MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Seventy-Eighth Session
April 22, 2015

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Melissa Woodbury at 3:19 p.m. on Wednesday, April 22, 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 Victoria A. Dooling
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblyman David M. Gardner
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz (excused)
Assemblywoman Shelly M. Shelton (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Scott T. Hammond, Senate District No. 18

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority
John Sande IV, representing Academica Nevada, Henderson, Nevada
Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County
Carlos McDade, General Counsel, Clark County School District
Joseph Legat, Coordinator III, Office of Student Adjudication, Clark County School District
Stephanie Heying, Court Service Analyst, Administrative Office of the Courts
Regan Comis, representing M + R Strategic Services, Washington, D.C.
Mike McLamore, Education and Public Policy Specialist, Nevada State Education Association
Dale A.R. Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Nicole Rourke, Executive Director, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District
Dawn Miller, Member At Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association
Tim Shestek, Senior Director, State Affairs, Western Region, American Chemistry Council, Sacramento, California
Christopher B. Smith, Chief, Office of Homeland Security, Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety
Samuel P. McMullen, representing Touro University Nevada, Henderson, Nevada
Kelly D. Wuest, Administrator, Commission on Postsecondary Education
Shelley Berkley, Chief Executive Officer and Senior Provost, Touro University Nevada, Henderson, Nevada
Philip Tompkins, Dean of Students, Division of Student Affairs, Touro University Nevada, Henderson, Nevada

Chair Woodbury:
[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 200 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 200 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to enrollment of pupils in charter schools. (BDR 34-183)

Senator Scott T. Hammond, Senate District No. 18:
I would like to explain what the bill does and then discuss the rationale behind the changes.

Under existing law, a charter school may enroll certain children before enrolling children who are otherwise eligible for enrollment. These include the children of an employee of the charter school, a member of the committee to form the charter school, and a member of the governing body of the charter school. This bill authorizes a charter school located on a military installation to give the same enrollment preferences to the children of those who reside in or work on the federal military installation. It is another preference that is given to either those military personnel who might be stationed there or contractors who work at the military installation. Their children would go on a preference list and be at the head of the line.

Why would I want something like this? Last year I was approached by representatives of Nellis Air Force Base who requested a change to existing statute regarding a charter school enrollment preference for schools on base. Currently there is a public school on Nellis Air Force Base; however, it may be replaced with a charter school. From what I understand, it looks even more likely because I think they have chosen a particular charter. Under existing law, if the school at Nellis becomes a charter school, there is no guarantee that the children of people who live or work on the base would be able to enroll. This bill ensures that a charter school on Nellis, or any other military installation in Nevada, must give preference to the children of parents who live or work there.

This is not merely a hypothetical situation. A very similar situation or scenario has already occurred in Arizona. We are taking steps to ensure that those who serve our country are not unduly burdened by having to take their children off base for school.

I urge your support of Senate Bill 200 (1st Reprint) to ensure that military families have enrollment preference for on-base charter schools.

Assemblyman Armstrong:
As a cosponsor, I thought this was a really great bill, and I commend Senator Hammond for bringing it forward.

Chair Woodbury:
Seeing no more questions, I will ask for anyone in support of S.B. 200 (R1) to come up.

Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority:
We want to express our strong support for this legislation. Having worked on founding charter schools on military bases in other states in the country, I would like to emphasize the critical importance of this particular provision. I was involved with the founding of the first charter school on a military base in Louisiana in the early 2000s. That school was scheduled to open shortly after 9/11 and, as a result, had to make significant changes to its enrollment because of the changing security environment on base after the attacks, which created concerns for some families who would have otherwise been able to attend the school. Given the uncertain nature of our national security interests in the future, it is critically important that there be a mechanism in place to allow for the preferences for military-connected children on such bases—to ensure that those children are able to receive the services that are necessary for them to be able to thrive in a changing world.

John Sande IV, representing Academica Nevada, Henderson, Nevada:
We want to echo what Mr. Gavin has said and offer our support for this piece of legislation. We think it will allow good outcomes on the military bases.

Assemblyman Stewart:
This would apply to civilian personnel, contractors, and other civilian employees working on the base as well as military employees, is that correct?

Patrick Gavin:
I believe that to be the case, but I will defer to counsel on that.

Assemblyman Stewart:
Senator Hammond, is that correct?

Senator Hammond:
Yes, it is.

Assemblywoman Joiner:
It seems that originally charter schools were in addition to our neighborhood schools. If they start converting our neighborhood schools, will this be a problem for other neighborhoods as well? I see the need for this bill, but is it more of a concern that we are starting to see more charter schools come in? Under some of the bills this session, we would have some of our neighborhood schools converted to charters. Can you foresee in the future if we need this

type of neighborhood preference for our current neighborhood schools? Right now the charter schools are on a lottery if I understand correctly. I wonder if this might be bigger than just Nellis in the future.

Patrick Gavin:
I believe there is other legislation in addition to the bill that you mentioned which does contemplate that particular issue. I am not here to talk about that today. I imagine it will be a topic of discussion later on. That bill did pass through the Senate in Committee and is wending its way over here.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of S.B. 200 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 200 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral to S.B. 200 (R1)? [There was no one.] Senator Hammond, would you like to make closing comments? [He did not.] I am closing the hearing on Senate Bill 200 (R1) and opening the hearing on Senate Bill 212.

Senate Bill 212: Revises provisions governing discipline of pupils and prohibited acts at public schools. (BDR 34-177)

Senator Scott T. Hammond, Senate District No. 18:
This bill comes from some work by Justice Nancy Saitta over the interim. This was a very lengthy process in which they looked at the way students are disciplined in schools. I happened to come on late in the process and looked at the language. I completely understood where they were going and I really liked it. They asked me to help out and I am happy to attach my name to Senate Bill 212.

Let me tell you why I believe this is necessary. Every case is different when you are talking about school discipline and how to deal with a case. Those of us who have been in a classroom or in a school for any length of time know that almost every case and every incident that occurs in a school can be a little bit different. I will give you an example and show you why I like the bill.

There was a case at the school where I teach in which one student had just come back from expulsion and wanted to get expelled again. The student did not want to be at school anymore. She found the first person she could to engage in a fight and attacked that girl. The other girl was a straight-A student, never had any problems, and turned around to defend herself when this girl came at her. In so doing, while they were scrapping the teacher tried to get involved, and the one girl who had never had any problems reared back and hit the teacher in the head—made her nose bleed—and according to the way we

currently have things written, the student was penalized by an automatic three-day suspension. I thought that was unfair. If they were able to look at the case and determine based on the circumstances, the outcome would have been different for that particular student. That is why I like the direction they are going with this bill. It is looking at it case by case, not just a set-in-stone policy.

Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County:

I am a member of the School Attendance and Disturbance Subcommittee which was appointed by the Nevada Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform in October 2012. Our leader, Justice Saitta, is not able to be present today, so I will be walking you through the bill on her behalf.

The School Attendance and Disturbance Subcommittee developed a mission that we would work to promote safe, respectable, and supportive school environments for all students by advocating for appropriately timed services and by identifying and applying best practice models that encourage student engagement and prevention of school suspension and expulsions. We looked at specific statutes, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 392.466 and NRS 392.910 and have recommended some legislative changes in order to address some of the issues that we saw with expulsion and suspensions in schools.

In reviewing Senate Bill 212, in section 2, we are looking to amend NRS 392.466 to allow the superintendent of a school district, for good cause shown in a particular case in that school district, the discretion to allow modifications to the suspension or expulsion requirement for battery, possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon, or a pupil deemed to be a habitual disciplinary problem. The current statute does allow the superintendent discretion for possession of a firearm or a dangerous weapon. However, they do not have discretion if that pupil commits a battery or is deemed a habitual disciplinary problem. This amendment will allow the discretion to apply to a pupil who commits a battery and a pupil who is deemed a habitual disciplinary problem. The superintendent can still expel or suspend a pupil who is in violation of this statute.

In section 3 we are looking to amend NRS 392.910. The current statute states that it is unlawful for any person to disturb the peace of any public school by using vile or indecent language within the building or grounds of the school. Currently, any person who violates any of the provisions in this subsection is guilty of a misdemeanor. The amendment to NRS 392.910 would remove the language in subsection 1, removing misdemeanor penalties for using vile or indecent language within the building or grounds of the school.

The additional amendments clarify the definition of school employee, add the definition of assault as defined in NRS 200.471, and add "maliciously" as defined in NRS 193.0175.

In our research through the School Attendance and Disturbance Subcommittee, we have found there is a clear association between exclusionary discipline such as expulsions and suspensions, and poor outcomes within our delinquency system. We made the recommendations to our full Commission on March 21, 2014, which were unanimously approved. These recommendations were also presented to the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice at the meeting on June 20, 2015. As a member of the law enforcement community with the Office of the District Attorney, we are supportive of assisting schools to keep them safe and to keep students in schools. We believe our communities are safer when students are in schools. Most of crimes committed by students are when they are not in school.

I also have the good fortune of representing the foster care agencies in Clark County through my 17 attorneys. We believe this bill will assist our foster children to maintain in school. Our foster children already come into the system disadvantaged. They are usually behind in education, lacking a supportive home environment, and having traumatic affective brain disorders. For the schools to be able to have some discretion in looking at that child as a whole, whether they are committing a battery or becoming a habitual disciplinary problem, will assist our foster children and produce better outcomes within our schools and hopefully keep them from entering the delinquency system.

Carlos McDade, General Counsel, Clark County School District:
With me is Joseph Legat, and we will present the Clark County School District's (CCSD) point of view. We support this bill. I also had the good fortune of being on Justice Nancy Saitta's subcommittee and was involved in garnering the testimony and some of the evidence to present to consider this bill.

This bill provides discretion and we believe it increases the due process for all of the children so the superintendent of the schools or his designee has the ability to do a case-by-case analysis for each child and determine the best behavior modification for that child. Sometimes that will be expulsion and sometimes it will not. By removing the mandatory language in the statute, it gives the schools more discretion and increases their ability to tailor and customize the outcome for each child. As we are concerned with the success of every child in the school district, this allows us to provide the individual attention that a specific child will need and to gear up a developmental plan and action for that specific child and adjust as needed. This will still maintain the ability to protect the students in the school and the school climate.

Joseph Legat, Coordinator III, Office of Student Adjudication, Clark County School District:

We are supporting this bill because it gives the superintendent, for good cause shown, the ability to modify some expulsions so both the student and the school district have their best interest served. If I take these one by one, the first area in which the superintendent does not presently have that ability is the habitual disciplinary problem. That is a very specific statute that was originally meant for rural schools. In the CCSD, we have the ability to take a student who has been placed out or expelled for a habitual disciplinary problem and put them in another school. Some other school districts do not have that capacity, so that student is then put out to the street or to whatever online schooling they might be able to obtain. A habitual disciplinary problem student has to either extort, or attempt to extort, or threaten to extort a pupil, teacher, or school employee in a school year; initiate two fights on the school grounds in a school year; or have a record of five suspensions in a school year. If these things occur in the CCSD, typically the student will be placed in a behavior school and recommended for expulsion without having to go through the habitual disciplinary problem channels. However, there may be situations where a student did not meet those criteria and the superintendent, for good cause shown, could modify it to something other than an expulsion. That student might be best placed in a different school altogether—not attending a consequence or behavior school. That would be one situation that would apply to what is called a habitual discipline problem.

As far as battery which results in bodily injury, the statute is fairly clear on that. It has to be a battery that results in a bodily injury to the school employee. Obviously this is something the school district takes very seriously, and quite often if there is a battery, even without injury, that is something where the student stands a very good chance of being expelled. There are some situations where if the superintendent had that discretion not to do an expulsion or to modify it to something other than an expulsion, that may be a good option.

Consider one example: Perhaps a young elementary school student pulls out a chair on a teacher and the teacher falls down and breaks her hip. The law as it is stated now would say that elementary student would have to be expelled and would have an expulsion on his or her record. It might be a situation where some other consequence could be put into place.

A second situation is similar to the example Senator Hammond gave. Quite often when a school employee is in the midst of breaking up a conflict between two students, that employee might be inadvertently hurt. If the employee is injured, the student would then have to be expelled the way the statute is currently written. This bill would give the school district or the superintendent the ability to modify for some other consequence than expulsion.

The third situation is the sale or distribution of a controlled substance. Currently a student who sells or distributes drugs has to be expelled. Our schools absolutely need to be as drug free as possible, and the consequences for those students who engage in that activity have to be substantial. However, there is a big difference between sale and distribution. A person who comes to school to sell drugs is most times going to be expelled. There may be some examples where a student might not be selling and the superintendent, for good cause shown, might be able to justify that. I am hard-pressed to think of an example for that, but distribution is different. For a student who comes to school and shares a drug or maybe unknowingly provides a drug, superintendents, for good cause shown, with that ability to modify might be able to find a situation that best serves the academic interest of that student as well as maintains the safety and security of our schools.

The last thing I would like to address is the modification language in lines 33 through 37 at the bottom of the proposed amendment (Exhibit C). It says, "The modification statement must include a corrective behavior plan for the student developed by the campus administrator in conjunction with each teacher assigned to the student prior to the student being returned to the class...." This is language that would vary depending on what kind of school district you are in. In the CCSD, if a student would be recommended for expulsion—for example, battery to a staff member—and the superintendent, for good cause shown, modified that to something other than an expulsion, that student would most likely not return to the school where the battery took place. The student would either be returned to a behavior school or a continuation school, or to another like school. That would provide that staff member a measure of safety and would also allow that student to continue their education. In a situation like that, this language probably means, at least in the CCSD, the outgoing school and teachers would cooperate with the incoming school and teachers to develop that plan. In smaller districts where there may only be one school, then that language may be that the student returns to that school and the same people would work on the plan and then would implement the plan.

Assemblyman Armstrong:
This amendment allows for the modification statement to be included if they remain in the same school, but you talked about cooperation between the outgoing school and the incoming school. I do not see where that modification statement would be a requirement for a student attending a new school. I wonder why we would not allow those teachers in the new school to have the modification statement or at least be aware of that behavior.

Joseph Legat:
What would happen here is if the student was transferred from school A to school B, the administration and the teachers who worked with that student would work with school B to explain what kinds of issues that student has and what kind of behavior modifications would need to be put into place for that student to be successful at the next school. I would tell you that the practice in the CCSD is typically, when there is a victim in a building where that student attended, it is unlikely that student will return to that school.

Assemblyman Armstrong:
Could you point me to where in the bill that intent is stated? I do not see it.

Senator Hammond:
It is not in this bill because it is already addressed in school district policy that when a student is enrolled in another school, if it is for a disciplinary reason, you let the other school know what modifications are coming with that student. I think that is what you were trying to get at.

Joseph Legat:
I would say that this bill might need to be revised to put that language into it. Certainly whenever a student is facing disciplinary consequences and the student moves from one location to another, the school that is now going to educate that student has the full academic and disciplinary history of that student. What would happen here to allow the CCSD to follow the letter of the law for this bill, is there would be cooperation and maybe additional documentation from the referring school to the receiving school.

Senator Hammond:
I wonder if there is not something already in statute or in policy that you already follow. I do not know whether we would necessarily amend this particular piece of legislation to accommodate that. That is why I wanted to see if we could talk about what we already have in practice.

Joseph Legat:
We do have things in place. There is already a behavior plan that is followed when there is a student with an Individualized Education Program, but again, when a student is referred to another school, that school is apprised of all of the disciplinary and academic history, the grade transfers, and the counselors are often involved. There is a procedure in transferring one student from one school to another. Obviously that student's academic background is considered even prior to placement. That would be through Clark County School District's policies and regulations. He or she is placed at the school where we believe he or she would be most successful.

Senator Hammond:
That is why I wanted to know if that would answer your question more fully.

Assemblyman Armstrong:
Yes. It was odd to me for a student to remain at the same school versus all schools, but you answered that question.

Senator Hammond:
I would like to give one more example. As a member of a charter school board, we had an incident where a middle school student was being expelled because he brought a paint gun to school. The way the principal read the statute, it was automatic expulsion. As the board was apprised of the issue and was asked to come together and talk about it, we discovered later on that in this particular instance, there is some latitude by administration and by board members. In charter schools, you have some latitude to deal with that kind of issue. In the cases of assault or drugs, there is no latitude. We listened to the evidence presented to us, and the child had asked the teacher several times if for his show and tell could he bring his paint gun, which is his hobby. He thought the teacher had given him permission. He made sure when he brought the paint gun in in the morning that he brought it straight to the teacher to stay with that teacher all day. He disabled it. It did not have a cartridge to go with it. It was not functioning whatsoever. The teacher looked at it and said he could not have it at school and to take it to administration. We looked at all of that evidence and realized that expulsion was not necessary. He brought it to the teacher and the teacher should never have told him to go through the hallway one more time to take it to administration. The teacher should have taken possession of the gun. We looked at all of that evidence and realized we could modify this to say, "Every day for the next couple of weeks, you have to show what is in your backpack or you have to carry a clear backpack." We came up with a modification so the student could stay at the

school and stay in the class. There were no safety concerns. As a school, we worked through the situation and the student was able to stay in school which is what we were ultimately trying to get at. Administrators at the school know the children, I think, better than almost anyone else and they know what they can do to help that student through that situation. That is what we are trying to arrive at here with these other areas of concern.

Assemblyman Hickey:
Are you saying this process could be expedited by site-based administrators? At one point you mentioned that the superintendent had to sign off. I wonder if, by the time it gets to that level in such a large school district, you have gone beyond the time when it is practical to make those wise decisions.

Senator Hammond:
We envision this just having a little more flexibility for the administrator. The superintendent might make a policy whereas they can deal with this more on-site. Again, we are talking about having the flexibility to look at some of the more egregious cases. This does not mean that we are always going to take a more lax approach. This just gives us discretion in certain circumstances.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of S.B. 212?

Carlos McDade:
I would like to provide more clarification to Assemblyman Hickey's question and Senator Hammond's explanation. When there is zero tolerance in the statute, then only the superintendent can address it because when it is brought up at the school level it is, "Oh, this occurred. It is zero tolerance. We have to initiate the expulsion." When the zero tolerance is removed, according to this amendment, then the principal and the teachers at the school will have the opportunity to evaluate what happened. It is no longer a zero-tolerance statute, and they do not have to expel the student. They can then decide what is appropriate. They can begin that analysis at the school level.

Stephanie Heying, Court Service Analyst, Administrative Office of the Courts:
I currently staff the Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform and the School Attendance and Disturbance Subcommittee. The Juvenile Justice Commission is chaired by Chief Justice James Hardesty and Justice Nancy Saitta and they have conducted a series of hearings to study issues of concern involving the youth of Nevada. The fundamentals of this legislation are supported by the study and findings of the Commission.

Justice Saitta has spent a number of years involved in the concerns addressed in this legislation. Her advocacy for our children began before she went on the bench, and she has continued her advocacy in her role as a Justice on the Supreme Court of Nevada. She regrets that a conflicting schedule prevents her from testifying in support of Senate Bill 212 this afternoon. She was able to attend the Senate hearing and gives an unqualified endorsement to S.B. 212. She expresses her thanks to Senator Hammond and the many concerned professionals and educators and others that helped put this together. If there is any information you might need from the Commission, we stand ready to answer requests.

Regan Comis, representing M+R Strategic Services, Washington, D.C.:
We would like to voice our support for Senate Bill 212 as well. You have heard many of the reasons why we feel this is necessary, but looking at each incident on a case-by-case basis allows the schools and the principals to make the appropriate decision for the students.

We know that national studies have shown that students who have been expelled or have been suspended have a dropout rate of 68 percent. We also know there is a strong correlation between juveniles who had been expelled or suspended and the juvenile justice system. We want to keep students in the schools where they can continue to increase their likelihood of success.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas who would like to testify in support of S.B. 212? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 212? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify as neutral to S.B. 212?

Mike McLamore, Education and Public Policy Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:
I am here testifying in the neutral position because I believe it is procedural if we have a proposed amendment that we do so at this time (Exhibit C). We are very supportive of what this bill is trying to do. We believe we should be working to keep students in school with all appropriate measures, even those who may be ruffians or have committed some type of infraction that would warrant a suspension or expulsion. The testimony we have heard already shows that those are pretty egregious acts whether it be accidental or intentional on the part of a student. We fully agree with the effort that is being made here to keep students in school.

What we are asking for in this proposed amendment is that if a student has done something to warrant a suspension or an expulsion, a waiver is provided so that a corrective behavior plan can be developed for that student before he or she returns to class. The language before you would be applicable for those students to remain in the same school. We have heard comments and questions regarding that today, and I want to be very specific that what we are asking for is a corrective behavior plan—not a history of activity or a record of arrests and prosecutions, a rap sheet, if you will, of what a student has had in his or her past that might accompany him to a different school or back to the same school.

I want to be very clear on what we are asking in terms of what a teacher's role and responsibility is to keep discipline and order for the learning and safety process for all students in the classroom. We believe that a corrective behavior plan that accompanies a student who has done something to warrant suspension or expulsion will help provide a formal guidance for that student. It will put all teachers and administrators involved on the same page for what the expectation is for that student once this is in implementation.

Assemblyman Hickey:
In your amendment, I have a question on one word where it said "in conjunction with each teacher assigned to the student...." Does that mean every teacher that student is enrolled in a class with, or is it just the teacher that is overseeing this action?

Mike McLamore:
Our thinking there was that you might have a high school student who matriculates through several classes over the course of the day and the year. It would be important that each teacher have knowledge and understanding and know what the behavior plan outlines are. It just provides a stronger safety net of guidance opportunity among the instructional staff and administration. If you have a student who has committed something and has been assigned to one teacher, then it would only be applicable to that one teacher. For a secondary student who is matriculating through a number of teachers throughout the day and throughout the year, we feel it would be a good idea for all teachers to be informed and that expectations also be known by the student and by the student's parents or guardian.

Assemblyman Hickey:
But it does not imply that each teacher is going to have to create a specialized version for the student?

Mike McLamore:
No, sir. It would be a single plan, but all teachers involved with the student would have an awareness of what it is and an opportunity to contribute to the development of that plan. [Submitted letter in support from NSEA (Exhibit D).]

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else who would like to testify as neutral in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Senator Hammond, would you like to make closing comments?

Senator Hammond:
Justice Saitta and I have both heard the recommended proposed amendment and I would like a little more time to peruse it, but we will defer to you, Chair Woodbury, and your Committee for your consideration. I am sure you will figure out if it has a place in the bill. We listened and we are not completely opposed to it, but we will let you vet that out.

Chair Woodbury:
I am going to close the hearing on Senate Bill 212 and open the hearing on Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public schools. (BDR 34-316)

Dale A.R. Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:
Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint) is what we used to call a cleanup bill. The late Speaker Emeritus Joe Dini warned me 20 years ago never to call a bill that because it sets you all on edge that there is something hidden in the bill. This is a smorgasbord of little items from the Department of Education—most of them fairly technical in nature.

The bill was amended in the Senate to add a couple more items that had occurred to the Department from the time the bill draft request had been submitted, and to remove two items based on public testimony regarding testing and standards. I will walk you through section by section because each section is somewhat different. With me today is Robin Pawley from our finance office who will answer questions if necessary regarding money.

Section 1 clarifies board appointments to the State Board of Education. We had an instance occur where a member of the board stepped down to be appointed to an elected board, the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District, and there was some question of whether an individual could serve on both

boards. We also have an annual issue when terms expire where we are in a rush to have appointments completed by the Office of the Governor in time for our required January meeting to meet statutory deadlines. That section clarifies that, if need be, an appointed member of the board could serve until the appointment of their successor.

Section 2 was deleted by the amendment.

Section 2.5 adds another parent to the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement and Family Engagement. This bill calls for that parent to be designated by the Nevada Parent Teacher Association (PTA). Currently there are only two parents involved on the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement and Family Engagement. We think it is appropriate to add more parental voices to that body.

Section 3 is one of the most robust and interesting sections of the bill. It deals with a measure passed by this body about three sessions ago regarding environmental cleaning products. It set up a process for my predecessors to adopt regulations about chemicals. Quite frankly, they were never implemented and that is not our area of expertise. What this amendment does is leave that responsibility, in terms of reporting, to the school districts and takes the Department out of that role. I know there is an amendment from that sector of industry that did not make it through the Senate. The Department is neutral on this.

Sections 4, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 18 all deal with a change in language. The Council to Establish Academic Standards and the academic standards staff now refers to English with the broader term of English language arts. Thus it is encompassing reading as well as writing and comprehension skills. When we adopted new foreign language standards in 2014, the group of teachers who brought those standards to the Council and the Board for adoption used the term "world language" rather than "foreign language," so we are making changes that align the language to be "foreign or world language." Those standards now contain American Sign Language, which is not a foreign language. This is a broader term and seems to be a term of art for those that provide instruction in that field.

Sections 5, 6, 8, and 9 are where there is some math involved. In the 2013 Session of the Legislature, the body passed a bill originating from Senator Woodhouse dealing with distance education. It made distance education courses more widely available for students on a part-time basis or full-time basis. That caused our staff some conforming challenges in how we compensate between a district and a charter school, or a charter school and

a district, or a district and a district, if the student enrolls in various places to receive his or her instruction. These sections provide a process for those entities to enter into agreements on their own. We do not gather partial information on enrollment at the Department level, so we are not a good arbiter on making that exchange. If it were a student's entire enrollment, we could do that, but this process, as worked out with the districts and charter schools, provides a mechanism for them to enter into their own agreement to exchange funding as dictated in the amended language of the law. Should they be unable to reach an agreement, the Senate added to this bill that the Superintendent of the Department of Education would decide what the final dollar amount would be.

Section 7 may be the last conforming change to changes made in 2011. Prior to 2011, the Board was the executive head of the Department and thus was involved in the submittal of the budget. In 2011, the Superintendent was made executive head of the Department. I am subject to the State Budget Act. We were in a situation where documents which are declared confidential in the Budget Act could not be given to the Board under this statute. This change puts the Governor in that role rather than the historic role that was the Board's.

Section 13 deals with testing. It conforms our law to federal law, and the purpose here is to ensure that we have the right courses of study addressed in our end-of-course assessments. We are required by federal law to test at least once in high school in English, mathematics, and science. When we made the transition from the high school proficiency examination over to end-of-course assessments, the statute contemplated only courses the law required, which were those for which the Board had adopted the common core standards: English and mathematics. Yet, I have a legacy science test requirement that students are taking this year, but is not part of an end-of-course assessment. The Board has indicated that in the future, they will roll science into the end-of-course requirements for future classes of students. This statute change conforms with the federal requirement and, in my view, will help us be sure we do not make a mistake like that in the future.

Section 14 of the measure is a cost-saving step. We are required to develop a pamphlet concerning end-of-course examinations. We are increasingly trying to do this electronically. We then post them online and the districts in turn print them. Therefore, the printing costs are incurred at the district level and not at the state level as we are assigned these pamphlets sometimes without a printing budget.

Section 14.5 was added as an amendment by the Department of Education. It removes antiquated language, in particular, the names of some institutions and organizations that are no longer in existence.

Section 16 deals with hearing officers. In the suspension and revocation of a license, there is a provision. The suspension and revocation is typically a proceeding that takes place in front of the State Board of Education; it acts as the quasi-judicial body, and I act as the district attorney, bringing the case before the Board. An individual whose license is being suspended or revoked has the option to exit to a hearing officer and the timelines are very tight as spelled out. We had an instance this time where the individual was incarcerated and we could not have the hearing in time, so at the recommendation of the Attorney General, we are saying that if we agree on a different timeline, we can still move forward with the hearing.

Section 19 updates language dealing with private school accreditation—here naming the institutions that accredit private schools. We have different types of accreditation, and this gives a more clear direction to those institutions. It is a streamlined process for the Department if it can come in this way.

Section 20 addresses an obscure fund that exists in state government that allows proceeds from gift cards or cards that go unused and have a cash value on them to go to the state. They are apportioned out to a variety of causes ranging from museums to a number of other things—one of them is education. That educational trust fund can be accessed by the Department for certain budget items. Today, it can only be accessed by coming to the Legislature. We had an instance where we could have had access to a small amount of money to send the teacher of the year to an additional activity, but we could not do it because the Legislature was not in session. This is a minor change that gives us a little more latitude and the opportunity to go to the Interim Finance Committee.

Section 21 removes antiquated provisions. There is one dealing with the Board adopting a seal. Today, the Board uses the state seal or the Department logo. The board no longer has an official seal as we did when the Board was created in 1964. The other statute is an antiquated statute that empowers the Department of Education to approve all library books. That is really not our role. We approve textbooks after a local approval process, but the approval of library books is beyond the scope of the Department. This is taking out a statute that is not being used.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:
In sections 8 and 9 it talks about giving you the final approval should they not be able to agree on how to compensate for the distance education. It seems to me that would not encourage resolution. Maybe they would not agree and just let you do it. Would it be better to keep the formula and say this is how we are going to divvy it up so there are no arguments and maybe makes it a little easier for compliance?

Dale Erquiaga:
In the original language submitted to the Senate, there was no provision like this. We used the agreement language and an attorney in the other house said, "If you have that in an agreement, what happens if they cannot agree?" Someone needs to make a decision to agree. That is where that language came from.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:
Why do we need the change? Why not just say this is how much you will compensate?

Dale Erquiaga:
We considered that at the staff level when we ultimately came to change the statute. We started with trying to set a price schedule in regulation, that a distance education course or a partial distance education course would cost X, thus, this much money must exchange. We went through a survey of other states that have done this and came to the point where our districts and our charters are very different from each other—we were either going to short somebody or overcompensate somebody by picking a price or trying to set a formula. We left it to the locals and the charters to work out what the actual cost is.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:
In section 14 it talks about having an electronic pamphlet. I am anti-paper, but I am wondering about students and parents who do not have a computer. How would we deal with that? I did not think the language would still allow for a paper version. How would they be able to look at the pamphlet for those end-of-course examinations?

Dale Erquiaga:
You are correct. This language does not say that the board of trustees or the governing body has to provide a paper version, but as a practical matter that is how it operated this year and that would be our intent—we would provide a digital file that they could print for their families, or they could distribute them electronically to their families. This year they all printed it.

Assemblywoman Swank:
I am going to return to sections 8 and 9, looking at subsection 2 in both sections. It looks like in section 8, subsection 2, that a student who wants to enroll in distance education has to get approval of the board of trustees of the school district. Then I go to the analogous section in section 9, subsection 2, and there it says a pupil is not required to obtain approval of the governing body of the charter school. Why do the charter school students not have to get approval, but the traditional school students do?

Dale Erquiaga:
If it says that, I do not have an answer why. I will have to check. I will find the answer and send the answer electronically.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone to testify in support of Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint)?

Nicole Rourke, Executive Director, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:
We are here to support S.B. 25 (R1) and thank the Department for working with us on sections 6, 8, and 9 regarding distance education. We worked with them on that language, and we do work with other schools and districts to come up with agreements when we offer classes that their students want to take part in.

Dawn Miller, Member At Large, Nevada Parent Teacher Association:
We stand in support of section 2.5 adding another parent. We always feel that a parent's voice is very important, especially in parent involvement groups. We thank Superintendent Erquiaga for adding that.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else here in Carson City or in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of S.B. 25 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in either location that would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 25 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify as neutral to S.B. 25 (R1)?

Tim Shestek, Senior Director, State Affairs, Western Region, American Chemistry Council, Sacramento, California:
I am with the American Chemistry Council. Our member companies manufacture a variety of raw material ingredients including those that are components of cleaning products. We do have a proposed amendment to section 3 of the bill (Exhibit E). As it is currently drafted, the bill deletes language in existing law that allows school districts to use disinfectant sanitizers and antimicrobial products that may be necessary to adequately protect students and employees. While some cleaning products remove soil and

basically clean the surface, disinfectants and sanitizers do destroy germs, bacteria, and other infectious diseases. We believe the current language in the bill would potentially and unnecessarily restrict the use of these products when they may be necessary.

The other point I would make is that disinfectants are considered registered pesticides under federal law, so they may not be able to make environmentally sensitive or green claims; therefore, they may not be available for school districts to use.

Our proposed amendment does not intend to change the intent of the bill, nor does it mandate the use of these products. When situations warrant their use, we would like school districts to be allowed to use disinfectants and sanitizers. Several states that do have green cleaning procurement laws on the books do have provisions similar to what we are proposing.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else who would like to testify as neutral on S.B. 25 (R1)? [There was no one.] Superintendent Erquiaga, do you have closing comments? [He did not.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint), and open the hearing on Senate Bill 205 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 205 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to plans to be used by a school in responding to a crisis or emergency. (BDR 34-404)

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Assembly District No. 15:
The Legislative Committee on Education, which I had the honor to serve on during the interim, is proposing Senate Bill 205 (1st Reprint).

At its meeting in January, the Committee heard presentations from a variety of school districts regarding their strategies and policies for maximizing the safety of students and school personnel. Nevada's Department of Education and the Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety, offered insights to update current state school safety frameworks and made suggestions for revising the statutes to improve the framework's submittal and approval process. Senate Bill 205 (1st Reprint) requires the Department of Education to develop a model plan for the management of a crisis or an emergency involving a public or private school. This model plan must include certain procedures, plans, and information, including threats or hazards listed in local county hazard mitigation plans and is utilized by each school district, charter school, and private school in the development of those plans.

This measure removed the requirement that district and school plans be submitted to the State Board of Education and instead requires that notices of plan review completion be filed with the Department. It also requires any approved deviations to school emergency plans to be distributed to all relevant entities as soon as practicable.

Chair Woodbury:
Committee, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of S.B. 205 (R1)?

Dale A.R. Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:
The Department supports this bill. I was glad to see our contribution characterized as insights. We support good change, so we are not filing all of these plans. We are not a secure environment to have those documents resident at the Department. The switch for us to the model, rather than trying to have the Department write a plan for use everywhere, is an excellent change suggested by Chief Smith.

Christopher B. Smith, Chief, Office of Homeland Security, Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety:
I also support the legislation as it is presented today. The enhancements that we are correlating, the local hazard mitigation plans to the local school districts, will really help tailor those natural disasters and threats that are in the local jurisdictions to the most appropriate level of government for dealing with the emergency at the lowest level—at the county level. We appreciate the changes.

Chair Woodbury:
Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas to testify in support of S.B. 205 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in either location who wishes to testify in opposition to S.B. 205 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who is neutral to S.B. 205 (R1)? [There were none.] As there are no closing comments, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 205 (R1), and open the hearing on Senate Bill 418 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 418 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to refunds paid by private postsecondary educational institutions. (BDR 34-727)

Samuel P. McMullen, representing Touro University Nevada, Henderson, Nevada:
As you see, there is a panel forming in the southern Nevada conference room that is ready to talk about this. I will turn it over to Shelley Berkley with Touro University. I will take you through the bill after this panel.

Kelly D. Wuest, Administrator, Commission on Postsecondary Education:
I support the proposed changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 394.449. The requested changes are twofold. The first is changing the amount that schools are able to retain from $100 to $150 both prior to the beginning of school and once school has been initiated. This has not increased in ten years, and this change would bring us into alignment with neighboring states. Secondly, there is a provision in the bill that would allow for regionally accredited schools to retain an application fee if it is disclosed to the student up front. This will allow those schools to be able to have a seat hold for students who are going to take a seat in a highly competitive program. Nationally, we are one of the few states that do not allow this provision, and we believe it is harming our schools in Nevada. We would like to have this changed to allow the schools to be competitive nationally.

Shelley Berkley, Chief Executive Officer and Senior Provost, Touro University Nevada, Henderson, Nevada:
I am here to speak in favor of Senate Bill 418 (1st Reprint). I have with me today the Dean of Students of Touro University, Dr. Philip Tompkins, in case there are any questions that I am unable to answer. I am also here today on behalf of Renee Coffman, the President of Roseman University of Health Sciences, who is in favor of the bill as well, but is unable to attend.

Touro University is a private, nonprofit, fully accredited, Jewish-sponsored institution of higher learning. We grant master's and doctoral degrees. We have a medical school that admits 135 students every year and hopefully graduates 135 future doctors every year. That should help us with our doctor shortage in the state of Nevada.

We had 3,300 applications for 135 seats in our medical school for osteopathic medicine. We personally interview 500 of these 3,300 applicants. We give letters of acceptance to 322, and we accept 135 into the class. The issue we have, as Kelly spoke quite eloquently about, is a matter of competitiveness and Nevada having the lack of competiveness because, according to the current NRS, we have to return every penny of the deposit that a student has given us after they have been accepted into the program. Why is that a challenge for the state of Nevada? The applicants that have been accepted know that according to *Nevada Revised Statutes* that while they have to give a deposit, we have to

return everything but $100 if they decide to go someplace else. At the very beginning of classes—sometimes within 12 hours of the moment the classes start—if they receive another acceptance from another school, they know they can choose to go to that school and get their deposit back from Touro University. That leaves us scrambling to find students at a very late date to fill our class quota. If we publish and notify the students from the beginning that their deposit in nonrefundable, it would help tremendously in ensuring that not only the quality of students we get are of the highest quality, but our future doctors in the state of Nevada are of the caliber we want to keep here.

I have a list of all of the schools of osteopathic medicine throughout the United States [list was not provided as an exhibit]. Approximately 99 percent of them have nonrefundable deposits. Touro University is one of the very few that has to return a deposit.

Assemblyman Stewart:
The full deposit is $150 and currently you have to give them back part of that deposit, is that correct?

Shelley Berkley:
Full deposit is $2,000. We have to give everything back but $100.

Assemblyman Stewart:
So, you would be able to keep another $50 which would help in administrative costs, is that correct?

Shelley Berkley:
With the proper notice in our handbook and on our application form, we will be able to keep the $2,000 just like every other school of osteopathic medicine across the country does.

Sam McMullen:
I would like to take everyone through the actual operative language of the bill. Under the current law, as you heard, the maximum that can be retained by the school is $100. If you notice on page 2 of the bill, on line 9, there is a rule for all institutions, but there is a second rule that begins on line 9 that deals with the quality of schools—medical schools or osteopathy schools—where there is a national accreditation, and there is a seriousness with respect to their charter that lifts them up a couple of levels. What we chose to do there was if, in fact, there is a deposit for the place holding of a seat, we would make it absolutely clear in our documentation what the refundability policy would be. It may be 100 percent; it may be along an industry standard. Under those circumstances, we would be able to set a competitive refundability clause or policy.

I would like to clarify one thing. This is not just about Touro University or Roseman University, or any other school of that caliber. The point is that this is about Nevada students. There are a lot of people who want to come to our universities and they find out that there is someone holding a seat, and there is no consequence for that person holding the seat until the last day, so they accept a school outside of Nevada. We have an unbelievably great number of people who want to go to school to become a doctor of osteopathic medicine or for other programs that we have at Touro University. They want to go to school in Nevada. We are actually disadvantaging some of the people in Nevada that want to attend school here. We are looking for a normal pattern and a seriousness of purpose that means when you put your $2,000 down, you are going to fill that seat and not walk away 12 hours before class. It is about Nevada students as well.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:
I understand why you want to do this, and I understand that you have administrative costs and are worried about filling the seats. What I am not understanding is, you do have a wait list for people who you think would be a candidate, right? A lot of schools do wait list people and that is how they fill the seats. Could you make yourself whole if you did have a wait list?

Secondly, what would qualify as clearly disclosed under that language? Would you require them to sign a paper when they fill out their application? Maybe we could tighten that up a bit to make sure we have really good notice with a signature.

Shelley Berkley:
Kelly Wuest will address the second question and my Dean of Student Services will address the first question.

Philip Tompkins, Dean of Students, Student Affairs, Touro University Nevada, Henderson, Nevada:
Yes, we definitely have a wait list for students. The issue as we see it is that we are trying to attract the best students that want to live in the state of Nevada, go to school in the state of Nevada, and then hopefully want to practice medicine in the state of Nevada, and to address the shortage of health care providers that we have here. We want students that are truly motivated to be here in Nevada and not necessarily students who are just using us as a placeholder. We believe the modification in the language will help us to best do that.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:
That makes sense—to put skin in the game. I thought what was holding us back was our lack of residencies. We obviously have enough people; we have seats for everyone, but we need residencies. Are you confident that if a high fee were required, we would be able to get enough qualified applicants and they would stay here and it would not potentially drive down enrollment?

Shelley Berkley:
I am really happy that you mentioned the graduate medical education residency crisis that we have. As far as your question is concerned, we are asking our applicants to be held to the same standards that most of the schools of osteopathic medicine across the United States are held to. Again, I will submit that of approximately 40 schools of osteopathic medicine, 95 percent of them have a no-refund policy. The three out of the five that do not have a no-refund policy are Touro University: Touro New York, Touro California, and Touro Nevada. They are in line with us because we want our policy to be the same across our system. Consequently it is the state of Nevada that has to change the NRS so that Touro University can be treated like every other school of osteopathic medicine in the country.

To answer your question, I do not see how this would impact the number of students that are applying to Touro. As I said, we had 3,300 applications for 135 seats, but we try to select and offer letters of acceptance to the best and the brightest. Twelve hours before school starts, chances are the most qualified students have accepted positions in other schools of osteopathic medicine. Consequently, we are going to a second tier and that is something we absolutely do not want to do for the very reasons Sam McMullen set forth. We want the best and the brightest coming to Nevada, we want them being educated here, we want them holding residency programs here as we expand that program in our state, and we want the best and the brightest practicing medicine for our fellow citizens.

Assemblyman Armstrong:
Do you require all students to pay the application fee, or do you offer scholarships for some that do not have to pay any fees?

Shelley Berkley:
We do offer scholarships. We are a private, nonprofit institution. We do not take any money from the state or federal government. Our scholarships come from private donors. We try to provide scholarship money for our students.

Phil Tompkins:
For all of our health sciences and medical programs, there is a deposit that is required. It is not only for the doctor of osteopathic medicine but across other programs as well.

Shelley Berkley:
This is not an application fee. This deposit fee is only expected of students who have already been accepted into our program, who have agreed to come to our program, and we want to keep them. We do not want them notifying us at the last minute that they are not coming to Touro.

Assemblyman Armstrong:
You offer 332 letters of acceptance, but your classes are only for 135; that wait list could be up to 200 students. Those 200 students would not pay the deposit until they had been taken from the wait list and placed in the program?

Shelley Berkley:
[Inaudible answer.]

Assemblyman Armstrong:
Okay. Thank you.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:
What are you contemplating to be clearly disclosed so we have some intent for that? Would it be something to be signed?

Phil Tompkins:
We would disclose the information on our website and on our application materials. We would disclose the information on the various mechanisms that we use and when it goes to various recruitment activities, et cetera. Through our different programs there are accreditation requirements, so we are required to disclose all of that information. We would keep in line with that.

Kelly Wuest:
The Nevada Commission on Postsecondary Education requires all schools to have an enrollment agreement. In this enrollment agreement, we require the schools to disclose all financial costs. When the students are selected for the program and have agreed, they will sign this enrollment agreement so it is a legal contract.

Assemblyman Flores:
You indicated that the deposit amount was $2,000. When I applied to law school, I had acceptance letters, I negotiated and tried to determine the

best thing for me. I do not remember what the deposit amount was for one school, but I decided I was not going there. They were holding the seat, and I decided to go to William C. Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. What is the average deposit for state institutions as opposed to a private school? My concern is that private schools will increase that deposit fee to $8,000. Then all of a sudden we have a bunch of students who have better options, but now they are obligated for that $8,000. Can that happen?

Phil Tomkins:
The deposit fees on average across the various osteopathic medical schools across the country are in that $2,000 range. As Ms. Berkley indicated earlier, we can submit those records so you can see the breakdown of the various schools across the country and see exactly what their deposit fees are. One thing to note is that the deposit fee actually gets credited and goes toward the student's tuition. When the student comes to Touro University Nevada, this is not an extra fee per se.

Assemblyman Flores:
My understanding of the bill is that this deposit fee is being opened up for all private schools. My concern is that if, for instance, the tuition is $10,000, and we create the deposit number and put it at $8,000 and we say it is going toward your tuition, then the student is now on the hook for $8,000 if he decides to switch at the last minute. That is what I am trying to understand.

Sam McMullen:
The most important thing about those nationwide statistics is that they have been the rules of the game across the country for many years and it is only at $2,000. To your fear that the number may escalate, we already have some empirical evidence that there is a competitive market. You certainly do not want to make your school so priced out in terms of the deposit that you are not even considered.

Assemblyman Flores:
Let me know what the average deposit is for the private schools in the state. That is my only concern; I understand the intent and it is great.

Shelley Berkley:
I know that Ms. Wuest is anxious to help clarify a point, but right now, as far as I know, Touro University is the only school of osteopathic medicine in the state of Nevada. Roseman will be a medical doctor school, and they will not be coming online for another couple of years. While they are in favor of this bill, it

more directly impacts Touro University and makes us less competitive nationally when it comes to attracting and keeping the highest quality students.

Kelly Wuest:
Right now the Commission has 164 licensed schools in Nevada, but this particular area that only addresses schools that are regionally accredited could potentially impact 13 schools, and only 5 of them have programs where this would apply. What we are hoping for in the future is that it will also attract some of the schools to start these programs. We have colleges right now that do not address master's and doctoral levels in nursing and in other aspects as they do in other states. This is one of the things that is a holdback for them. As I said, there are only 13 schools that this could impact and 5 that we have identified that it will.

Chair Woodbury:
Are there any more questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in Carson City or in Las Vegas in support of S.B. 418 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 418 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in either location that would like to testify as neutral to S.B. 418 (R1)? [There was no one.] Would any of you like to make closing comments?

Shelley Berkley:
We would like to thank the Committee for your kind attention. We appreciate your listening to the challenges we face and hope they can be remedied.

Sam McMullen:
We appreciate your support.

Chair Woodbury:
I am going to close the hearing on Senate Bill 418 (1st Reprint). Is there anyone here for public comment?

Nicole Rourke, Executive Director, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:
Since it has been a while, I thought it might be time for a quick good news minute break.

Congratulations should go out to our Cashman Middle School students for winning the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada art contest in celebration of Earth Day. Their beautiful artwork will now be displayed on one of the buses in southern Nevada.

I would also like to give a shout out to our robotics teams from Cimarron-Memorial High School and Sierra Vista High School that are on their way to St. Louis, Missouri, today for a national competition. We wish them lots of luck and we hope to bring you back the results.

Chair Woodbury:
The meeting is adjourned [at 4:53 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Assembly Committee on Education

Date: April 22, 2015 **Time of Meeting: 3:19 p.m.**

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 212	C	Mike McLamore, NSEA	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 212	D	Ruben Murillo, Jr., NSEA	Letter in Support
S.B. 25 (R1)	E	Tim Shestek, American Chemistry Council	Proposed Amendment