their constitution through the voter initiative process. They have spent over \$20 billion on class-size reduction since 2003. There was also a federal program in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

This has resulted in a decline in the pupil-teacher ratio pretty much every year since before the year 1900. There are only two exceptions, one being the Great Depression, when it inched up a couple of those years, and after the Great Recession, when it inched up for one or two years. In the PowerPoint, there is nice figure showing how the class sizes and the pupil-teacher ratios have gotten smaller and smaller over a very long period of time (page 4, [Exhibit E](#)).

Today when we talk about class-size reduction, people notice that teacher salaries and benefits account for a lot of what schools are spending, 45 percent of total spending and 91 percent of instructional spending. [Referred to ([Exhibit F](#)).] Given the cost-effectiveness issue that has been raised, it raises the question: Have some schools spent too much on lowering class size? Could that money be reallocated to other more productive uses with slightly larger class size?

I am going to talk about the evidence on class size and a small number of studies that I call "high quality" studies. The problem with class-size research is that most of the studies do not meet high standards of good social science research. As a result, the results are all over the map. We call it meta-analysis when researchers try to put together results from a hundred different class-size studies. I think of meta-analysis as—if you put garbage in, you get garbage out. If you average a bunch of lousy studies, it does not give you the right answer. The reason it is so hard to study class size and learn the causal effects of a larger or smaller class, as opposed to just a correlation, is that there are a lot of things going on. One example is that more affluent schools can better afford small classes. You might look at the data and see that in the small classes, students do better, but it could just be that those schools are more affluent. We also could see the reverse. In some studies it looks like small classes are worse and larger classes are better. That could be at schools that are providing smaller classes to students with behavior problems who need the extra help.

Really, what you need to do to learn the causal effect of class size is to compare students who are in larger or smaller classes for reasons that are unrelated to their achievement. The gold standard to do that is the randomized experiment. The only one of those we have had in the last 75 years is the Tennessee STAR experiment that has been brought up already.

The Tennessee STAR experiment was a pretty unique experiment. It was a large reduction—from about 22 to 15 students in their early grades. There was a pretty big effect on student achievement, particularly after the first year, with smaller effects in future years. There were larger effects for disadvantaged, minority, and urban students. That was a study that a lot of people got excited about. It led to a lot of class-size policies.

If you look at the high-quality evidence that has been produced since the late 1980s, it is more mixed. There was a really good study in Connecticut that was called a "natural experiment." A natural experiment is when you get this kind of random variation in class size, but it occurs naturally. One way that

happens is—let us say a school has a class-size rule that says there can only be 20 students in the third-grade class. If this year there are 20 students, there can be one class of 20 students. If next year there are 21 students, the rule will trigger, and the school is going to have to create a second class. They will probably have one class of 10 students and one class of 11 students. Triggering of that rule is a big pain for the school to have to find another teacher, particularly if it happens mid-year, which is how these class-size rules can be a problem. For researchers it is great because we are able to learn the effect of the smaller class versus the larger class. Researchers who ran the Connecticut study found there was no effect—no evidence that it made any difference whether the class was larger or smaller. There is a similar study using a similar methodology in Minnesota that found small effects. There is a study from Texas using a somewhat different methodology that found modest effects in Grades fourth and fifth, and small or zero effects in Grades sixth and seventh.

There have also been two policy evaluations where states reduced their class size. One of those is California, which made a very rapid reduction—from 30 students to 20 students in kindergarten through third grade. The data are not very good from California, but the evidence suggests that the impacts were small. One of the reasons they were small is because the class-size reduction happened so fast that they had to hire inexperienced teachers. That suggests the biggest effects were not from statewide class-size policy but from unintended consequences of the way it was implemented.

The other state where we have an evaluation is Florida. Florida did a more gradual reduction to implement their constitutional amendment beginning in the early 2000s. I conducted the evaluation there. I found schools and districts that had to enact greater reductions in order to meet the target class size and compared them to districts and schools that had already met the target and did not need to make any changes. I did not find any evidence of effects either overall for all students, or for particular subgroups of students, such as disadvantaged students or minority students, the kinds of students we might expect to see affected as we did in the Tennessee experiment.

A lot of people will tell you that there is conventional wisdom: "What the research says about class size is that class size matters and it matters most for disadvantaged students in their early grades." It turns out that if you look at all the high-quality evidence, that is really just a summary of the Tennessee STAR results. The weight of the high-quality evidence—all of it, not just one important experiment—is that the effects are possibly much smaller, and there really is not very much consistency that certain groups benefit more than others.

Since the evidence side indicates smaller classes cannot hurt—in some cases they probably help, and in some cases they help more than others—you also have to think about the cost side of the ledger. The per-pupil costs of reducing class size are estimated at between \$160 and \$250 per student per one-student reduction. That means if you want to reduce class size by 1 student in a class of 20 students, it is going to cost you 20 times \$160 to \$250. If you took \$200 as the estimate, that would mean \$4,000. You need to compare the cost not just to the benefit but to the benefit of other expenditures. Think about not just if it is worth it in some larger sense, but if I am going to spend \$1,000 or \$100,000, or \$1 million, or \$450 million on smaller classes, could I get more bang for my buck by spending those \$450 million on something else? One example of that is a study that looked at the effect of the STAR experiment, the class-size experiment, on college enrollment. It found that for every student who attended as a result of being in a smaller class who would not have attended college otherwise, it cost about \$400,000. They compared that to some other studies and found that for something like Head Start the cost was only \$133,000. You have to think about the cost-effectiveness issue.

I will conclude on a political point. I think that informing the public can really help. At the beginning, I said that the vast majority of the public and of teachers when asked if they wanted higher salaries for teachers or smaller class size, pick smaller class size. When you help them understand the relative costs—how much it costs for even a small change in class size—support by the public for smaller classes drops. That is true for teachers as well. In Washington State they did a survey in which teachers were asked if they would prefer a \$5,000 salary increase over a two-student reduction in class size, which cost about the same amount. Eighty-three percent said they preferred the salary increase.

I like the idea that Nevada is considering trying out a program that would replace across-the-board mandates for smaller classes with more flexibility. I can well imagine that districts and schools are going to want to use smaller classes in some cases. They might find that for certain students and for some teachers, smaller classes are critical. For example, a new teacher struggling with classroom management skills may really benefit from a smaller class, and his students may really benefit. Another teacher—a veteran teacher who has really good classroom management skills—may be willing to take on a larger class, particularly if there is greater compensation for the extra work a larger class entails. Districts might want to spend the money in other ways, on other programs. I will conclude by noting that it is important to evaluate these programs to see if they have the intended effect.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I would be happy to answer any questions that the members of the Committee have.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I know that class-size reduction always refers to kindergarten through third or fourth grade, depending on the state. Has there been any research done on middle school and high school class-size reduction where we are not talking about classes of 20 or 22, but classes of 42?

Matthew Chingos:

Most of the research is focused on the early-elementary school grades. There are a few studies that have looked at the middle grades. I mentioned a study of Texas that found some small effects in the late elementary school grades but not much of an effect in the middle school grades. There is another national study that looked at eighth graders in the longer paper that I provided ([Exhibit F](#)) that did not find much evidence of an impact on test scores but did find some impacts on different student behaviors and perceptions. I am not aware of any high-quality research looking at the high school level. There really is a problem here in terms of a lack of research and not really knowing what would work at the high school level—smaller or larger classes.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I feel like we always try to quantify everything and that ignores a large subset of qualitative data that show a different perspective. In my first year of law school I had two writing classes that were kept at a 16-to-1 student/teacher ratio on purpose. It is the third-highest-ranked legal writing program in the country. I learned more about writing in one year in those 16-to-1 classes than I had in my entire life. Keep in mind, we were all self-motivated law students, not children who were goofing off. If you ask me to quantify that, I could not exactly show you numbers, but I had more time with that faculty member than in any other class that I can remember. The time I had for feedback was exponential. Because of that, I was able to grow as a writer. Do you think that qualitative data can also show benefits of class-size reduction that you cannot quantify?

Matthew Chingos:

I agree that we cannot quantify everything that is important and everything that we care about. I think quantifying outcomes around student learning by using standardized test scores enables us to have a common metric to compare the benefits of different kinds of interventions. People ask me what the optimal class size is. I tell them that if money is no issue, it is one. One-on-one gives you the most personal attention opportunities for feedback, but we do not live in a world of unlimited resources, so we have to make trade-offs. Your story

about learning well in a class of 16 students illustrates it. Would you have learned more in a class of 14? Maybe. Would you have learned less in a class of 18? Maybe. We need some way of making these trade-offs and figuring out where we should spend our last dollar—is it on class size or on something else? I certainly do not think we ought to have 80 third graders in a classroom. I do not know exactly what the right answer is, which is why I think it often makes sense to provide flexibility to the folks who are in the classroom, who are on the ground, and who have a better sense of their needs than someone at more of a distance.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I hear a lot about making sure that we have good teachers. We all share that goal. We may disagree on the means of achieving that. When I look at this bill, I wonder if teachers might feel a bit under attack by this. It feels like teachers will become at-will under this bill. I do not know that a professional who spends a lot of time going to school to get a position like this would feel respected with that sort of arrangement. People want job security in addition to having high pay. I am not saying it should be unlimited—I voted for the reform measures in 2011—but it seems like this bill could drive people out of the profession. Is my understanding of the bill correct? Would this make teachers at-will? Are you worried that this could exacerbate the problems we are having with retention in our school districts?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

The research shows that the most important school control variable on student achievement is quality of the teacher. A good teacher trumps everything. That is the goal of everyone here—to get the best teachers that we can. I do not know if you were here when I discussed the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit C](#)). The idea behind the conceptual amendment is that school districts can apply this bill in whatever way they want. If they want to keep the current class-size reduction program they have in place, making no changes whatsoever, they have the freedom to do that; however, if they want to reallocate some or all of those funds toward something else, including a program of higher teacher pay, that would also become an option. It is a method for recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers by not just telling them that we appreciate them, but showing them by giving them a higher paycheck, making it more worthwhile. I know a lot of teachers are very altruistic. I have great admiration for the sacrifices they make to go into the classroom, drawing intrinsic value from helping students learn, but I think it is also incumbent on us to give them an income that is competitive with what they could make elsewhere in the marketplace.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I was not getting into pay-for-performance—that has its own problems because we do not even have the evaluation system up and running. We just heard a bill a few days ago that delays that. I do not know that we want to be basing the terms and conditions of employment on performance at this point. We are not yet sure that the data are reliable. Getting back to the probationary issue—let us say that you had a good teacher that is doing well but has a personality conflict with the principal. This would be a teacher we would want to keep, but because they are at-will, could it mean that this good teacher could be fired for just having a problem with the principal?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

The text of the bill itself may change drastically. The way it is written now, the intention is for a teacher to be evaluated through a variety of mechanisms including through a student data tracking system that shows their impact on student achievement and also through a series of evaluations from administrators and peers and others. Is it possible that some teachers could become at increased risk of losing their jobs or going to probationary status? Yes, that is possible. That is one of the objectives of a lot of education reform ideas across the country—to make it easier to dismiss teachers who are not very effective on increasing student achievement. We do not want to do that on a whim. We want to give people every chance that we can to improve their craft. That is why the bill as written creates this master teacher program that is supposed to serve as a mentoring process—you identify the 5 or 10 percent of the best teachers in the state and have them go out and do intensive training with those who are struggling so that they get a couple of years to try to implement what is learned. Then we can come back and reevaluate whether they have improved or not.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I appreciate the mentoring position—I like mentoring. I think it is a good idea, I just worry that the reforms in 2011 tied tenure and contract decisions to student data, but the way I read this bill, that is not necessarily tied to student data. There is no difference between probationary and post-probationary employees, so a probationary employee is basically at-will.

Chair Woodbury:

The conceptual amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) says that it removes the existing provisions of the bill and replaces them "with the following." Is the original bill gutted?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

There may be some elements that remain, but I think that there are going to be drastic changes to the language.

Chair Woodbury:

That is very confusing—not knowing which parts are remaining and which are not because I am reading off the conceptual amendment now.

Geoffrey Lawrence:

I understand that. There was a time crunch with the Legislative Counsel Bureau trying to get this bill into place before the deadline this week. The conceptual amendment is actually the intent of the bill. We anticipate it will be written to implement what is included in the conceptual amendment.

Chair Woodbury:

Do you think we can have it clear during the hearing what we are keeping from the original bill?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

The intent is to make the Fund for Master Teachers an option for school districts to participate in, as opposed to making that mandatory. The intention is make everything flexible, so you are not forced into one program or another. The language that establishes much of that program would exist because it would be a new program that is an option for the use of funds we are talking about—the class-size reduction funds; however, the language would make that an option.

Chair Woodbury:

That is going to be important for those coming up in support and opposition to understand. The report that should be submitted annually to the Department of Education—would that be able to demonstrate that student achievement is maximized by the programs that the school district or the charter school chose to implement? What metrics will be used to judge the success? Can those metrics be tied to the implementation of any of these programs?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

That is a very difficult question to answer. The intention of the reports is to show how the programs that have been selected by the school districts are contributing to student achievement. Hopefully, they should be able to demonstrate some type of track record about their improvement. When it comes to being able to quantify exactly which programs are leading to better achievement, that is something that academics have been struggling with for years. It is something that I think we are getting much better at.

The Department of Education is now implementing a lot more analytics. That is something that we will have to filter down to the school districts so they can complete those reports as well.

Chair Woodbury:

Except that it is clear about the effects of class-size reduction.

Geoffrey Lawrence:

Class-size reduction is a program that has been around for about 30 years. There is a pretty long track record there, where many reforms that are a little bit more experimental have been around for 10 years or less.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I am compelled to first clarify that we are not spending money, we are investing in our children. I get irritated in hearing how we spend money. If we invest money in our children, that is the best way possible we could be spending it, rather than by not investing early and creating a pipeline to prison. Mr. Chingos, how did these studies prove that class-size reduction was effective or ineffective?

Matthew Chingos:

I agree with your comment that spending on education represents investments in children, investments in education. The way I look at that is figuring out what investment is going to have the highest return for the taxpayer dollars. In the studies I talked about, there were a variety of outcomes. Most of them for a short-term outcome looked at student performance on various standardized tests. Some of the studies also tracked cognitive outcomes, and some followed students into college and looked at things like college enrollment.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

What span of time did they look at? You said that some of the studies followed students to college. The Tennessee STAR study is the one I am most interested in. Did it follow students all the way through college?

Matthew Chingos:

Yes, the Tennessee study is the oldest study. Because it is the oldest study, it followed students for the longest period of time. It not only looked at test scores for kindergarten to third grade when the students were actually in these smaller classes, it also looked at if these students were more likely to attend college. On average, the students who were in the smaller classes in the early elementary school were likely to attend college.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I am thinking about Nevada. I do not think the student population of Connecticut looks at all like Nevada's. What really rang true from the Tennessee STAR experiment was larger effects for disadvantaged, minority, and urban students. In southern Nevada, we have a high number of English language learners (ELL). I can tell you—I am in the trenches, in the classroom—when you have 35 fifth graders that are at six different language levels, class-size reduction does make a difference. You tell me that class-size reduction does not make a difference—I beg to differ.

Matthew Chingos:

To be clear, I am not saying at all that class-size reduction does not make a difference. The point that I would like to make is that how much it matters can vary in different circumstances. For example, the Tennessee STAR experiment found positive impacts of small classes on college enrollment. When you split the sample into African-American students and white students—there were not that many students from other racial and ethnic groups in Tennessee in the 1980s—there were big positive effects for the African-American students but not for the white students. The two important points are that the effects can vary in different contexts and different populations of students; and there is also the important cost-benefit point—that if we do not spend or invest the money on class-size reduction, that frees it up to be invested in other things. If those investments pay higher dividends, we could potentially get more bang for your buck.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

You said something about the 1980s—we are in 2015 now. Times have changed. The makeup of our school districts have high poverty and high numbers of English language learners, which are huge barriers in the way of our students. If we do not facilitate the appropriate climate for a lot of these disadvantaged youth, we are going to lose them. I do not know if there is a legitimate study that says that class-size reduction is not effective.

Chair Woodbury:

Mr. Chingos, how do we know if those programs pay more dividends if we cannot tie them to metrics?

Matthew Chingos:

I think it is important to evaluate different programs. I am not sure that going completely no strings attached is the way to go. I am not sure exactly what is the right way for the state to regulate how the money is being spent. It sounds as if what is now being proposed is a system of applications and getting approval from the Department of Education. I think it is important to try to do

this in a way that can be evaluated. You have been investing money in smaller classes for a long time. If you can track outcomes in districts that try out different approaches, you may be able to learn something about whether the schools and districts that took advantage of the flexibility were able to make better use of their resources or if it would have been better if they had been required to spend their resources on class-size reductions as they had done in the past.

Chair Woodbury:

I would agree. Anytime we spend public money, we need to be able to track outcomes to see if those dividends do pay off. I would agree with a lot of this if we were able to track that appropriately.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I would like to return to Mr. Chingos' studies. We started class-size reduction in Nevada a little while ago. I am concerned that we are looking at states that are very different from Nevada in terms in diversity but also in terms of economics. Nevada was the worst hit during the recession. We have never adequately funded education. We certainly have not spent the dollars that we pledged to spend on class-size reduction. That leaves me with a couple of questions. First, if we have been doing class-size reduction in Nevada for a long time, why have we not studied this before we decided it was time to go? The data must be there because we have been doing this for a while. It seems that doing a study specifically in Nevada and tying that to funding and lack of funding in Nevada would be helpful. If you are going to look at states like Connecticut, Florida, Minnesota, Tennessee—many of these states fund education much better than we do—was level of funding tied into the effects of class-size reduction or not? It seems there are a lot of variables that are not accounted for.

Matthew Chingos:

I think you hit the nail on the head. The problem is that state policies are hard to evaluate in general. The reason they are hard to evaluate is that states tend to enact them for all applicable schools at the same time. What you have to do is look for groups of schools or districts where some are more affected by the policy and others less affected by the policy. That is what I did in Florida. Generally, that is much harder to do than when a state does as Tennessee did in the 1980s under Governor Lamar Alexander. They actually did an experiment. I agree with you that it would be great if we had a good study of class size in Nevada as a benchmark. As a researcher, obviously I am supportive of more research. The final comment I would make on this question is that if you do go ahead and make a change to these policies, I would think about trying it in a way that lends itself to evaluation. One way states can do that is instead

of rolling something out for everyone all at once, you can do a phased implementation and see if you get more of an effect on student achievement in the places where the implementation was phased in first. There are ways to do that, but they compromise your ability to give the new policy to everyone all at once, which is what states tend to want to do.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I would like to follow up on the comment you made earlier about the Tennessee study. When you pulled out the students by ethnicity, you found that the African-American students seemed to benefit from class-size reduction, but the white students did not benefit as much. Is that correct?

Matthew Chingos:

That is right, when looking at college enrollment as the outcome.

Assemblywoman Swank:

That does not mean that this was not effective. It was probably pretty effective for African-American students. I am hesitant to say that because it did not work for the white students, then we should not be doing it.

Matthew Chingos:

Absolutely, absolutely. The point I was making there is that effects can vary for different populations of students. I think the hammer I feel I often have to keep on swinging when we are talking about class size—just because something gets you a positive effect does not mean you should do it or do a certain amount of it. I go back to the cost-benefit argument. You have to think about where you are getting the most bang for your buck. It is hard to figure out exactly how to do that in education because we do not have really good evidence on all the different things that people like to do. I think it is important to acknowledge that spending public resources on class-size reduction could get you positive effects, but there could be some other way of spending those resources—for example, by paying teachers more. That might give you a larger impact. I am not saying that is often the case or always the case; I think it is just important to acknowledge that there are real trade-offs that have to be made.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I am happy that we are having this conversation. I think that one-size-fits-all very much does not fit all. I have looked at a lot of these studies myself. Most of the newer studies, the ones from the last few years, are pointing away from class size being the fix-all for education: "If only we had smaller schools, we would be able to get smarter." There are studies by Harvard University, the National Bureau of Economic Research, and several others I have read that say

that class size is not the main issue. There are other things that are more important, especially the quality of the teachers. They even point out the fact that what teacher you have affects the student now, but also affects their total lifetime journey. It is my understanding that this bill is just doing two things, which are in the conceptual amendment. We are saying that we are going to treat charter schools the same as public schools, and we are going to allow flexibility in the spending of the \$350 million we spend every year. Is that correct?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

Yes, that is accurate. Realistically, I do not expect schools to fire teachers that they hired to meet the class-size mandates. In fact, it may be that there will not be much change at all in the first few years after this bill is implemented. As the state continues to grow, the increments of growing funds for this purpose may be increasingly spent on things like higher teacher pay. That is an option. I expect that the needs of a school in east Las Vegas are different than they are in Summerlin or Gardnerville. In some places there may never be any change if it is deemed that a reduced class size is the most effective way to use the money in that particular classroom. In a different area, the case may be different. What we are seeking to accomplish here is to give the administrators the flexibility to make that decision on their own.

Assemblyman Gardner:

If the administrators decided that they like the way it is, they could just keep it the way it is.

Geoffrey Lawrence:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

I would like to return to the outcomes that you are seeing in your data. It relates to the question my colleague asked about—the difference between quantitative data and qualitative. I have taught at the university level; I have never taught younger ages. I have so much respect for teachers who do, simply having been a parent volunteer in several classrooms. I have seen firsthand how incredible teachers have a difficult time with students. The more students you have, the more difficult it is to manage the classroom—you can have students who are running around. No matter how good the teacher is, they have only two eyes and two hands. You will never be able to convince me that adding ten students to the classrooms that I have been in would somehow be no different. That being said, from a qualitative perspective, I am concerned. My question is, do you have any data relating to the health and safety of our children in these classes? The reason I ask is that all of our outside recreation

programs have adult-to-student ratios. We do that for day care centers, for nonprofits like Girl Scouts, the troop that I lead—we have very strict guidelines. Why is it that you do not think that we should have an adult-to-student ratio in our classrooms from a health and safety perspective? Does your data show anything at all about the health and safety of our children if we have no ratios?

Matthew Chingos:

None of the studies that I have looked at include particular information on health and safety. What I would point out is the kinds of limits on class size that lawmakers tend to put in place seem to be targeted less at health and safety and more around educational benefits. For example, let us say you have a classroom where the fire code says that you cannot have more than 25 children in the room. There should be a rule that you should not have more than 25 children in that room if adding 1 more student is going to put those children at risk. When instead you are talking about a limit of 18 or 20 students and it is not about safety but about perceived educational benefit, I think there is more of an argument to be made for providing some flexibility to the local schools to decide on their own that instead of having 18 students, which was the old rule, we are going to have 19 students and use that extra money to hire an art teacher or add some other program we think is valuable.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I would like you to make clear what is left and what is not left in this bill. We are going to take \$123 million and put it in the Master Fund for Teachers. Is that new money or does it come from the fund we already have for class-size reduction?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

The conceptual amendment aims to take out those hard numbers. That is not actually the case. Some school districts are likely to take the current class-size reduction money they are using and continue using it exactly the same way. If at the district level they want to participate in some other program of higher teacher pay including the new master teacher fund program, which would be an option, they can elect to do so at that level. They would apply to the Department of Education to get approval for that program.

Assemblyman Stewart:

The money will still go for class-size reduction if they wish it, but they can use that same money for other programs. Is that correct?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

That is accurate.

Assemblyman Stewart:

There is not any increase in funding; this is just a reallocation of funds.

Geoffrey Lawrence:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Will they apply to the Department of Education? Has that part been taken out so they do not have to apply; they can just use the funds as they see fit?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

I think it is still valuable to apply to the Department of Education to get approval for participation in a program. The Department has a much more comprehensive analytical capacity than many school districts have, especially rural districts. That is the intent.

Assemblyman Stewart:

In its application, Clark County School District could say they want to take \$100 million of the \$500 million allocation and put it in this teacher fund. Is that correct?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Once they got that money, the district would decide who gets the money. Would the district evaluate the teachers, or would the principal evaluate the teachers? Is that still flexible?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

The way the bill reads in this part is something that will be retained as the structure for participating in the master teacher program. The school district would be responsible for coming up with a mechanism for evaluating teachers and getting that approved by the Department of Education. I think it should be required that student achievement data form at least a part of that evaluation, in addition to evaluations from administrators and peers.

Assemblyman Stewart:

The school district itself would set the standards. Is that right, or would the Department of Education set the standards?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

The district would set the standards and get approval from the Department of Education.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Are you going to stick to the \$150,000 to \$200,000 for that master teacher?

Geoffrey Lawrence:

Yes, if a district wants to participate in the master teacher program, those would be the parameters.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I would suggest that you made that more flexible with the principal or district to spread it around a little more. You might have one teacher that barely made the standard and one that barely missed it, and the one gets \$150,000 and the other the regular salary.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I am looking at your conceptual amendment saying that you could use the money from class-size reduction as signing bonuses and as pay for performance. I have to admit that I am a little frustrated reading that. I feel that this session we have had a lot of bills that looked to undermine benefits for our teachers, that hurt the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS), which we know is one of the best retirement systems in the country. We are willing to take money away from reducing class sizes that benefits our teachers while, at the same time, we are undermining them just to add salary. That is more of a statement than anything. I find this terribly frustrating. On one end you can say, "Let us get rid of PERS; let us make all these changes and pull all those benefits out from underneath our teachers," but then say, "Oh, but we are going to give you a little bit of money on top." This is up to the administration to decide. Where does parental input come in? We have the State Board of Education that has been elected and we have trustees. Where is parental input in these changes that are going to take place in the schools?

[Assemblyman Stewart assumed the Chair.]

Geoffrey Lawrence:

Addressing your first statement—I think as Mr. Chingos alluded to—in a world of unlimited resources, you would love to have rock star teachers that could be one-on-one with every student. Unfortunately, that is not the case. We not only have limited money, but we also have limited rock star teachers. The research shows that the best teachers are able to handle classes that are a little bit larger. We are not talking about a class of 100 students, but we are

also not talking about a class of 16 either. About parental input—I do not think that mechanism will change in any way. Currently parents can elect the local school board members. This session, we have also created an Opportunity Scholarship program for parents of families at 300 percent of the federal poverty level or less. If parents do not like the way their district is using the money, we also have a system of charter schools within the state, which are public schools of choice that a parent can enroll their child in. There are a number of avenues for parental input, and I do not think this bill will change any of them.

Vice Chair Stewart:

I think the parents as well as the district could be involved in the evaluation process.

Assemblyman Edwards:

As a student I was in classrooms of only 10 children or 100 children. If the teacher was good, usually you actually learned something. If the teacher was bad, you did not. The size of the class did not matter. Most people have been in auditoriums where there are several hundred people in the class. If the teacher is good, you learn a lot. If they stink, you do not. Is there any credible data we can rely on, or should we just face the fact that we need to find good teachers and focus on that and give them the flexibility to teach their subject matter?

[Chair Woodbury reassumed the Chair.]

Geoffrey Lawrence:

That is the intention of this bill—to create a compensation package that is attractive for the most talented professionals.

Chair Woodbury:

Are there any further questions? Is there any testimony in support of Assembly Bill 378?

Lauren Hulse, representing Charter School Association of Nevada:

I just learned about this new amendment. I am here in support of the conceptual amendment that has been proposed. Currently charter schools do not receive any categorical funding, which class-size reduction monies are part of. There are other funds used for kindergarten and at-risk kindergarten. The \$165 million is the biggest chunk of categorical funding there is, and charter schools do not have access to it. I believe that is unfair. I applaud this conceptual amendment. If a school is successful in its class-size reduction

program, they would still implement that program. If they think they can improve student outcomes in a different way, the school would be free to do that. Giving schools—district schools or charter schools—that flexibility would not be a problem.

Andrew Diss, State Director, StudentsFirstNV:

I am here today to speak in favor of the merit pay provisions in A.B. 378. We are an organization that strongly supports investing more in our best teachers. Students with the highest-performing teachers gain five to six more months of learning in a year than students with the lowest-performing teachers. Additionally, those students are more likely to attend college and earn a higher salary when they enter the workforce. Offering higher salaries to our best teachers based on effectiveness will serve to attract high-quality educators to our state, which routinely sees massive teacher shortages at the beginning of each school year.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

How can we do merit pay when we do not have an evaluation system in place?

Andrew Diss:

I envision this bill coming on line at the same time as our educator performance framework comes on. Maybe that is an amendment you would like to entertain.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Do you think it would be better to have the evaluation system fully tested and operational for a few years and have the new standards implemented before we start basing terms and conditions of employment on it? Would this make us rife for lawsuits?

Andrew Diss:

This bill as drafted leaves the choice up to the teacher of whether they want to apply to be considered for the program. Nobody is forcing them to apply and be part of the program.

Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority:

We are in strong support of the conceptual amendment to the degree that it permits charter schools to participate fully in the class-size reduction program funding mechanism. Charter schools, as you know, are not eligible for the class-size reduction revenues, which are the largest single categorical funds that flow towards schools. We have some schools that have managed to scrimp and save and fundraise to be able to lower class sizes because they believe that is a strategic priority and they have demonstrated exemplary academic outcomes. We also have schools that have chosen to use their limited

resources in other investments and have still achieved exemplary academic results at four- and five-star levels without this revenue; however, all of our schools—regardless of whether they have chosen to prioritize class size or not—are united in their need for the funds to be able to recruit, reward, and retain the most highly-effective teachers. To the degree that this amendment and the underlying bill would permit that and would give charter schools full access to these funds, we are in full support of this legislation.

Assemblyman Armstrong:

Is it your opinion that the class-size reduction program does work? Do you see results from reducing class sizes?

Patrick Gavin:

The national data on this is pretty clear that class sizes have an equivocal impact, at best, on student achievement. What is far clearer is the impact of school leaders and exemplary teachers, regardless of the number of students in the class. There are schools that have their theory of change—they believe they can do small class sizes, bring in rock star teachers, and develop great teachers. We also have schools like Oasis Academy in Fallon, which has demonstrated that they can do that at a 20-to-1 student/teacher ratio with a high degree of fidelity to their academic program with many teachers in their building and that small a ratio. There are other schools that have made a different strategic choice—to invest in perhaps paying people more or investing more in professional development and have larger class sizes. If we look at some of the best-in-class charter networks nationally, that is the balance that they have struck.

Assemblyman Hickey:

My question is for Ms. Hulse. It sounds to me as if the main reason for your support is that charter schools are not currently getting money that the rest of the system is. Could you briefly tell me what the rationale was behind that? Why have charters previously not received those funds? What attempts have you made to be on an equal footing in respect to class-size reduction?

Lauren Hulse:

Are you asking why they have not received funding specifically for class-size reduction or for all categoricals?

Assemblyman Hickey:

I would like to know about class-size reduction funding.

Lauren Hulse:

Charter schools are unique in that they can set a certain number of seats per class for which they will accept applications for enrollment. If they have 30 seats open for a certain grade level, they will fill that many seats and not accept students past that. Generally, that is how they control their class-size reduction. The issue is the large amount of funding that charter schools do not receive. They would like to be able to access the funding that traditional public schools receive to equalize funding, to not have a tiered system of funding.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I am looking at some rough numbers on the makeup of American students enrolled in charter schools in Nevada. It looks like around 55 percent of charter school students are white, with 20 percent Hispanic, 16 percent African-American, 5 percent Asian. It seems to me that for charter schools, class-size reduction might be less of an issue. As we heard earlier from Mr. Chingos, minority children tend to benefit more from class-size reduction. If you have a majority of white students—which does not happen in a lot of our classrooms, especially in Las Vegas—it seems to me that in our regular public schools class-size reduction could be a real benefit, but not so much for charter schools.

Patrick Gavin:

One of the barriers to creating best-in-class charter schools in our urban core is this inequity of funding. You have submitted that it is not as great a return on investment for our Caucasian and more middle-class students to benefit from class size reduction. Regardless of whether the money is used for class-size reduction or for some other high-quality intervention such as intensive professional development and support in instructional coaching for teachers, I would submit that for us to ensure that we are able to attract and foster high-quality operators in the most needy neighborhoods, we need to ensure that there is equitability of funding. The fact of the matter is that when operators from other states examine our law and our fiscal policies, the lack of fiscal equity, particularly in the operating fund area, is something that distinguishes Nevada in a very negative way from other states. When operators from Colorado, Texas, Arizona, or California look at where they can create a high-quality, inner-city school using the model they have perfected in those other states, they look at the inequity in funding here and question whether they can do it—particularly given what teacher compensation rates look like in this state versus other states with similar pedagogy and professional responsibilities.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I am reading through *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapters 386 and 388. Are you subject to class-size reduction ratios now? I think the answer is no. If we were to approve this measure to give you class-size categorical funding, would you be willing to be required to meet those ratios?

Patrick Gavin:

We are not currently subject to those ratios—that is correct. As I think I have made clear, data on whether it is the sole means of effectively improving pupil outcomes is equivocal at best. There are clearly other means including, but not limited to, creating ladder teacher leadership roles where teachers spend one quarter of their time teaching in the classroom and the remainder of that time teaching other teachers how to be more effective instructors that many states allow charter schools to use class size reduction monies to do. This is arguably a more effective investment of those resources. That said, were this body to say that class size reduction money would only be available to those schools which agree to submit to class size reduction, I would certainly encourage our boards to consider that and to make that judgment on their own—whether they choose to change their ratios to comply and have access to the money or not. I would also argue that those schools that have managed through some creative financial mechanisms to achieve a low ratio should not be penalized for having figured out some extraordinary way to make that happen under rather challenging circumstances. I would strongly argue that a school that has already achieved a 20-to-1 ratio should be able to access the money to maintain that ratio and to make additional investments in other areas that improve pupil outcomes.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

In the past, I have supported charter school financing equity in the revolving loan account [Account for Charter Schools]. We need to play by the same rules if we are going to do this sort of thing and use those monies. I am not supporting class-size reduction money so that people can have more money; I am supporting it so that we can reduce class sizes. That has to be an absolute condition. To be clear, I do not know if I am fully there on all the provisions of the conceptual amendment. I do not believe in just throwing money at a problem. I believe in throwing money at smart solutions and smart investments.

Chair Woodbury:

I am going to call up anyone else who is in support of Assembly Bill 378. [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition?

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

I have with me today our interim superintendent, Traci Davis. We are a little caught off guard because we did not know about the conceptual amendment until the hearing. That could change our testimony. I would like to give Superintendent Davis the opportunity to weigh in on her experience in class-size reduction.

Traci Davis, Interim Superintendent, Washoe County School District:

Class size matters. I was a third-grade teacher with 36 students. Trying to make sure I heard every student read each day was difficult. With class-size reduction, I had 22 students. Each had an opportunity to read to me every day—whether they were white, gifted and talented, or English language learners. We have to afford every student the same opportunity, regardless of color or whatever subgroup they fall in. When we look at class size, I understand there are many variables in the average classroom. We talk about the quality of the teacher, the home environment of the students, the quality of the curriculum, and the leadership of the school. I can tell you, as the principal of a failing school that was turned around, we believe that we have to give special attention to students in kindergarten through third grade. We talk about "Read by Three." That means we need to hear those students read daily. When you enlarge the class, that becomes almost impossible by the nature of instructional minutes and other things you have to do during the school day.

Lisa Noonan, Superintendent, Douglas County School District, and President Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

I will hit on two points and save all my notes for another day. I very much enjoyed all of your comments and hearing the discussion. A lot of the points I wanted to make have been made by members of this Committee. After 32 years in public education and serving children as a teacher, as a principal, as a district-level leader, whenever this conversation comes up, I am saddened to see us fall into this trap of either-or. We have this debate over if it is more important for the teacher to be outstanding or for the class size to be small. We need to stop saying either-or. It is a matter of both. Of course we want every teacher in front of a classroom to be an outstanding teacher, with the support and the materials and all of the pieces we know that go into the effective schools research, but if I take my most amazing teacher and say, "You are going to have 35 to 40 students instead of 20 to 25," how long will I be able to retain that quality educator? When I was teaching, I had 35 to 37 students, but all of my children came to school ready to learn. They spoke English as their primary language. They were living in two-parent families. One parent was typically staying home full time. My students were scared to death that I might call Mom if something did not go exactly by plan.

I might have 1 child a year out of that 37 that had an individualized education program (IEP) and needed a little extra help. Please do not compare today's 2015 classroom to the 1980s or your own childhood. We appreciate this. It is one of the things that we do really well in Nevada. Please do not let the temptation of the big dollar signs do something to jeopardize what makes a difference for our youngest and neediest students.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Thank you, ladies, for your public service. Ms. Davis, I know you have a tremendous amount of responsibility on your shoulders because you have to make sure that we are educating our students in Washoe County School District to the best of our ability. I will be forever grateful for your lead on that. We are now in the process of implementing Common Core State Standards. It seems it would be even more detrimental and would set us further behind in reaching the achievement levels that we need as a state in moving our state up from 50th place. I know that you and I want to be off that bottom-of-the-barrel list.

Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District:

I want to give you testimony that probably no one else in the room can give. I was the direct beneficiary of class-size reduction. I was a first-grade teacher in 1988 with a class of 40 first graders. I can tell you firsthand, as Ms. Davis has, that the level of expertise I was able to provide to those students when there were five different reading groups and I needed to listen to 40 children read on a daily basis—it was nearly impossible. I gave up my lunch time and every bit of time I had in a free day to be able to get to those students. In 1989, the session brought forward some class-size reduction. We were able to move that forward in 1991. I went from 40 students in 1988 to 32 in 1990 to 16-to-1 in 1991. That population—Ms. Diaz, you know the population because C. C. Ronnow Elementary School has not changed that much—was still Hispanic. There were a large number of students who came in with no skills because they had not been in a kindergarten experience, yet had met the age requirement. Before those times we did not have tests to make sure that children were ready for first grade. The impact on a teacher is significant. The impact that I saw as a supervisor of classrooms over the years—I can walk in and tell you how well a teacher is able to reach students just by being able to listen to the language they are using with their students in a small-group reading session. When you have a large number of students in a reading group, you are not going to be able to give individualized attention.

We keep talking about professional development and other high-impact strategies, yet we cannot necessarily say empirically that professional development is the single factor that is going to increase student achievement either. There is no research to show that. We have to make sure that we are

looking at a combination of efforts to ensure the success of our students. With that, one of the challenges that we have had in the state of Nevada with class size is that neither the Department of Education nor the Legislature ever put into place a K-2 assessment that was consistent across the state so that we could actually measure this process. We never had to stick to those class sizes to ensure their success or failure. I would caution you that we need to be very careful as we go forward. Applying categorical funds will not ensure that I am not losing \$30 million, which is what I stand to lose to support some of our most at-risk students as well as students who are not necessarily at-risk but deserve the same opportunity to learn.

Vikki Courtney, representing Nevada State Education Association:

I agree with all the folks who spoke before me in opposition. I am a 35-year teacher here in Clark County. The difference in working with 35 children in a classroom compared to working with 16 or 18 is huge in the effect that I can have on my students. I would appreciate your opposing this bill.

Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association:

I am offended when people say that you can put additional students in a classroom and a master teacher will do just as well. I was a master teacher when I was in the classroom. I had students that were in special education. It does not work that way. [The witness submitted prepared text that included additional testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Dawn Miller, Member At Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association:

Our members feel that support that takes place in a small classroom is vital to the primary learning, so we speak in opposition.

Tina M. Leiss, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System:

I want to put on the record that the Public Employees' Retirement Board is opposed to section 14. It appears that will be removed. I will submit written testimony as to why we are opposed ([Exhibit H](#)).

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] Assemblywoman Dooling, would you like to give your closing comments?

Assemblywoman Dooling:

This bill does not eliminate class-size reduction, and it does open up flexibility for funds to be used for teacher pay where it enhances student achievement.

Chair Woodbury:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 378. We are in recess [at 4:48 p.m.].

[Meeting reconvened at 5:55 p.m.]

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 374. Assemblyman Flores will walk us through the bill.

Assembly Bill 374: Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-1064)

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Assembly District No. 28:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 374 on behalf of all the students who live in my district and on behalf of every student I have ever had a conversation with who told me, "Had I known that, I would have done something different." I am also presenting this bill on behalf of every student I met with in the past seven months after visiting their schools who told me that they did not know if they were on track to graduate or on track to go to a four-year institution or a two-year institution, and said that they had not had an opportunity to sit down with someone to create a roadmap for their success. This bill is for them. In the interest of time, I will try to go through the bill as fast as possible. It is not complex, but there may be questions. First I will give you the intent—the issue we are trying to resolve. Upon completion of high school, a lot of students do not go to a community college, a trade school, or a four-year institution because they do not know that they are eligible, they feel fearful or intimidated, or they have not been told about the process involved. I am not here to blame or point fingers at anybody. I am now an assemblyman. Once elected, I became part of the problem, so I point at myself any time a student graduates without knowing what they are eligible for. I am trying to be part of the solution. I am not saying that this is going to fix everything, but at a minimum it is a step in the right direction.

I will be working off of the mock-up ([Exhibit I](#)). Every Nevada public school eleventh grader has to take the ACT, which is the college career assessment test. My original intent was to have each student, after they received their results, sit down with somebody at the administrative level of their school to create a roadmap to whatever it is that they are trying to achieve: entrance to a two-year institution, a four-year institution, or a trade school. Upon conversing with Clark County School District and other stakeholders, many issues were identified that indicated why we should not go that route. The first is that we do not know if the ACT is something we will always be doing—we might get rid of that at some point. My intent is to obligate that sit-down, roadmap-creation meeting for each student. I did not want the fact that we might not have an ACT in the future mean that we could not move forward with

this roadmap for the student. Secondly, the results of the ACT might not come out in time for a student to be able to have this conversation while in eleventh grade. The reason that is a problem is that we may be obligated to have this conversation in twelfth grade. In my opinion, that is too late. The final issue is that the original bill did not include the fact that we already have an academic plan created for all students at the ninth-grade level. Why go into a completely new plan when we are already working with one from the ninth-grade level? With that said, we move to the mock-up.

I will read through it and explain, section by section, what we are doing. The board of trustees of each school district shall ensure that a counselor, administrator, or other licensed educational personnel from each public high school in the district meets at least once with each pupil in Grade 11 for the purpose of reviewing the academic plan developed pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.205. I made sure that we did not solely focus on putting this responsibility on counselors. I know that our counselors are overwhelmed and that there are other faculty and staff who could help with what we are trying to accomplish. We wanted to make the bill broad enough so that those individuals could help.

Assemblyman Armstrong:

Regarding the plan that is developed in ninth grade—is there currently no follow-up to that?

Assemblyman Flores:

I have read the NRS. There is a lot of "may" language. Our language is "shall." This will guarantee that at the eleventh-grade level, school staff will sit down and review the academic plan that was established in ninth grade.

Assemblyman Armstrong:

Is there a "may" in reference to the eleventh grade in the NRS currently?

Assemblyman Flores:

No, there is no reference to eleventh grade at all currently.

Section 1, subsection 2 says "At a meeting conducted pursuant to subsection 1, the counselor, administrator or other licensed educational personnel shall use the results of the pupil's college and career readiness assessment administered pursuant to NRS 389.807, if assessment results are available at the time of the meeting, and the pupil's academic records to review with the pupil the areas of his or her academic strengths and weaknesses, including, without limitation, areas where additional work in the subject areas tested on the assessment is necessary to prepare the pupil for college and

career success without the need for remediation." The original presumption is that we would have the results of the test available. I wanted to have the ACT results and transcripts available for when the student sits down, so that school personnel can tell him, "You are on track," or "You are not on track and here is what you need to change. If you want to go to a four-year institution, you need to take an additional math course." The results might not be out at that time, but I did not want that to prevent the conversation from taking place. The more appropriate route to ensure that the student is still having that conversation during the eleventh-grade school year is by saying that even if the results of the ACT are not out yet, you still have to have that individual meeting and create a roadmap for whatever that student is trying to achieve and explain how to accomplish it.

Chair Woodbury:

If this takes place in eleventh grade, is it too late for some students to get on the right path?

Assemblyman Flores:

The reason we are focusing on eleventh grade rather than tenth is because there is a possibility that some of those students will have received their assessment test results. For those who do have them, it adds one more tool to the conversation. Instead of just looking at the transcript and the objective of the student, we would hopefully have the results for some of them so that those can be included in the conversation. If we move this to the tenth-grade level, we will guarantee that those results will not be part of that conversation.

I will continue to subsection 3. "If it is determined that remediation is necessary, the counselor, administrator or other licensed educational personnel shall coordinate with the pupil and the pupil's parent or legal guardian to revise the academic plan for the student to ensure that the pupil is prepared for college or career success before he or she graduates." I will paint a simple hypothetical. A counselor is meeting with Student A. Student A wants to go to the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR); however, UNR's requirements demand that there be a specific grade point average (GPA) and a specific number of math credits. The counselor identifies that the student is two math courses behind and the GPA is not up to par. At that the point, we have the remediation component come in. That is where we bring a legal guardian or parent to the table to say that all of us will be part of this student's solution. That means the student may have to take an additional course load over the summer, or take night classes, and the legal guardian or parent is going to have to be responsible in ensuring that the student is getting homework done and completing the necessary courses. It is a collaborative effort.

Assemblyman Armstrong:

It is interesting to me that we do not have any follow-up to that ninth-grade plan. I looked at when it was enacted. It included a review of the academic plan at least once each school year in consultation with a counselor, and revision of the plan if necessary. Then in 2011, that language was removed. Do you know why it was taken out?

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education:

I do not know why that was taken out. When this body enacted the college and career readiness assessment and the State Board of Education adopted the ACT in 2013, this is what was added. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 389.807 says the assessment results are to be used to provide data to inform each pupil who takes the assessment in a manner that allows the pupil to review his or her academic strengths or weaknesses, and additionally allow teachers and other educational personnel to use the results of the pupil on the assessment to provide appropriate interventions for the pupil to prepare for college and career.

Assemblyman Flores:

In looking at NRS 389.807 subsection 4, paragraph (b), where we see "Allow teachers and other educational personnel to use the results" of the ACT to provide appropriate interventions et cetera—that is to allow the teacher, it is not "shall" language. The data has to be there, and it has to allow the teacher, but we are not saying that we have to have a sit-down, that we have to have this conversation. This is where my bill differs from that language. The law currently says allow, my bill says, we will, we must, we shall.

Pedro Martinez, Superintendent in Residence, Department of Education:

I would like to give you some context for why this is necessary for both Clark County School District and Washoe County School District. If you go back to 2011, most of Clark County ninth grade students were not taking algebra. Many were taking prealgebra and eventually taking algebra. We had a class called intuitive geometry—to this day I do not know what that is. Most of our children, unless attending Coronado High School or other certain schools, did not get math credits up to Algebra II. If you talk to UNR and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), they will tell you that the best indicator of college completion is not GPA but whether students can handle those first two years of math courses. Many of our rural school districts are still struggling with this today. With the new standards, we changed that. In 2012, we started eliminating pre-algebra classes in ninth grade. It was a process. Now Clark County School District has gone on that path where children across the district actually have a shot of getting to precalculus by senior year.

In Washoe County, we did not have that issue. In Washoe County, the challenge was the fact that we did not have academic plans for our children and had been stuck at a 56 percent graduation rate for many years. In Washoe, students were taking algebra and up to four years of math. What we did in Washoe was build an academic plan for every single child. Let us not just look at graduation, but how do we build them up so that they have a shot at going to a university after high school? We started looking at some of the challenges that existed with our children. We started with a first generation initiative pilot. It consisted of 500 students. We learned from that pilot that about 40 percent of our upperclassmen in high school are first-generation children. In Clark County, the percentage is higher because the poverty rates are higher in Clark County. We put in supports—doing exactly what Assemblyman Flores is proposing. We brought families together, we brought in counselors, we expanded the hours. There were some great benefits from that. If you go to any Washoe County School District high school today you will find that staff know their children—whether it is the principal, the assistant principal, or the counselors. They work as a team. Last fall, we had a child who moved here from California. He only had six credits and came in as a twelfth grader and immediately left that day, never coming back. The principal was livid because that child would count as a dropout in her school. I told her that the fact that she knew that child came in and did that—I applauded her for that, even though it was unfair that he was counted as a dropout. That is what is happening in Washoe County.

What are the results that we are seeing? In 2012, we had approximately 1,865 graduates that were going into higher education—either in the Nevada system or out of state. Right now we have 2,201, an 18 percent increase. What is more interesting to me is looking at the children now attending four-year universities. The University of Nevada, Reno has been a big beneficiary, but so have out-of-state colleges. Between UNR and out-of-state, four-year universities, there has been a 27 percent increase of children attending those institutions in the last two years. Truckee Meadows Community College President, Dr. Maria Sheehan, has been a great partner with us, but her enrollment is kind of flat. She is only up about 50 children, which is about 3 percent of enrollment, but she did not lose any children. In the process, we did not have one institution losing children to another but had an almost 30 percent increase in children attending four-year universities. What we learned in that process was that many of our families, because they are first-generation, do not have the support or the resources to understand what the higher education system is like. In Washoe County, we had the advantage that we did not have the issues that Clark County did of children not having enough math, not having a lot of math rigor in ninth grade. We had that already in place. We had the issue of the families just not knowing.

In our pilot of 500 children, we had 100 children that could have gone to UNR but chose to go to TMCC instead. They had all the academics and everything needed to go to UNR. No disrespect to TMCC, but that caught our attention and made us wonder what was happening. We dug deeper. Now, not only do our administrative teams know their children, but UNR, with the permission of our parents, sends conditional acceptance letters to every single incoming twelfth-grade student so that they know that have been accepted at UNR. In addition, that has completely empowered our counselors and the administrative teams in our high schools to have the conversation, "Now that you have this conditional acceptance letter, what are you going to do with it? Are you going to go to UNR or are you going to apply to Stanford University, or to the University of California, Berkeley, or to the University of California, Davis?" We are on track this year in Washoe County to have a record number of graduates again going to UNR. I would not be surprised to see a record number of graduates going to out-of-state universities, mainly the California system because they love our students. I wanted to give you a glimpse of the power this can unleash. I applaud Assemblyman Flores' amendment, because I think it makes it more feasible to implement. One of the concerns that many of us had was that we were going to load all this on counselors. With this amendment, since it is the whole administrative team at work, I think this is feasible. I think, frankly, that it is the next level for Clark County to go to. They have seen gains in graduation. The next step is, what is going to happen to those graduates? Right now we have 20,000 total graduates a year in Clark County and Washoe County. If you look at the number of students that go to UNR and UNLV, it is just under 7,000 students. What is happening to all these other children? I think something like this could help us answer that question and address some of the obstacles.

Assemblyman Hickey:

The two people seated with you answered a question that I had. I am happy that they are here. My question was, have you really vetted this with people in the districts? It is a great idea, and I think you have done your homework. My question now would be to Mr. Martinez because you have been in the district. In a sense, you make the point of many of the bills—good leadership makes for good outcomes. I am sure that in many of the schools, principals, administrators, counselors, and others are already attempting to do many of these things. This is going to bring more of an emphasis. You referenced the amendment that this would not just fall on the school counselors. Practically speaking, are administrators going to be able to do this readily, embrace it, and be successful at it?

Pedro Martinez:

If this were four years ago, I would be very concerned about its execution. Today, this is exactly where we need to be. Washoe County School District is already doing this but needs to go up another level. I think Clark County School District is ready to go up to this level. What I worry about is the fact that I see children going to community colleges that could go to universities, even though I think our community colleges are the gems of the state and underinvested. It makes me wonder if we are doing our jobs about letting those children know. When you bring up this conversation, everybody can relate to it, especially children that just recently graduated from college or are attending college. That says to me that this is an issue that needs to be addressed. I think both Clark County School District and Washoe County School District are ready for this. The rural school districts would need more help, but they have fewer children. The numbers work to their advantage because they do not have the scale that Clark County and Washoe County have.

Chair Woodbury:

Are there currently enough counselors or other licensed personnel to implement this?

Pedro Martinez:

The reason the amendment is such a good one is it requires that this be a team effort. In Washoe County School District, I would meet with every high school team each fall. We would look at every grade level—high schools that have 2,500 children and high schools that have 1,800 children. We would go through every class. What we learned is we had to do two things. One, we had to expand the hours of the counselors, which was not that expensive. We expanded the hours, but we also brought in retired counselors who love this kind of work. Some even argued that they never had the chance to do this kind of work when they were active counselors. Two, it had to be a team effort, every assistant principal had to participate. In Washoe County School District every grade level is assigned to an assistant principal. It is not much different in Clark County. Many of the high schools also have counselors assigned that way as well. When it is a team effort, it can work. If it were just counselors by themselves, it would not.

Chair Woodbury:

When would they have these meetings—during the school day or after school? How would it work into the schedule?

Pedro Martinez:

The way it has worked so far in Washoe County is that we have a schedule that is set up around the students. We will meet with them before school, during

a certain period of the school day, or after school. They are very thoughtful about planning it. It is not just the counselors. One of the reasons the assistant principals need to be involved is because they have a little more flexibility. Another lesson we learned is that our counselors in the high schools are spending too much time testing. We brought in substitute teachers to proctor exams. That freed up the counselors. You have to do all these different things together and then it can work.

Chair Woodbury:

Can a student or a parent decline to have the meeting?

Pedro Martinez:

What was interesting is that we had the opposite problem—we had so much demand for it that Interim Superintendent Davis recognized this and started setting up sessions outside of the school day specially, just for families that could not make it during the school day. We had meetings at Boys and Girls Clubs and at libraries. It was a big hit. It was not a large percentage of the students, but it was for students who could not have their meetings during the school day. Our problem was that parents wanted to be involved but could not make it because of work, so went out to community centers.

Chair Woodbury:

The wording is "shall ensure," so I wonder, is it on the board of trustees or the school district to make sure this happens or to make sure that you have it available and make the attempt? Hopefully, there would never be a problem, but I wonder if you are covered?

Assemblyman Flores:

I will address your question about when these meetings would take place. We did not want to make it that specific because I think the school needs to have the flexibility to know when is the best time, the best day. There might be a day during second period that works. I want the schools to have that flexibility. I do not want to put it just on the counselors. Coming back to your question pertaining to "shall ensure," shall is saying that the school has a responsibility to set up the appointment with the student, but if the student does not show up, there is nothing they can do about it. It was not the intent that if a student refuses to go to a meeting that somehow we would reprimand the administration.

Assemblyman Stewart:

The one concern that I have is that we have counselors with 500 to 600 students and administrators that we have put more burdens on as far as

evaluating teachers. Have you considered crossing out licensed personnel and having trained parent volunteers go over the assessment and give students some instruction? I could see having a preparatory graduation night with tables all around where students and their parents could have this meeting.

Assemblyman Flores:

Absent the school district telling me that they would not agree with it, I would take that as a friendly amendment. Prior to running for office, I had been devoted to visiting high schools, working through different programs—Jobs for America's Graduates, Street Law, Inc., and programs that I started myself. I do it of my own volition and have been for many years. I would be one of those individuals who would train for that.

Assemblyman Armstrong:

Other licensed personnel would include teachers as well. I do not see anywhere in here that the meeting has to be one-on-one. Could this bill be used by teachers to do a group session? They could have those plans and then in a group setting ask questions and answer students' questions so that everyone would have the answers, rather than having to spend so much time doing one-on-one meetings.

Chair Woodbury:

There are privacy issues you might want to address.

Assemblyman Flores:

It is my intent in the way this is drafted to have these meetings be one-on-one. This is for many reasons. One, the fact that the transcripts are available to the student and need to be a part of the discussion; two, I am trying to avoid a presentation where we have a group of students. I think that takes away from how powerful a one-on-one interaction can be. Often, when we have a group setting, a lot of students tend to zone out. When a student does not think that they qualify for a two-year or four-year institution, or when they lack the confidence—any time we have a conversation about higher education, they immediately tune out. A lot of these students are eligible. Sometimes they think the fact that their grades are not the best means that higher education is out of the question. They do not realize that community college is a great start for them, or that there are options for them, or that a trade school is an option. It is my intent that we have these meetings be one-on-one.

Assemblyman Armstrong:

As a follow-up, I would recommend that you add, "that the district meet at least once individually with each pupil," in order to satisfy your intent.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

There are many in my district that would greatly benefit from having this mentoring, this educational insight into their futures. When I was going through high school, I noticed that counselors gravitated toward the students that had higher GPAs rather than those students who were average. I wondered why they would spend more time on me when I was already on the right track and self-motivated. I wondered why they did not spend more time on the student that was making a B or C average who needed the support. Do you see your bill having an impact on those students that have potential, that can do many of the things that our state needs? We need so much human capital in terms of where we are going—with workforce, Tesla, and teachers. Do you see this as potentially tapping into that human capital pool that we as yet have not?

Assemblyman Flores:

This is exactly what the intent of this bill is. I put myself in that situation. I did not have anyone who went into higher education in my family. I was the first one to do a lot of different things. It was having the right mentors come in and just point me in the right direction—that is the only reason I am here. If it were not for those mentors who came in at the right time to keep me pointed in the right direction, I would not be here. I can share so many stories of different students who said, "I had no clue, but someone sat down with me for two minutes, and that conversation was sufficient for me to realize that I needed to take an additional course to be on track for college, and now I have a master's degree." We were going to have someone testify to that very story. We had ten individuals who were going to be here to tell their stories.

I am going to go through their stories because they go along exactly with what you were talking about, Assemblywoman Diaz. We were going to have a student talk about graduating in eleventh grade. Everybody assumed that everything was perfect for this student, but at home there was not the necessary support system. This individual ended up not graduating from college because no one had set that roadmap. No one explained about starting at a university as opposed to somewhere else.

One student did not have anybody at home who had gone through the university system that could explain the ropes. A teacher who met with this student in the mornings to explain the basic steps is the only reason for that student's success.

Another student was fortunate enough to have walked through a counselor's door while his friend was getting information, so he decided to sit down and listen in. He took that advice, which he otherwise would not have gotten.

A young lady told me it was a conversation she had when she was in twelfth grade—the first time she spoke with a counselor—that set her on the right course.

This dialogue sounds basic. We talk about such complex things in here on such a macro scale that when we bring it down to the smaller scale it seems like it does not have an impact. Sometimes that tiny conversation has greater impact than many other things. If we are not getting the small things done correctly, when we open it up to a 30-meter view, we are not going to get that done.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I like the way you summarized for all the people who were going to testify for you. Please tell them about Assembly Bill 150, the alternate route for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship, which allows for students who may have grades that are not As and Bs but do well on the ACT to still receive the Millennium Scholarship.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I grew up with parents who were counselors. They are always frustrated when they do not get to spend time with students. That is what they love to do. Unfortunately, they are tasked to do too many things. It also ties into school safety and having those relationships so that when someone is down emotionally or having mental health issues or they need help getting back on the right track, it is absolutely crucial for counselors to have the relationships. We need to look at ourselves to ensure that they have the resources they need and that the districts have what they need to have those counselors involved in the lives of our children. We also need to make sure that they have a manageable ratio so that they can have these conversations.

Assemblyman Flores:

I want to respond to Mr. Anderson's remarks. I do not think there is any question that our counselors would not love the idea that they could do this every single day at every grade level. I do not question their passion. It is my belief that because I am here now, I am to blame for why this is not working. I am not blaming anyone else. I want to find solutions and offer them. It is not my intent to tell a student what school to go to. It is our intent to tell them what options they have—because often students do not know the pathway to get there—and give them the proper resources to be able to make that decision. For example, I might be thinking about going to a community college. There might be someone telling me that I qualify for the Millennium Scholarship and because of my high GPA, I can receive these other scholarships. Plus, my family is low income and I may qualify for some grants. They might tell me, You can, if you choose to, attend a four-year institution and pay for all of it.

If your concern is money, know that you are going to be okay. Or, If you do not want to leave the state because of money, let me explain to you what your options are. It is my intent to put the roadmap in front of the student and ultimately allow the student to decide. They need to know what their options are. Most students do not know what they are on track to achieve.

Steve Canavero:

We are very grateful for Assemblyman Flores bringing forward a bill that is less than 35 lines in length, does not assign the Superintendent any additional duties, or create a board, commission, or council. I think it is the right thing for students. We have had conversations with the superintendents to work on the testing window for the ACT. The testing window can be moved—the earlier, perhaps, the better—to arm and inform our parents, our children, and the individuals meeting with these students consistent with the bill. The other point I will share in the deliberations of the State Board in selecting the ACT, they were very deliberate in doing so. A lot of the testimony and conversation before they selected the test was ensuring that there was some currency to the college and career ready assessment. In other words, the students take that exam or assessment one time, and they have something that they can work with. They can move forward. The ACT would do that. Another reason is the data from other states that have implemented statewide ACT. They have found thousands of students who would otherwise never consider themselves to be college material suddenly considering themselves to be college material. It is also about expectations and ensuring that our children have those expectations—whether from home, friends, family, or school—and that they are reinforced in this critical year of eleventh grade.

Chair Woodbury:

I am going to call for those who are in support Assembly Bill 374.

Ivet Santiago, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a product of the Clark County School District and a first-generation college graduate. I attained a bachelor of science degree in human services counseling, with a minor in communication studies and a master of arts degree in social work from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. With children and youth being the center of importance in the work I do in the community, I am passionate in helping youth achieve the skills needed in life in order for them to reach their highest potential to be successful. It is why I am here today supporting A.B. 374. I am not a school counselor, yet I have served in an advisory role for many high school students throughout the past 10 years. I am a former director of the Latino Youth Conference—an empowering conference that invites high school juniors and seniors to attend a week-long, full-immersion program that exposes them to college—access skills, leadership training,

professional development workshops, and social networking. It begins a process of forming critical connections to campus student leaders and their organizations. Working with high school students through this program, I have witnessed the struggles many eleventh- and twelfth-grade students face when trying to gain information about what to do in order to prepare for college and begin thinking about their future careers. The circumstances hindering students' transition to college vary and may include the lack of academic preparation, their perception of college cost, and their perception of available opportunities.

Many times I have asked students if they meet with their designated counselors, and often the responses I get are that they are too busy. With no disrespect to the hard-working school counselors, they just do not have the time due to high demands placed on them. I witnessed such demands and lack of time counselors have to spend with students when I served as a student aide for my counselor during my junior and senior years at Ed W. Clark High School. It was because of that opportunity to be an aide that I received the critical information that helped me prepare for college, but not all students have that opportunity. Perhaps partnering with the school social worker or other specialized administrators, or even making this a community partnership, could help with the college and career readiness assessment. I was one of the lucky ones, but students need guidance. They need A.B. 374.

Today, I teach at UNLV. I get numerous students who continue to contact me, asking to meet with me. I have developed what I call "College Prep 101: Ready, Set, Go" in an effort to help students prepare for college. Although I include a tour of UNLV, I do not limit or encourage students to attend UNLV. I also open the window for them to attend other institutions. From high school students to first-year college students, I continue to be appalled and astonished to learn that students continue to struggle through this process. The consequences can be placing students at risk of not graduating from high school or completing their first year of college, which then leads to not completing a four-year degree. If we apply the corrective measures, we can prepare students for success. Under A.B. 374, students will be given the encouragement and support to complete high school and be inspired to continue their educations by applying to and enrolling into college. Not only will college attendance be promoted, but an increase in the interest of attendance at Nevada institutions of higher learning or trade schools.

In closing, the importance of establishing and advocating a college-going culture through activities such as career planning and emphasis on the benefits of higher learning is crucial for student success. It also goes beyond that—it strengthens our economy. Our state, administrators, school district, and—most importantly—our students need A.B. 374.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas in support of A.B. 374? [There was no one.]

Nicole Rourke, Executive Director, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:

We would like to thank Assemblyman Flores for working with us. We initially had some concerns around the timeline because of the availability of the ACT results. We appreciate the amendment very much and the fact that some of our language was accepted. Our counselors work diligently with our students. They annually meet with our students on their academic plans which are created in ninth grade. We have incorporated that plan into Infinite Campus, which is a wonderful system. Students and parents have access to it—both in a mobile phone application and online. They can look up their status at any point in time—for credits, for assessments, and all their academic information within their high school career.

To touch on the point of volunteers—we cannot release information on assessments or grades or anything like that to volunteers because of Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) regulations; however, I do want to let you know that we utilize volunteers on a regular basis to encourage students to come back to school through our Reclaim Your Future program, where we reengage youth who may be behind and are looking to drop out, trying to bring them back and to reset their plan. We also utilize mentors from the community in our Graduate Advocate Program. That is a pathway to graduation and beyond. We have mentors that work with students regularly to talk about completing high school and life beyond high school. We also have our PAYBAC Program: Professionals and Youth Building a Commitment where we bring volunteers into our middle schools to talk about how they achieved success in life. Their success often begins with graduating from high school. They encourage students to do that while they are in middle school, and then going beyond to college and moving forward from there.

We conduct Family Enrichment Day where we bring parents onto a college campus. We teach them how to work with their children academically and to give them information about going to college and engage with the GoToCollegeNevada program to encourage college attendance for our students.

Sylvia Lazos, Vice Chair, Latino Leadership Council:

This issue that Assemblyman Flores and his bill have identified is of supreme importance to Nevada in education. Justifiably, as a Legislature, you have been concentrating on K-12. Early education is where routinely you get the most bang for the buck. This is a low-cost-investment-with-high-returns-type of bill. We in Nevada are number 50 in college graduates and in college-going rates. I like to say that if we focused on how badly higher education is performing in terms of national statistics, we would be putting Chancellor Dan Klaich under the kind of pressure that Pat Skorkowsky experiences every day, and that would be justified. We have to do better in higher education. This is a simple bill that addresses a huge problem. I think that in Nevada we have what is called a mismatch problem. Mismatch means that you are highly qualified and should be going to a university where you will be challenged, where you will graduate promptly, but instead of going to that kind of environment, you go an easier route. You wind up not being challenged, not getting the mentoring or support, and not graduating. What Assemblyman Flores is doing here is encouraging students to make the right choices at the right time. Those of us who are moms and dads of teenagers know that we can lead a teenager to water, but we cannot make him or her drink. This is a structure of helping teenagers, young adults, make the right choices so that eventually they will graduate and help Nevada become more successful in our higher education and have a workforce that is truly productive. We support this bill, and we think that it is going to really help the overall economy. We commend Assemblyman Flores for identifying this issue and posing a commonsense solution we can all support. [The witness submitted prepared text that included additional testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

I want to thank Assemblyman Flores for working with Ms. Rourke and me and clarifying some issues that we had with the bill. As a former high school counselor myself, I met with every one of my students at least once during the year. I had around 600 students at Carson High School. That is an important meeting that you have with the students. I think this bill reemphasizes that. If I am reading *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.205, subsection 3, paragraph (c) correctly, it is the obligation to take those ninth grade plans and to meet with the student each year to personally discuss those plans. This will reemphasize the importance of this. With ACT information, it adds a little more. The timeline did need to be changed because, if my information is correct, students are not taking the ACT until April 24, with the makeup date being May 12. Getting the results back before the end of the school year would be difficult.

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42:

I am here representing my district, but also am proud to be the chair of the Hispanic Legislative Caucus. I want to keep in line with what Mr. Stewart said and not repeat testimony. There were several individuals here today for Latino Lobby Day who wanted to come in support of this bill but had to catch flights back to Las Vegas. This was the number one issue in education today that they wanted to support. I wanted to speak on their behalf and on behalf of our members in this body.

Luis Valera, Vice President for Government Affairs and Diversity Initiatives, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

We are here in support of the bill. My testimony is a little bit more anecdotal than anything else. In response to a number of the concerns raised by transfer students coming over from the College of Southern Nevada, UNLV recently worked with the Nevada System of Higher Education as well as College of Southern Nevada (CSN) to send staff from UNLV to CSN to help with transfer students. The reason was, while credits may transfer, they do not always apply to a major. That was a source of frustration—students were taking courses that transferred but did not necessarily help them along the way towards graduation. In working with students and CSN staff, we were able to streamline greater efficiencies there. This goes to support this legislation in that someone who is prepared and well-informed can better advise students as to whether or not they are taking the relevant courses that will help them graduate in a more efficient manner.

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

Dr. Maria Sheehan, who is president of Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC), was here earlier. Due to time constraints, she had to leave. She asked that I read her testimony into the record ([Exhibit K](#)) into the record, so I beg your indulgence as I honor her request. She has enjoyed a wonderful relationship with the Washoe County School District on behalf of Truckee Meadows Community College and truly sees the benefits of that relationship and the guidance counseling and the additional enhancements that are offered to our students. She states, "TMCC serves more than 11,000 students each semester in the state and has state-supported programs as well as additional students in non-credit, self-funded classes. [Ms. Brooks continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).] Intervening while [students] are in school is the best way to keep them on track to graduation at a level that supports career and college readiness." [Ms. Brooks continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).] "Any intervention in the 11th grade or earlier to provide a pathway to preparation and direction for our students will be beneficial."

Michael Flores, Communications and Government Affairs Director, College of Southern Nevada:

I want to thank Assemblyman Flores for sponsoring this legislation. I know it is late, so we will just echo what everybody else is saying. We are in support of the legislation.

Omar Saucedo, External Affairs Coordinator, Nevada System of Higher Education:

I, too, want to thank Assemblyman Edgar Flores for reaching out to us, bringing this bill forward, and keeping us involved in the communication. We are supportive of any dialogue that encourages students to examine their college readiness before enrolling at one of our institutions of higher education. The Clark County School District, the Washoe County School District, and other school districts across the state are strategic partners. Any endeavor that strengthens and involves our relationship is a benefit to us and to all the students across the state. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).] I also wanted to bring up that Joseph Cline, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education from UNR, was here. He had to leave but left a letter that I will provide for the record ([Exhibit M](#)). I did not have a chance to review the amendment beforehand but reviewed it while here. We are supportive of the amendment. [Returned to reading from prepared testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).]

James Campos, Senior Advisor to the President on Economic and Business Development, Office of the President, Nevada State College:

We are in full support of this bill. We also would like to say that the majority of our students are first-time college seekers. This is a new environment for them and for their families. This sort of help can immensely help their process and their success.

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7:

Ditto. I like this bill.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 374? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I am going to close the hearing on Assembly Bill 374. We will take a short recess [at 6:57 p.m.].

[Also submitted on NELIS but not discussed was a report from the National Center of Higher Education Management Systems, "College-Going Rates of High School Graduates - Directly from High School" ([Exhibit N](#)).]

The Assembly Committee on Education is called back to order [at 7:27 p.m.]. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 349.

**Assembly Bill 349: Revises various provisions relating to education.
(BDR 34-901)**

Assemblyman David M. Gardner, Assembly District No. 9:

This bill is to give teachers more rights. We will tell them what to teach, but they will determine how to teach in their classrooms. I talked with Assemblywoman Diaz. She thinks, and I agree, that we should not do this for all teachers, so we will do this for teachers who are not on probation. That is an amendment that I would consider friendly. I am not working off the bill but off the amendment ([Exhibit O](#)). The intent of the bill is to give teachers freedom in their classrooms. They will still have to follow the standards but will have the ability to teach how they decide is best for their students.

Chair Woodbury:

What prompted you to draft this bill?

Assemblyman Gardner:

I have talked with teachers in Las Vegas who were being given scripts for teaching math. Instead of being able to interact with their students, they were required to read out of a book. I thought that was too much micromanagement.

Assemblyman Hickey:

It seems as if we go back and forth. We want teachers to do specific things, then we tell them that we do not want them to have to do things. What is the response from principals and administrators that you have talked to? On the surface, who does not agree with the spirit of this bill? We all know good teachers are people who know what the standards are and know how to best accomplish them with their students. On the other hand, I am sure that there are directions that principals, administrators, and schools themselves have.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I spoke with the Clark County School District. They asked me what the impetus of the bill was. That was about as far as we got in our discussions. We are still discussing it in case they have any amendments. I would be open to those, if they do have any. As of right now, I have not received any from them.

Assemblyman Hickey:

We hear in the discussion over Common Core State Standards that we are talking about standards and not curriculum. If that is true, then state or local districts are not developing curriculum per se other than guidelines, standards,

and textbooks. If you follow them, you are going along with a certain plan. If we do not apply curriculum as school districts state, then how is it that teachers are being told what to teach and how to teach it? Why is this bill needed?

Assemblyman Gardner:

This will not touch standards or curriculum. Those can still be given to teachers. I will give you an example from when my wife was a teacher. She was trying to teach her class about the layers of the earth. Her students were having a hard time understanding the concept. She went to a website and bought a lesson plan from another teacher. One of the ideas she found was making a dessert with pudding, Oreo cookies, and other ingredients to show the layers. It was put in clear plastic cups so that the students could see the layers. Her students finally understood the concept. She was written up by her principal for doing that. They told her that was far below her students' grade level. They did not care that the illustration actually worked, that she was teaching her students in a way they understood. She had not followed what they had prescribed. That is why this bill is needed. We want teachers to use their education. We want them to have this ability.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Do you see this bill presenting any problems? I think your example is one we all agree with. I do not think her principal was necessarily correct if it worked. Could a consequence of this bill be that teachers might say that because of this law their supervisors cannot critique them? Could this make things grayer, rather than clearer?

Assemblyman Gardner:

That is not the intent of the bill. Teachers would still have to be graded under the evaluation system when it comes out, under the four different levels. You would still have to go through all that. The idea is just to give them freedom in deciding how they are going to be teaching to their students, allowing them to use all the education and child psychology courses they took in college.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I think the intent of the bill is very good. I would make one change. In big high schools the vice principals are usually over two or three departments. I would encourage you to put the principal or vice principal in the wording so that the work could be divided up.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I appreciate your validating teachers as professionals. We do go to school to teach and to create lesson plans that are engaging. It is not until we get into the classrooms that we are told otherwise. There are schools that adopt certain programs for a specific purpose. When Edison Learning came on board, they had a very scripted program in order to turn around the school because the achievement levels were not where they were supposed to be. Freedom and flexibility were taken away; we had to follow Success for All (SFA) for reading instruction, we had to follow Everyday Mathematics for math instruction. What if there is a school whose model says we need to implement this curriculum—how does this fit in with your bill?

Assemblyman Gardner:

Maybe we can put in an amendment that says, "except for when the school has a specific plan." I know that in Title I schools they do things like that—there is a certain script they want you to go through. I would be amenable to such an amendment if it could fix that.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

When I see that teachers would have total discretion to instruct the course how they prefer, I picture very young and idealistic or ambitious teachers who might have a great idea that they think would work for teaching students. We all know that part of the reason that teachers go to college and specialize in a certain area is that there are best practices in how to teach children. There are multiple best practices in how to teach certain difficult concepts, and there are grade-appropriate ways to teach children. My concern is that a teacher would have total leeway to experiment on our children for however long until it was discovered that those children were not testing at the correct reading level. The teacher might think that they do not need to read books and have a crazy idea of how they want to teach. I am sure you considered that when you were thinking about this bill. Where do best practices fit in and how do you make sure teachers are not just experimenting on our children?

Assemblyman Gardner:

That is actually kind of the idea behind this. I noticed that the teachers I talked with were not allowed to do some of the best practices. There were things they had learned in college or that they were finding in studies that said these were better ways to teach, but they were not being allowed to use those because the principals or the school districts did not appreciate them. I was hoping that we would allow these teachers who went through so much education, who are professionals, to have this kind of leeway. An example I use is that I am an attorney. If someone tried to micromanage me as much as we have tried to micromanage teachers, I would have a lot of issues with that.

Not many of us are educators, so it seems strange to me that we as legislators are trying to tell teachers how to teach when we do not have that kind of training ourselves. This is supposed to free that up. If this language does not get us there, I am happy to make any amendments that would satisfy your concerns.

Assemblyman Munford:

It seems like we are taking the joy that comes from being innovative and creative out of teaching. Today I was talking with my colleague, Assemblyman Stewart—another former teacher—about teaching itself. You feel encouraged when you as a teacher accomplish something or contribute something and the students get excited about what you are doing. It is great for enthusiasm and morale. The biggest problem that I have observed in teachers is a lack of morale. The biggest morale-builder in the school is the principal. The principal is like the head coach on an athletic team. He or she keeps everybody feeling like they are contributing to the success of the team, to the success of the school—it is up to the principal to convey that to the teachers. As a teacher, you feel good when you go home in the evening after you have done something that the students joined in on and became part of. Teaching is still an individual thing. You have got to leave teaching up to the teacher, not take it from him. The teacher is the number one component in this entire equation.

Assemblyman Gardner:

The original draft did not come out the way it should have, but the amendment comes out clearly. The whole point of it is trying to give teachers the ability to do exactly what you are talking about—using their creativity and innovation to get through to students who may not be able to be reached right now. The teachers I have met tend to feel micromanaged. I know that not all teachers feel that way, but many feel micromanaged by their principals. This bill would give them the freedom to do exactly what you were talking about.

Assemblyman Munford:

When I look at this amendment, it has some merit to it. It gives a little bit back to the teachers.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I agree. I think we are not trusting our teachers enough to give them the freedom to know how to work with their students. That does not benefit our students but also does not make for a very rewarding job for our teachers. My only concern as I look at this is that a teacher could say that the class will be reading from a certain religious document because they feel that is the best way forward. I do not see that this amendment would constrain that as long as

it is tied to the standards and gets the class to the appropriate reading level. That could set up a lot of issues. How would that be dealt with in this?

Assemblyman Gardner:

Teachers would be beholden to all the rules they currently are. For example, they could not use something completely inappropriate for a five-year-old just because they felt like it. They would still have to follow decorum and other rules that teachers already have. This would just allow them leeway within in lesson planning, not allowing them to go off and say, "Today, class, we are going to learn counting. I am going to use a shotgun and we are going to shoot apples and see how many shells you can count." It is not meant to do something like that. It is supposed to give them leeway in the classroom so that they can teach the best way.

Assemblywoman Swank:

If a teacher wanted to teach second grade reading through this religious document, is there recourse? Does this give permission to do that? I looked up the specific statute it refers to and I do not see where that would be limited. I want to give our teachers much more freedom in the classroom, but I want to make sure that we are not going to be leaving some students feeling as if they are being taught other lessons than just learning to read.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I do not believe it says it specifically; I think that would be covered through the other regulations and rules for teachers. I could add that to the section.

Assemblyman Edwards:

It seems as if we are pushing aside the school board, the school district, the principals, and any other kinds of supervisors, jumping through multiple layers of the chain of command to tell how a classroom will be run. Should this be directed at a school board to tell them to make sure that there is freedom and flexibility in the classroom? Are they not the better target to go after? They could be told, "You are not making sure that this part of the teaching experience is being done; it is your job to set the policies so that it is done correctly." We are dealing with bad management and leadership at the local level, but we are jumping through that without correcting it. By doing so, do we take away the accountability and responsibility of the principals, school districts, and school boards? They will simply turn around and say, "You guys at the state Legislature said they can do whatever they want in the classrooms. It is not my fault that everyone is failing." This is a problem that is unexpected but likely to happen.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I would argue that I am not taking them out. They are still going to be able to set the standards and the curriculum, telling the teachers what they need to teach.

Assemblyman Edwards:

You are taking away managers' ability to manage in their schools. You are taking away the leadership of the principal and the policymaking of the school board.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I would say that we would be taking away their ability to micromanage the teachers. I do not think you would find in many of the studies of effective teaching that any of those top-down kinds of management have worked where they have been tried.

Assemblyman Edwards:

There are no parameters here that specify just how far they can go; therefore, anything goes. I also am saying that this is really the policy that should be made at the school board or at the school district level, rather than at the state Legislature. We are jumping past all of them, pushing aside all those other layers, and telling them how they can or cannot operate within the classroom itself. This would just be one example of the state Legislature coming down through all of that, reaching into the classroom to set this policy which would set a precedent that we should do that all the time. We already have other people and other organizations that are responsible to do this.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I would say that we do that all the time right now. Think about our antibullying bills. We have enacted a lot of laws that reach right into the classroom. We passed three or four this session out of this Committee alone.

Assemblyman Edwards:

That does not make it right.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I am not saying it is always right. I am saying there are ideas sometimes that work. As far as a possible amendment saying we will direct the school district to provide that teachers have this kind of flexibility—I would be okay amending it to that. The idea is to give teachers the ability to use their training. They went through a lot of school and have a lot of training. Let us let them use that.

Assemblyman Edwards:

I am all for that. I just think it should come down through the right organization. I do not think the state Legislature should be so intricately involved in the classroom on something that is as basic as the teaching experience like this. I think we are getting out of our swim lane here. I think we need to have it done but have it done through the school board or the school district. Otherwise, teachers are going to keep coming to us for every little thing that comes along. If you want to be here in session until midnight every night five days a week, we can do that. I do not think that is the goal of the state Legislature.

Assemblyman Gardner:

I was already on the Assembly Committee on Judiciary subcommittee on homeowners' associations, so I already know about that. I understand your point. I would be happy to have the school district implement the regulations.

Chair Woodbury:

Committee, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone here in support of Assembly Bill 349? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wants to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 349? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 349 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 321.

Assembly Bill 321: Clarifies that the jurisdiction of school police officers extends to all charter school property, buildings and facilities.
(BDR 34-925)

Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus, Assembly District No. 29:

Thank you for letting me introduce Assembly Bill 321. I will make my presentation as concise as humanly possible. Along with me are Patrick Gavin, the Director of State Public Charter School Authority, and Craig Stevens with Clark County School District. It has been my pleasure to work with them on putting together this bill. When Mr. Gavin and I first spoke several months ago, I was shocked to find out that we had schools that were unable to get police response to some rather serious events. As it stands presently, we have public charter schools that cannot get a police response for incidents on campus. This is an incredible safety concern for students, parents, and staff alike.

Assembly Bill 321 clarifies that services of school police officers can extend to all public school property, buildings, and facilities including public charter schools. Today we look to bring attention to this issue. Although A.B. 321 may not be the ultimate fix, it is my hope that it will start the discussion on this important issue and create at least a partial remedy until we can find a permanent solution. With that, if I may, I will ask Mr. Gavin to give you a brief firsthand description of the problem.

Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority:

To echo Mr. Silberkraus' comment, this is not the ultimate solution but an immediate solution to a pressing issue. In my brief tenure as head of the State Public Charter School Authority—I joined the Authority about seven months ago—I am aware of at least three separate instances in both Reno and in Clark County when schools have called me directly because they had situations where a student had made a violent threat, or there were other serious concerns that the principal believed warranted police involvement and they could not get a response. There was one incident that was particularly vexing for me. I shared it with Mr. Silberkraus because it happened at a school in Washoe County shortly before my first conversation with him. A grandparent of a student informed the principal that he would not be sending his grandchild to school that day because the day before, a student had threatened to rape him in the school bathroom. In my view, that is a terroristic threat. In most states it is definitely the kind of thing that warrants a police response, investigation, and possibly a referral to the Division of Child and Family Services depending upon the age of the child and other circumstances. It certainly warrants some kind of official response. It is not something that a school with 10 to 13 staff members is well equipped to handle. This is not an incident of schoolyard bullying or name-calling. That is a serious criminal act, a terroristic threat. It was deeply disturbing for me to learn that the principal called the county and then the school police. Neither chose to respond, each saying it was the jurisdiction of the other. My concern, and the reason that I feel this bill is critical, is that someone needs to show up in cases where the adults have serious concerns about violent or criminal activity.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

We have a conceptual amendment on the bill ([Exhibit P](#)). After working with the Clark County School District, we will be changing the language as it reads now to state that a local school district that has a school police force will, upon request, provide police services to other public K-12 schools at cost. This request must be made between January 1 and March 15 for services to be

provided in the upcoming school year and must be for a term of no less than three years. With that, I thank you for your time. I thank the parties for working with me to craft something that was workable for everyone. We are available for questions.

Craig M. Stevens, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:

Our participation was making sure that, first of all, if a request came, we had the time to budget for additional police officers. That is the reason for the January 1 to March 15 deadline. The second thing regards the three-year contract. If it were a one-year contract, we would have to hire the police officers and then let them go the next year. It is difficult to find police officers who would be willing to do that. We wanted to make sure there was some job stability within our workforce. We are happy to help the charter schools and to provide this service. We want to make sure that we are easily able to plan for this.

Assemblyman Edwards:

What is the daily workload for your police? How available would they be to respond to calls from charter schools?

Craig Stevens:

We have just over 150 police officers for the Clark County School District; however, we would not be taking police protection away from the schools we currently have. The reason for this amendment is so that we can adequately plan, so that we can hire staff to do that. Our hope is that the charter schools can come together to say what they need, so that we can formulate a plan to protect our schools as well as theirs.

Assemblyman Edwards:

Do you make your contracts one year with additional option years that automatically follow, or do you have to renegotiate contracts every year?

Craig Stevens:

I am sorry. I do not know the answer to that, but I can get that information for you.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Student safety is of utmost importance. We need to do whatever we can to make sure that all of our schools have first responders whenever they are needed. How are we with manpower with the Clark County School District police?

Craig Stevens:

We have adequate response and ability. We have strategic plans in how we put this all together and have had several bills to help with those. With the funding that we have, out of our State Distributive School Account (DSA), we have made plans to ensure we always have someone available should a response be called for. Some schools have officers there all the time. At others, they make their rounds. We have adequate coverage for our schools, but adding the number of schools we could add means we would need to plan for that.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

How many charter schools would be added to the number of schools you cover now?

Patrick Gavin:

Clark County currently sponsors seven charter schools. We sponsor 17 or so charter schools in Clark County which operate somewhere around 32 campuses. There are schools such as Doral Academies of Las Vegas, which will have three campuses this fall. This could be upwards of 40 schools that might take advantage of this service. They would not be required to. They may well choose to use some other avenue. It is worth noting as well that this is an area where the level of response varies depending on whether you are in an unincorporated area or in an incorporated area. We have schools in Henderson where the Henderson Police Department is delighted to show up at no cost to the school. We also know there are schools where there are particular relationships with the local police precincts and they choose to show up. There are other schools, particularly in unincorporated areas, where this seems to be more of a challenge. There is an equity issue here, but I do not know that it is one we are in a position to solve this evening. This is at least an attempt to provide a solution.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

In your opinion, would school police be better equipped, since they probably deal with a lot of these issues that they will encounter, or do you think the local police that are offering the help right now are addressing the problems? Is there an advantage to using Clark County School District police over other law enforcement agencies?

Patrick Gavin:

If I were a parent and I found out that my school has to pay a certain amount of the DSA for what I would consider to be a basic service, I might object to that. The fact remains that Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) determines what its jurisdiction is in this area, apparently. That is not

something that we as an agency or that the school system as an agency can influence. Metro's view is that this is purely within the purview of schools, regardless of the level of severity. This is an attempt to at least address those things. I would assume that most schools will use this in cases when they feel that it is absolutely necessary. I do not know many schools that want to call the police into their buildings on a regular basis if they can help it. Most schools that we work with and most of the ones in Clark County's charter portfolio have strong enough instructional leadership cultures in place that misbehavior is less of an issue than it might be in some larger, more comprehensive buildings.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 321?

Kimberly Regan, Executive Director, Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School:

I am the executive director for the Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School (SNACS) and SNACS Preschool and the president of the Nevada Association for the Education of Young Children. I am also a parent of children who attend SNACS. Today I am here to speak on behalf of Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School. We are sponsored by the Washoe County School District (WCSD). We are Nevada's first K-8 charter school. I served on the founding committee and have served at the school since. In fact, I am the longest-running charter school administrator in the state, with 16-plus years. Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School is one of Nevada's four-star schools. We serve nearly 300 students with a 76 percent at-risk population, based on state definition. We are located in the north valleys of Reno.

We have a unique situation. We are located in the back end of a strip mall on the corner of Stead and Lear Boulevards, which is a very busy corner. On one side of us, there is a bar within walking distance and a gas station. On the other side are apartments. Our charter school board has put over \$100,000 into perimeter fencing, installing surveillance cameras, and acquiring closed-circuit radios so that we could do everything on our end to ensure school safety.

Each year, WCSD-sponsored charter schools and administrators participate in quarterly technical support meetings with the charter school liaison and any other necessary representatives from different departments. It seems like requesting school police services and proposing options for acquiring those services is becoming a yearly ritual. In the past, we have been told that we, as charter school administrators and governing boards, would need to hire—either individually or as a consortium of schools—a school police officer and purchase a police car in order to get those services. Given the unique facilities in which

we are located, facility-related expenses, lack of access to public school bonds and other programs, charter schools already serve students at a deficit when compared to traditional public school funding. That makes funding a challenge for us. We have proposed an on-call charge where we would incur fees per service so that we could access services when it is absolutely necessary and a safety threat to our student population. We have been denied year after year. During our 2014-2015 annual meeting with the WCSD Chief of Police, Jason Trevino said the conversation has not changed from their end and that it would "take an act of the legislature" for them to consider providing services to charter schools. I am hopeful to be here today to provide testimony and to plead that this amendment be approved.

During the evolution of charter schools in Nevada there have been, on rare occasions, less than a handful of situations where we have had support from our school police. One of the scariest moments as a school administrator occurred a few years ago during our dismissal. Part of our initial zoning requirement included a plan for dismissal to ensure students are dismissed in a safe and orderly manner and to ensure that traffic does not back up onto Lear Boulevard. We established a procedure where walkers are dismissed, then we have parents pulling into a circle format. Using walkie-talkies, we call students out individually, making sure we load each in the car with their family member that is picking them up. As we were about to dismiss students, a parent came in and told us that there was an altercation outside of our gates. I went out to see what was happening and heard someone shout multiple times, "What? You have a gun? Go ahead and shoot me." We went into immediate lockdown and called 911. Students were safe within their classrooms; however, families were still arriving, cars were inside of our gates and could not exit. I had fathers who were going to our property lines to posture to take care of this situation themselves since school police were not there. It was a nightmare. Family members refused to come inside. They wanted to remain outside and make sure their students were safe. I had to focus on the students at that point after attempting to get family members to come inside. After 20 minutes, I called the Reno Police Department three times. They were on another call and could not respond. I hopelessly called WCSD police and begged them for help. Then Chief Mike Mieras happened to be working in the area of the school and personally responded within minutes. I cannot explain the relief that I felt when I saw him and knew that the situation was under control. The Reno Police Department did arrive and were not even going to arrest the folks that were involved in the physical fight. They did not seem to care about accusations that were being made about having a gun and the threats of a shooting taking place. The chief had them arrested and taken into custody.

We do not have incidents every day; they are occasional, but when they occur in the area we need to know about them. Communication breakdown with our local agencies has occurred on multiple occasions. We often find out about incidents in the area by happenstance, parents calling, or hearing the helicopters circling above us. We have had incidents where parents are calling our office and asking if we are in lockdown because the school that is less than a mile away is in lockdown. We call Reno dispatch to determine the level of threat in order to determine our own safety protocols. Sometimes dispatch is unable to provide us with information. For whatever reason, this school year we have had an increase of incidents in the Stead area. During non-school hours, we have had an increase in gang-related activities and violence. In fact, the Reno Police Department reviewed our surveillance cameras in an attempt to collect video on two suspects that were involved in a shotgun armed robbery at the neighboring gas station at 10 p.m. the night before. The gas station is about 100 feet from our school doors. Additionally, we have nine millimeter bullet holes in our back playground where individuals have used our school playground for target practice or whatever else they deemed necessary. We have requested school police come and provide technical assistance in establishing increased safety protocols for our playground. We have had no help for over a year.

We had two incidents occur within ten days of each other. First, our education director happened to be at the gas station getting coffee when he walked into the middle of a pursuit of robbery suspects. A chase began at the gas station which is on one side of the school and ended at the apartments which are at the other side of our gates. This resulted in a standoff between Reno Police Department and the suspects where guns were drawn. It happened to be that we observed the situation and went immediately into lockdown. Many of our classrooms have glass walls from ceiling to floor. We had to move students to the other side. While the incident did end peacefully, meaning no shots were fired, one of the suspects was arrested while the other was reportedly hunkered down in the neighborhood, according to what the policemen told us. Students remained in lockdown while 15-plus police cars were outside our school gates and helicopters hovered, looking for the suspect. The Reno Police Department then informed school administrators that we could remove the lockdown, even though there was another suspect at-large. I called WCSD police for assistance and they were not able to send anyone to provide information, as that was a liability. Instead, I was referred to contact a school safety person's cell phone, where I was sent to voicemail. I called our charter liaison, Stacey Cooper, who kept me on her cell phone as she walked to the school police office and facilitated a conversation to assist in the lockdown procedures regarding when and how we would be able to lift the lockdown. Then she walked to the communications office where she had them assist me in drafting

a message to our families to inform them of the incident and to reassure them that it was not anything related to the school, it just happened to be near the school grounds. We appreciate her advocacy and support but just wish it were not so difficult to get help to ensure school safety. Of course, she is being reassigned within the school district, so we will no longer have access to her direct support in the future. We have had seven charter school liaisons and seven superintendents, so the rules keep changing from year to year. We have to have the same conversations, asking for the same services again and again.

The final incident I will describe took place within 10 days of the incident I just described. Most of the school was on a field trip to see a play performance at the Nugget. Several students, staff, and the entire preschool were present. This happened to be the same day that there was a shooting outside of the High Desert Montessori School on Silverado Boulevard, another charter school sponsored by the school district. I cannot directly represent them, but I can convey that principal Tammie Stockton reported her administrative staff person was outside when she noticed bizarre behavior among several suspects. She called 911 to report it. While she was calling them, she heard shots. The school was immediately put on lockdown and the suspects fled. Principal Stockton reportedly called WCSD police for information and support, which she was directly denied. Consequently, the suspects drove to Stead and pulled into our driveway, where Reno Police Department apprehended them with shotguns drawn. Our staff was not notified by Reno dispatch or by the school district that there was a problem and had no idea what was happening. They looked out their window by happenstance and saw shotguns drawn. Our protocol was to go into lockdown.

We are grateful when the police address issues when they occur. It is a challenge to face families every day and tell them that their children are safe. We as a school ensure that we do everything we can, but we believe we deserve the right to provide our children with a learning environment where they are safe and have access to the same police services that the school down the street has. We should not have to ask twice for that, much less wait years for that.

Two weeks after that incident, Tammie Stockton and I met with WCSD liaison Stacey Cooper, Reno Police Department Lieutenant Robert Larson, and WCSD Chief Jason Trevino to debrief that situation and discuss options to increase communication and school safety. The lieutenant recognized several challenges and has since pursued completing a map of the local charter schools with their respective grade levels and populations. He has also been working on a school safety protocol for charter schools to gain access to emergency procedures. Chief Trevino reported that he wanted to work with charter schools but there

were liability issues since it is not written in legislation. He committed to put any Washoe County charter school administrators who called with an emergency through to an officer who would remain on the line and try to provide communication between Reno dispatch and the principal that was on the phone so that at least we had confidence in knowing that we had access to the information of what was occurring in the situation.

These are steps in the right direction; however, lack of police assistance or response when it would involve the direct safety of an individual person or an entire school community is unacceptable. We need to work together as an entire community to ensure all Nevada students, their families, and our educators are safe when they are at school. These issues continue to present a threat to the school community. Fear and lack of presence can inhibit instruction and student learning. We are a four-star school, and we do not want that to change. I do not want school safety to affect the achievement my students and teachers have worked so hard to provide.

This is 2015. We should not be victims of circumstance. This can be prevented or diminished through our cooperative efforts which are paid for by the public. As SNACS, we have invested over \$100,000. I personally have taken Krav Maga self-defense classes and keep pepper spray and a stick-like baton in my office for safety precautions. I have considered getting a bullet proof vest because I may be the first responder if there is a situation that occurs. This is unacceptable. I do not understand why we would not work together as a community to ensure the safety of all students and our school communities and to provide everyone with school police services. Anything less is unacceptable. Families should be able to choose charter schools based on their unique models and curricular opportunities that meet families' educational needs. In doing so, they should have access to and be ensured the same level of school safety as traditional schools. Thank you for listening to my testimony. I appreciate your support in the passage of A.B. 321.

I read the conceptual amendment proposed by the Clark County School District. While I understand the need to plan, I do not think we have a day to waste when it comes to the safety of any student. I do not know how WCSD is equipped to provide police services. They have eight charter schools. It is not every day that we need help, but when we do need that help, we need people to be able to respond to us and ensure our staff, students, and families are safe. I do not think waiting until the fall of 2016 will make as much of a difference as it could if there is an incident tomorrow. I also believe the cost associated

should be reasonable and based on the level of need of a specific service. It is public money, so it should be just an access issue, something we are allowed to acquire. If we do have to pay for it, I am willing to do that if that is what it takes to ensure student safety and to be able to pick up the phone and say, I need help—please help me.

Kaiden Regan, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a sixth-grade student at Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School. I do feel safe at school, but there are some times when there are police outside of our gates and we do not know what is happening. The students are not allowed to have that information. For example, we have had times where we see police handling some kind of situation near the fences of our school grounds. We have had a few times where we have been in lockdown because of something happening. Once we had to move our classroom during an incident because all of our windows are glass and police were handling something in the apartments near us. Unfortunately, there are people in the world that do unpredictable things. I have a younger brother and sister that go to my school. I want to make sure that they are safe under the protection of school police. I think it is all of our responsibility to ensure all charter and traditional schools are safe. We should be able to have school police protecting us like they do in other schools. The students in the school down the street have more police services than we do. That does not seem safe. In closing, I want to ensure my friends, family, and teachers are always safe at school so that we can learn and do our best to prepare for college.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 321? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Assemblyman Silberkraus, do you have any closing remarks?

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

Thank you very much to everybody who has worked on this. We started with some friction but were able to come to something that will work in the interim until we can find a lasting solution. I look forward to your support in moving this forward and helping to protect our children.

Chair Woodbury:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 321.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 321.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I would ask to be included as a cosponsor of this bill.

Chair Woodbury:

I have a motion from Assemblyman Anderson to amend and do pass. Is the only amendment the Clark County School District amendment that you worked on together?

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

It is a conceptual amendment, so we will get that codified and done with the Legislative Counsel Bureau. It is including theirs, but is a second one.

Chair Woodbury:

We have a motion to amend and do pass with the conceptual amendments.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Armstrong:

I agree with the testimony that 2016 might be too late for implementing this. Could this go into effect sooner? I think it is a concern to leave those students unprotected for any amount of time.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

I agree with you. I will get with the parties and see if we can come up with a solution for this upcoming year, and then move forward.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

That was my concern as well in hearing this testimony. I know that Clark County has to budget for it. I know there are other moving pieces to it, but if we could get it sooner rather than later, I think it would be beneficial to everyone, especially our children.

Chair Woodbury:

Assemblyman Armstrong, were you concerned because of the date by which the request has to be made?

Assemblyman Armstrong:

I was led to believe by testimony that this would go into effect the fall of 2016. If I have misspoken on that, I would love to be corrected.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

The way it is structured, the window to request school police services from Clark County School District would be January 1 to March 15. We will have to come up with something to expedite this for the coming year.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

We could move this now and Assemblyman Silberkraus could work on an amendment for the floor. Would Assemblyman Armstrong and Assemblywoman Diaz be amenable to that? The faster we can get this moving the better, in light of the testimony we have heard.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

Thank you, Assemblyman Anderson. We will get right on that. I will be sure to give you the paperwork to add you as a sponsor of this bill.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Woodbury:

Assemblyman Silberkraus will take the floor statement.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 374.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Flores will make the floor statement.

We will move into our work session. I need to remove Assembly Bill 26 and Assembly Bill 421 off of work session for today because they both still need a little bit more work.

Assembly Bill 218: Revises provisions relating to emergencies in schools.
(BDR 34-666)

H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 218 requires the board of trustees of each school district and the governing body of each charter school to consult with the Division of Emergency Management of the Department of Public Safety in schools before designing, constructing, or remodeling buildings.

[Reviewed work session document ([Exhibit Q](#)).] Madam Chair, do you want me to go through all these amendments?

Chair Woodbury:

Everything under number one was in Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's original presentation. I have a question about Russell Hunter's proposed amendments (a) and (b). I know that the sponsor had expressed that she did not want to include (a) at this time but was fine with (b). I am unsure if it is already in her mock-up.

Pepper Sturm:

I think on the last page of her mock-up, item (e) talks about the procedure for the school for a lockdown. It would also assist pupils and staff with the lockdown procedure. Under (e) it does not address evacuations. Mr. Hunter's testimony concerned evacuating a disabled employee from the school.

Chair Woodbury:

Would the change, if adopted, add evacuation?

Pepper Sturm:

That is correct.

Chair Woodbury:

It looks as if everything is in the mock-up unless we want to add that provision that adds assistance with evacuation.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 218.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will ask Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson to make the floor statement.

Assembly Bill 226: Revises provisions for the payment of certain undergraduate fees and expenses of a dependent child of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty. (BDR 34-1010)

H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 226 was sponsored by Assemblywoman Carlton and others. We heard this on March 16.

This measure expands provisions requiring the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education to pay the undergraduate fees, expenses for textbooks, and other course materials for certain dependent children in the school system. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit R](#)).]

The bill requires the system pay these expenses for a dependent child of a public employee who was killed at work, in addition to the existing requirement that applies to the dependent child of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty.

There is a conceptual amendment that clarifies for public employees that "killed in the performance of his or her duties" apply the provisions of the bill to a public employee in the same manner as it applies to a public safety officer. Additionally, definitions are provided to specify that the provisions of the section also apply to persons in the bill that die as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty or in the performance of his or her duties.

Chair Woodbury:

Do I have a motion to amend and do pass?

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 226.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will ask Assemblywoman Carlton to make the floor statement.

**Assembly Bill 234: Enacts provisions related to multicultural education.
(BDR 34-102)**

H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst:

The last bill tonight is Assembly Bill 234. This bill was sponsored by Assemblyman Munford.

Assembly Bill 234 requires the State Board of Education to adopt a program of multicultural education and specifies the boards of trustees for each school district ensure the program is provided to pupils in second through twelfth grades. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit S](#)).]

Further, a teacher renewing his or her license must submit proof of completion of a course in multicultural education, unless the teacher has previously completed and documented such a course. Finally, the measure requires the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to adopt regulations establishing the multicultural course content and credit requirements a teacher must complete to comply with this requirement.

Chair Woodbury requested a conceptual amendment incorporating a number of proposals discussed, including in summary amending the bill to:

1. Require the State Board to ensure the state's social study standards include content pertaining to multicultural education, including the contributions made by men and women from various racial and ethnic backgrounds.
2. Require school districts and charter school governing bodies to ensure those content and performance standards are included in the relevant curriculum, and to consult with members of the community in which the school district or charter school is located from various racial and ethnic backgrounds in developing the curriculum for these courses of study.
3. Require a teacher who submits an application for an initial license for employment to teach during the 2015-2016 school year, and those applying for an initial license thereafter, to submit proof of completion of a course in multicultural education.
4. Retain the provisions of section 2, requiring the teacher licensure commission adopt regulations concerning the content of a course in multicultural education and the number of credits to be earned from such a course.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 234.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Woodbury:

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Joiner:

I wish I had had the opportunity to sign on for this. If it is okay with the sponsor, I would like to be added as a cosponsor.

Chair Woodbury:

Assemblyman Munford, Assemblywoman Joiner would like to have her name added to the bill. Is that okay?

Assemblyman Munford:

Of course.

Chair Woodbury:

If it is all right with everyone, the motion would be to amend and do pass including adding Assemblywoman Joiner's name as a cosponsor.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Munford will give the floor statement.

Assemblyman Stewart:

On amendment number 3, are we giving teachers any time to complete that class? It sounds as if they have to complete it before they start teaching.

Chair Woodbury:

The discussion was to complete the class before their first renewal. Can we go back and add that in?

Assemblyman Munford:

I think the undergraduate transcripts would show that they had taken courses in multicultural studies.

Chair Woodbury:

That would count. Let us say they transferred from another state or another school—could they have until their first renewal to get it done?

Assemblyman Munford:

That is correct.

Chair Woodbury:

We voted on the conceptual amendments so this is covered. We are adjourned [at 8:34 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joan Waldock
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Assembly Committee on Education

Date: April 8, 2015

Time of Meeting: 3:23 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 378	C	Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling	Proposed conceptual amendment
A.B. 378	D	Matthew M. Chingos, Brookings Institution	Policy Retrospectives
A.B. 378	E	Matthew M. Chingos, Brookings Institution	PowerPoint presentation
A.B. 378	F	Matthew M. Chingos, Brookings Institution	Handout: "The False Promise of Class-Size Reduction"
A.B. 378	G	Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., Nevada State Education Association	Letter in opposition
A.B. 378	H	Tina M. Leiss, Public Employees' Retirement System	Written testimony
A.B. 374	I	Assemblyman Edgar Flores	Mock-up of proposed amendment
A.B. 374	J	Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council	Letter of support
A.B. 374	K	Maria Sheehan, Truckee Meadows Community College	Written testimony
A.B. 374	L	Omar Saucedo, Nevada System of Higher Education	Written testimony
A.B. 374	M	Joseph I. Cline, University of Nevada, Reno	Written testimony
A.B. 374	N	Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council	National Center for Higher Education Management Systems Report
A.B. 349	O	Assemblyman David M. Gardner	Proposed amendment

Assembly Committee on Education

April 8, 2015

Page 71

A.B. 321	P	Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus	Proposed conceptual amendment
A.B. 218	Q	H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 226	R	H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 234	S	H. Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document