

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
May 29, 2015**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Paul Anderson at 6:38 p.m. on Friday, May 29, 2015, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Chair
Assemblyman John Hambrick, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Derek Armstrong
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Randy Kirner
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Michael Roberson, Senate District No. 20
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Stephanie Day, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Senior Program Analyst
Karen Hoppe, Program Analyst
Brody Leiser, Program Analyst
Anne Bowen, Committee Secretary
Cynthia Wyett, Committee Assistant

Following call of the roll, Chair Anderson opened the hearing for public comment. There being no public comment, Chair Anderson opened the work session for Assembly Bill 241.

Assembly Bill 241: Creates the Advisory Military and Veterans Research Committee. (BDR 36-579)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 241 for Committee consideration. As introduced, the bill created the Advisory Military and Veterans Research Committee, authorizing research of certain items of concern to veterans and members of the armed forces. Ms. Jones explained that Exhibit C was a proposed amendment to the bill. The proposed amendment deleted much of the existing language and created the Women Veterans Advisory Committee, consisting of five members appointed by the Governor. Three of the members must be women and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States, including, without limitation, the Nevada Army National Guard and the Nevada Air National Guard, who had received, upon severance from service, an honorable discharge. Each member would serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

There being no comments or questions, Chair Anderson advised there was no fiscal note attached to the bill, and he requested a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 241.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Anderson closed the work session on A.B. 241 and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 511.

Senate Bill 511: Establishes the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program and incentives for new teachers in certain schools. (BDR 34-1277)

Senator Michael Roberson, Senate District No. 20, provided an overview of Senate Bill (S.B.) 511, which established the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program and incentives for new teachers in certain schools. According to Senator Roberson, Nevada had higher academic standards, a more robust accountability system, and an improved graduation rate when comparing the past several years. With the plan proposed by Governor Sandoval, Nevada was poised to make further gains in the quality of the education system. Senator Roberson thought the education progress was impeded by lack of high-quality teaching and, in fact, a teacher shortage. The Clark County School District began the school year with 2,600 teacher vacancies. At the end of the 2014-2015 school year, Clark County School District had about 700 teacher vacancies.

Moving forward, Senator Roberson emphasized that the future looked bleak for Nevada's educational system. As the state's population grew, enrollment in teacher preparation programs was in decline. In the last year, available data indicated enrollment in Nevada's teaching programs was down 48 percent from the previous year. In California, the next largest contributor to the Nevada teaching force, enrollment was down 21 percent from the prior year. New teacher college graduates would be attracted to Nevada with the passage of S.B. 511. The Teach Nevada Scholarship Program would fund the cost of attending an alternative licensure education program, contingent upon the candidate completing the program, teaching for five years in a Nevada K-12 school, and meeting other requirements set by the State Board of Education. The incentive pay program in S.B. 511 would enable a school district to pay a bonus of up to \$5,000 per year for the first two years of employment to a teacher who was new to the district. This option included a caveat that the teacher must work in a Title I [of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended] or underperforming school.

Senator Roberson explained that Nevada was known for having solid average teacher pay. The pay was the same as the national average at \$56,000 per year. However, Nevada was also known for having unattractive starting teacher pay at about \$35,000 per year. Senate Bill 511 addressed the competitive disadvantage by putting incentive money in the pockets of new teachers and showing them that Nevada was committed to their long-term success by providing professional development to enhance their growth as a teacher. The bill also provided an incentive for Nevada licensure programs, which could be a great source of teacher converts: people who enter the teaching profession from another sector of the workforce.

Senator Roberson pointed out that as Nevada continued to struggle to find teachers to fill thousands of annual vacancies, this bill would have a significant effect on the schools' ability to attract and retain quality teachers. He asked for support for S.B. 511.

Dale A.R. Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, testified in support of S.B. 511. Mr. Erquiaga pointed out that section 2 through section 10 of the measure created the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program that was put together at the request of Governor Sandoval. The Teach Nevada Scholarship Program would provide scholarships for a variety of students to encourage them to join the teaching profession to address the long-term teacher pipeline challenge outlined by Senator Roberson.

Mr. Erquiaga explained that section 11 of S.B. 511 was the appropriation. There was a line item for the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program and a separate line item for the incentive or enhanced salary portion of the bill. That portion of the bill was in section 12. Over the two-year period, the monies included in the bill would provide the funding for the enhanced compensation program required of the districts by *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 391.168. As indicated by Senator Roberson, there were both immediate and long-term challenges to find teachers. There was an immediate need for teachers in Clark County.

Mr. Erquiaga remarked that a question posed by many was why charter schools were not included in the bill. He advised that charter schools were not included in Chapter 391 of the NRS; consequently, they were not included in S.B. 511. The existing mechanism in NRS 391.168 was used to provide the funds that school districts determined were needed.

Brian Mitchell, Education Fellow, Office of the Governor, testified in support of S.B. 511. Nevada school districts had been suffering from a significant teacher shortage, and the teacher preparation programs had not been graduating as many teachers as in past years. The data from 2012 indicated that the universities graduated 430 teachers, well below the 10-year average of 566 and the 10-year high of 771 teachers graduated. Beyond the aggregate numbers, it was important to note where shortages were most acute. There were long-term substitutes teaching year-round in some of Nevada's most at-risk schools. Many of the hard-to-fill subjects, such as math, science, and special education, were taught by teachers lacking the expertise required for the subject matter. Senate Bill 511 was an important bill that would add another tool to assist with the recruitment of excellent teachers.

Mr. Mitchell explained that sections 2 through 6 of the bill were definitions. Section 7 created the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program Account in the State General Fund and included standard language regarding interest and balance forward of funds. Section 8, subsection 1, of the bill provided that any public or private university, college, or other provider of an alternative licensure program was eligible to apply to the State Board of Education for a grant to offer a Teach Nevada Scholarship.

In addition, Mr. Mitchell mentioned that the program had been opened up beyond the public institutions to include private universities, both for-profit and nonprofit. There were eleven total programs.

After universities submitted a grant proposal to the State Board of Education to offer scholarships, the Board would review the applications and determine how many scholarships to award to each institution. This information was contained in section 8, subsection 2, of the bill.

Mr. Mitchell estimated there would be more requests for scholarships than there were scholarships available. The Board had the flexibility to either prorate all of the scholarships or award full scholarships to a specific institution.

Section 8, subsection 3, provided that the Board could prioritize applications from universities based on whom universities wanted to target with the scholarships. Mr. Mitchell provided the example that a university could offer scholarships to only students who wanted to become math teachers or special education teachers. Also, preference could be offered to applications from veterans or teachers interested in teaching in at-risk schools or minority students.

Section 9, according to Mr. Mitchell, described the roles of the universities and students governing the scholarships. The types of students eligible to apply for these scholarships included recent high school graduates enrolling in a four-year university for the first time; students who switched majors to become teachers; students returning to school after a short period; veterans; and students with classroom experience as teacher aides or long-term substitutes.

Section 9, subsection 2, of the bill outlined the amount of the scholarships. A student could be awarded a scholarship in an amount not to exceed \$3,000 per semester or \$24,000 in the aggregate. This figure was determined using the tuition schedules of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the University of Nevada, Reno as benchmarks.

Mr. Mitchell added there were 11 schools on the list to award scholarships, and some were more expensive to attend than others were. The Nevada State College fee was \$2,000 per semester; however, private universities could be more costly. The alternative routes to licensure (ARL) programs were less expensive because the students would not receive a four-year degree.

Section 9, subsections 3 and 4, described the students' responsibilities for the scholarship program and how the scholarships would be distributed. To be awarded the scholarship, students were required to complete their degree and teach in Nevada for five consecutive years immediately following graduation.

Mr. Mitchell explained how the five-year number was determined and why it was important. Many professions, such as teaching, had learning curves. Research indicated that teachers "hit their stride" at five years, became comfortable teaching, and had greater student achievement. The five-year number was also important because of attrition. National data indicated that about 50 percent of teachers left their positions before the fifth year. It was expensive to replace teachers, and requiring a teacher to work five years increased the odds of the teacher staying in Nevada longer.

The disbursement of scholarship money was described by Mr. Mitchell. The universities would disburse 75 percent of the value of the scholarship prior to graduation. The student would be responsible for the remaining 25 percent, which would be held in trust by the university system. After the student taught for five years, the university system would return the 25 percent to the student in a lump sum.

Mr. Mitchell emphasized that section 9, subsection 6, stated that if a student failed to meet the requirements as outlined in subsection 4, the provider that established the student trust account must transfer any money in the trust account to the State Board of Education for credit to the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program Account.

Section 10 of S.B. 511 was described by Mr. Mitchell as the section directed toward the failure of the scholarship recipient to complete a degree. If a scholarship recipient failed for any reason to complete the program for which the scholarship was awarded, the university, college, or other provider of an alternative licensure program must repay the scholarship fund the 25 percent held in trust and any scholarship money remaining, pursuant to section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (b). Additionally, pursuant to section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (c), the university, college, or alternative licensure provider must repay an amount of money equal to the total amount of money

disbursed to the scholarship recipient pursuant to section 9 of this act or \$1,000, whichever was less.

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that if the student completed the program on schedule for which the scholarship was awarded, the college or university would receive a \$1,000 bonus as outlined in section 10, subsection 2.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the appropriation was shown in section 11 of the bill. For the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program Account created by section 7, the appropriations were \$2,500,000 for each year of the 2015-2017 biennium. It was difficult to determine how many scholarships would be awarded because there were several variables, but the minimum number would be about 104.

In closing, Mr. Mitchell said he believed the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program would provide the universities the tools needed to recruit the best and brightest students in the state.

Assemblywoman Titus commented that it was necessary to help students, and holding them accountable was good for Nevada. She expressed concerns regarding section 10, subsection 2, wherein the university or college was held accountable. It appeared that often students were not graduating with all of the skills necessary for teaching and needed proctoring. She wondered whether schools might graduate students who were not fully prepared to teach just to get back the \$1,000.

Mr. Mitchell responded that the on-time graduation rate was federally defined as six years, rather than four years. Given the acute need for teachers, the idea was to provide the universities and colleges with an incentive to help students graduate sooner. He believed that each program at the universities was designed to be four years, but whether a student graduated in four years or six years, the program was designed for the graduate to be prepared to teach. He was opposed to providing incentives to graduate students in two or three years when it was designed to be a four-year program.

Assemblywoman Titus suggested holding back the \$1,000 incentive for the university or college until the teacher worked a few years in Nevada schools.

Mr. Erquiaga thought Assemblywoman Titus was speaking of emerging law in licensure and the quality of candidates. He commented that he liked Assemblywoman Titus's idea, and it was not reflected in the bill. However, in section 8, subsection 5, the State Board of Education had regulatory authority over sections 2 through 10. Nevada was remiss in tracking teachers from their program through their performance once employed at a school. Mr. Erquiaga

believed such tracking would become a requirement in the future for the federal equity plans. In the future, the Board might consider the scores on the practice exams.

Assemblyman Hickey appreciated the need for the bill. He was interested in whether the bill contained information on alternative licensing.

Mr. Erquiaga responded that Nevada had good ARL laws updated in 2011. The Commission on Professional Standards in Education certified the ARL programs, which primarily existed in the school districts. The school districts made good use of those programs to bring teachers into the classrooms faster. One of the unintended consequences of the great recession was that persons who were laid-off from certain jobs, such as engineers, were now working as math or science teachers.

Mr. Mitchell added that section 9, subsection 1, paragraph (d), referenced students who possessed a bachelor's degree in a field other than education and pursued an ARL program for teaching. There were 12 certified ARL programs in Nevada.

Assemblyman Hickey commented that the word "students" indicated to him persons who were already in programs. He asked whether someone who wanted to accelerate a path to alternative licensure might be able to qualify and get into the scholarship program for assistance, and Mr. Mitchell said that was correct.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick inquired whether Mr. Erquiaga had considered providing assistance for high school students to get some of the basic requirements completed prior to high school graduation.

Mr. Erquiaga replied that S.B. 511 did not address that particular policy. There were dual-credit opportunities for high school students to receive academic credit. There were also articulation agreements with the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) for career and technical education programs. Mr. Erquiaga was willing to encourage early credit accumulation in high school for students who wished to apply for a science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) degree in education or early childhood education or other preparatory programs.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick encouraged Mr. Erquiaga to look into the development of this type of program.

Mr. Erquiaga was aware that the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program was a beginning for building the culture that Nevada valued in the teaching profession. This was similar to the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) program. Nevada wanted to build a culture around choosing teaching as a profession and choosing early.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams noticed that the prekindergarten (pre-K) teachers were not included in section 8, subsection 1, paragraph (a), and she asked about the thought process regarding this element.

Mr. Erquiaga responded that the pre-K teachers were not included, because that was a challenging area. He was hopeful the program would grow in that direction. Senate Bill 511 addressed the immediate shortage in grades K-12 and in difficult areas such as STEM and special education. There was a federal preschool development grant to assist with promoting pre-K teacher training. At this time, the focus was on teacher development for the K-12 students.

Assemblywoman Carlton was concerned about the amount of the appropriation and the time frame. This appeared to be moving quickly, and it might be difficult to spend the money in the short time frame.

Mr. Erquiaga thought it was possible to fund the scholarships over the upcoming biennium. He had not considered the possibility of appearing before the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) as funds were needed. The same amount of appropriation was requested for each year of the biennium, knowing that even in the first year, a higher demand was projected for the scholarships. He did not believe the institutions would appear before the Board of Education to request funding by September 2015. Some of the scholarships might be made available by the January 2016 semester. The first year would probably be heavily skewed toward returning students or ARL students who might not be on a traditional track.

Assemblywoman Carlton agreed that January 2016 would probably be an appropriate time to begin the program. When a new program started, it took time to determine how successful the program would be.

Assemblywoman Titus stressed that she was aware there was an urgent need for teachers, and this bill would not solve the immediate problem. She suspected that in four years there would still be a critical need for teachers. Assemblywoman Titus was curious why this emergency bill was brought forward.

Mr. Erquiaga explained that sections 2 through 10 were the long-term scholarship plan for recruiting future teachers. Section 12 of the bill was developed for the more immediate need. Section 12, subsections 2 and 3, provided an incentive to be used to increase the base salary of a new teacher for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 per school year for Title I schools.

Mr. Erquiaga was aware of the immediate teacher shortage crisis. He believed that nearly 2,600 teachers were needed in Clark County. It was hoped the recruitment incentives would encourage the best and brightest teachers to fill the vacancies. The timeline was short, but he believed the school districts would be able to backfill the positions.

Mr. Erquiaga knew that the appropriations were not included in the Governor's recommended budget. This would be an additional cost to the state.

Assemblywoman Swank stated that it was her understanding that when a student was awarded the scholarship, 75 percent of the money went to the institution. When the degree was completed, the remaining 25 percent of the scholarship was paid to the student.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the university would receive 100 percent of the scholarship. Of that sum, the university would hold 25 percent for the student when he or she completed five years in the teaching profession. It would be the student's responsibility to contact the university to request the money.

Assemblywoman Swank asked whether the scholarships would be available for public, private, or nonprofit institutions. She knew that institutions had wide-ranging graduation rates. There was a U.S. Department of Education report published in 2014 that studied six-year graduation rates. That report cited a 57 percent graduation rate for public institutions; a 66 percent graduation rate for private, nonprofit institutions; and a 32 percent graduation rate for private, for-profit institutions. Assemblywoman Swank was concerned about what would happen if the scholarship recipient did not graduate and whether there would be an evaluation of the types of private, for-profit institutions that would be eligible.

Mr. Mitchell replied that each of the 11 institutions was eligible to apply for grants, but none were guaranteed an award. There must be a plan for the graduation of teachers. The State Board of Education would be looking for a plan to graduate teachers, and also for collaboration with school districts to fill specific needs. Special consideration would be given to those institutions that focused on specific needs of a school district, such as math or science teachers.

He believed the Board would take into account the past performance of different universities and the graduation rates.

Mr. Erquiaga added that the State Board of Education approved the teacher preparatory programs, and the 11 institutions had to complete state certification. The *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) required review boards to evaluate new programs offering degrees and to review existing programs. As directed by the State Board of Education, it was the charge of the Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement Division to ensure the quality of the programs for teacher preparedness.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked whether the allocation of the money was per semester or for the teaching program.

Mr. Erquiaga answered that the entire scholarship would be awarded at one time to the institution, and the money would be held in trust for the student.

In response to Assemblyman Sprinkle, Mr. Erquiaga explained that the law did not spell out whether the trust account was interest bearing. Mr. Erquiaga was uncertain how endowed scholarships were treated at the various institutions, but he assumed there would be interest-bearing accounts. He was aware the Board would have to adopt provisions in case a preparatory program ceased to be authorized. The law did not clarify whether the scholarship money would be returned or become property of the institution. Mr. Erquiaga said that the Board of Education needed to understand the common trust account practices for scholarships. Also, the Board considered awarding the money each semester, but realized that would require holding the money in trust or in the account to always keep the program in the budget. The lump-sum distribution appeared to be the best alternative.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked why the student who became a teacher would be required to pursue the return of the 25 percent scholarship fund award even though the money belonged to that teacher. It appeared that the school was hoping the teacher would simply forget about the money. The institutions could potentially make a considerable amount of money from holding the award.

Mr. Erquiaga said that the State Board of Education had discussed the situation Assemblyman Sprinkle described. However, not all institutions stayed in touch with their alumni, and it could be costly to find a person. The decision was made for the student to return to the institution to claim the money. The theory was that it would be easier for the students to return to the institution than for the institution to seek out the alumni.

Assemblyman Sprinkle thought this was a bonus awarded to the institution if the money was not claimed. The money should revert to the state if it was not claimed by the former student. Ultimately, this was a scholarship for the students, not the institutions.

Mr. Erquiaga referenced section 9, subsection 6, which stated:

If a scholarship recipient fails to meet the requirements of subsection 4, the university, college or other provider of an alternative licensure program that established the trust account for the scholarship recipient must transfer any money in the trust account to the State Board for credit to the Account.

Mr. Mitchell added that the section referenced by Mr. Erquiaga was directed toward students who either did not graduate or did not complete the required five years of teaching. However, section 10, subsection 2, stated that if the student did not claim the money, the money reverted to the university. He believed the Board wanted to incentivize graduations. If the money was not claimed by the student, it was to be reinvested in the teacher preparation program.

Chair Anderson opened the hearing for testimony in support of S.B. 511.

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, testified in support of S.B. 511. She had worked with Mr. Erquiaga regarding the importance of developing Nevada teachers. She had been involved with the at-risk schools and was aware of the challenges in hiring qualified teachers and the turnover rate. She believed the bill provided the incentive many students needed to become teachers.

John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 511. He believed the bill would appeal to individuals who wanted to become teachers but needed financial assistance. The scholarship could be an opportunity to overcome the teacher shortage. The Clark County Education Association supported many of the programs the Governor initiated. Most of the programs provided assistance for the at-risk schools. According to Mr. Vellardita, nearly 80 percent of the teacher vacancies were in the at-risk schools. He believed there was a national phenomenon called the "exit of the baby boomer." Older teachers were retiring, and over the past several years, there had been 1,000 to 1,400 teachers leaving Clark County annually, primarily because of retirement. The trend was projected to continue for at least another two years. There were currently 2,600 teacher vacancies in Nevada,

14,000 to 15,000 vacancies in California, and over 20,000 teacher vacancies in the western United States.

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, testified in support of S.B. 511. Ms. Haldeman said this was a smart bill, and the Clark County School District was happy to support it for three reasons.

Ms. Haldeman asserted the first reason for supporting this bill was the scholarship portion, which would help develop a robust teacher pipeline. This was a fundamental, systemic change needed in Nevada. The second reason cited by Ms. Haldeman was to enhance the ability to recruit teachers. In 2014, the Clark County School District's hiring goal was 2,300 teachers, of which 1,700 were hired. The hiring goal for 2015 was 2,600 teachers. There were currently 670 classrooms filled by long-term substitute teachers. Ms. Haldeman stated the third reason to support the bill was that it directed new teachers to the schools most in need and with the most difficult teacher positions to fill.

In conclusion, Ms. Haldeman said the three most important areas when discussing the teacher workforce were the ability to recruit, train, and retain.

Constance Brooks, Director, Government Relations, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), testified in support of S.B. 511 and provided [Exhibit D](#), a letter of support from Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor, NSHE, which she read into the record.

Adam Johnson, Managing Director of Growth, Development and Partnerships, Teach for America Las Vegas Valley, testified in support of S.B. 511 and read the following into the record:

For ten years our teachers have worked as part of the Las Vegas community to ensure all students have equal access to a great education. Today we are also working hard to meet additional demand from schools in southern Nevada by broadening our recruitment reach.

I am testifying today in support of S.B. 511. As an organization committed to cultivating teachers and leaders that help provide educational opportunity for students in Nevada, we have seen firsthand the challenges of recruiting diverse individuals to teach. One of the challenges we have seen in recruiting undergraduates to teach is their hesitation to join an ARL [alternative route to

licensure] program because of the reality of their student loan burden. In 2014, our incoming teachers had an average student loan burden of \$26,000, and African American recruits had an average student loan burden of \$36,000.

Senate Bill 511 is a concrete mechanism to help incoming undergraduate teachers pursue their teaching credential without the challenge of significant additional student loan burden.

As I am sure you are well aware, roughly 800 classroom vacancies exist across the state, and that in Clark County, over 75 percent of the vacancies are in Title I schools. Even amongst Zoom schools, where our state has invested significantly to improve student outcomes, we still have at least one vacancy in each designated school. We know that an effective teacher is the most important factor in a student's academic success, so we must continue to invest in the people who drive the outcomes for our programmatic investments.

Senate Bill 511 will help increase the pipeline of great teachers educating students in Nevada.

Finally, to ensure long-term sustainability for our schools and communities, we must also increase the number of talented teachers we recruit locally. Senate Bill 511 increases the opportunity for talented, diverse leaders in our state to pursue the path of becoming an educator. We cannot undervalue the importance of having homegrown talent remain in their communities to educate future generations of Nevadans.

Thank you in advance for your leadership in providing your full support for S.B. 511.

Seth Rau, Policy Director, Nevada Succeeds, testified in support of S.B. 511. He believed the scholarship portion of the bill was an excellent start toward filling the gap between the supply and demand for teachers. Statewide there were nearly 3,000 teacher positions to fill. According to Mr. Rau, the state was producing 1,200 to 1,300 teachers each year. He thought that providing incentives for teachers to teach in schools where they were the most needed would be beneficial. Title I public school teachers were sorely needed.

Mary Pierczynski, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, testified in support of S.B. 511. She was aware that teaching

was not a popular career with young people, and the incentives would be helpful in getting persons involved in the profession. The teacher shortage was prominent throughout the state.

Scott Baez, Government Affairs Specialist, Washoe County School District, testified in support of S.B. 511. Mr. Baez stressed that 57 of the 202 vacancies in Washoe County were for special education teachers. The flexibility in the bill to target teachers in the areas of critical need was important. There had been a focus on improving the performance of the Title I schools, and the incentive to attract teachers to these harder-to-fill positions was significant.

Jessica Ferrato, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards, testified in support of S.B. 511. Ms. Ferrato agreed that the teacher shortages were critical in the rural areas of the state. She voiced her appreciation for the creation of the bill.

Omar Saucedo, External Affairs Coordinator, Nevada System of Higher Education, testified in support of S.B. 511. Mr. Saucedo appreciated the work of Senator Roberson in preparing this bill. The passage of the bill would provide a critical tool to recruit talented students into the teaching profession. Mr. Saucedo advised that because of prior commitments, some of the representatives from the universities were unable to attend the hearing; however, he submitted the following exhibits:

1. Letter of support from Melissa M. Burnham, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Nevada, Reno ([Exhibit E](#)).
2. Letter of support from Bart Patterson, President, Nevada State College, ([Exhibit F](#)).
3. Letter of support from Kim Metcalf, Dean, College of Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas ([Exhibit G](#)).

Samuel McMullen, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, testified in support of S.B. 511. He believed this was a creative, progressive, innovative, and productive idea for the recruitment of qualified teachers.

Marcus Conklin, representing the University of Phoenix, testified in support of S.B. 511. He expressed appreciation to the Governor and legislative leaders for including private institutions in the bill. Mr. Conklin believed the University of Phoenix could be part of the solution to the teacher problem.

There being no additional testimony in support of, neutral on, or opposed to S.B. 511, Chair Anderson closed the hearing on S.B. 511 and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 133 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 133 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the reimbursement of teachers for certain out-of-pocket expenses. (BDR 34-118)

Senator Michael Roberson, Senate District No. 20, provided a brief overview of Senate Bill (S.B.) 133 (1st Reprint). He believed teachers were professionals dedicated to their students' success. The dedication went beyond classroom work and often included paying for needed school supplies out of their own pockets. Senator Roberson explained that the bill, as amended in the Senate Committee on Education, proposed to address the problem by providing teachers who purchased necessary classroom materials with a mechanism for reimbursement.

Senator Roberson noted that the bill had been amended to include charter schools. Section 2 of the bill specified that only teachers who devoted the majority of their time to providing direct instruction could benefit from this program, and substitute teachers were excluded.

Section 3 of the bill created the Teachers' School Supplies Reimbursement Account within the State General Fund. Senator Roberson pointed out that section 7 appropriated \$2,500,000 in each year of the biennium to this Account. Additionally, the bill was amended in section 6 to allow persons who recovered unclaimed property of \$500 or less to donate those funds to the Teachers' School Supplies Reimbursement Account. The Account was authorized to accept other gifts, grants, and donations. Any funds remaining in the Account at the end of each fiscal year would be held as a balance forward and not revert to the General Fund.

Senator Roberson explained that section 4 provided that the Department of Education would determine the amount of money available each year and would distribute the money to each school district or charter school based on the number of classroom teachers employed in the district or at the charter school. The Department would establish the amount of reimbursement permitted up to a maximum of \$250 per fiscal year. Each school district and charter school must establish a special revenue fund to be used for teacher reimbursement for the purchase of necessary school supplies for their students, to the extent money was available, and not to exceed the amount established by the Department. The money in the special revenue fund could not be used to pay administrative costs. Any money remaining at the end of the fiscal year would revert to the Teachers' School Supplies Reimbursement Account.

Senator Roberson continued his presentation, noting that section 5 provided that the school districts and charter schools would determine how to distribute the money to the teachers, including whether to require teachers to submit claims for reimbursement. Teachers who received money from the Account must provide receipts for school supplies purchased with the money. The principal of the school must retain the receipts and make them available for inspection through the end of the next fiscal year. Also, a district's board of trustees could seek the assistance of the local teachers' union in administering the reimbursement process. The organization would not be compensated for administrative costs.

Senator Roberson mentioned that he had heard anecdotal accounts of teachers spending more than \$250 of their own money for school supplies, and he believed there would be more heard about that problem. He pointed out that an indirect benefit of the bill was to provide insight into the true scope of this issue. For the first time, there would be a mechanism in place to identify the types of resources needed but not provided to teachers. In addition, by examining the number of claims, data could be gathered about the problem throughout the state.

At the conclusion of Senator Roberson's presentation, Chair Anderson requested testimony from those in support of S.B. 133 (R1).

Nicole Rourke, Executive Director, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, testified in support of S.B. 133 (R1). Ms. Rourke stressed that teachers spent out-of-pocket money on their classrooms and students. In 2006, a similar program was administered in the Clark County School District through a debit card process. She was appreciative of the amendment that allowed this process, which mitigated administrative costs and removed the fiscal note attached to the bill.

Mary Pierczynski, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, testified in support of S.B. 133 (R1). An added benefit of the bill, in her opinion, would be that school districts would be able to track the expenditures and see what was being purchased. It was possible that school districts could redirect buying methods to obtain needed supplies. Additionally, the bill allowed flexibility for districts to determine how the expenditures and reimbursements should be made.

Jessica Ferrato, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards, testified in support of S.B. 133 (R1). She believed the bill validated what teachers did in the classroom on a day-to-day basis. She appreciated the flexibility in the bill to

allow districts to implement the program in a way that was most feasible for their district.

Scott Baez, Government Affairs Specialist, Washoe County School District, testified in support of S.B. 133 (R1). Mr. Baez agreed with the previous testimony and thanked Senator Roberson for bringing the bill forward.

Theo Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 133 (R1). He stated that teachers appreciated the \$250 reimbursement, but most teachers spent several hundred dollars more than that each school year.

Assemblyman Hickey was curious to know whether there was a plan in place to ensure the reimbursements were made to individuals and not to a group of teachers who pooled resources, made purchases, and requested reimbursement.

Ms. Rourke responded that in the Clark County School District, an individual debit card was provided to each teacher with the amount from the grant allocated to each card. The receipts were submitted to the principal.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams inquired about section 6 of the bill that referenced unclaimed property. She noted there was an option in the bill under section 6, subsection 1, regarding the choice to donate the money.

Senator Roberson explained that the donations were for people eligible for unclaimed property up to \$500. The provision was added in the Senate Committee on Education. The idea was to allow another avenue for people to donate to the Teachers' School Supplies Reimbursement Account.

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, testified in support of S.B. 133 (R1). She pointed out that many educators spent their own money to meet the needs of the students. There were a wide variety of learners in the classrooms, and each child needed to be challenged. She believed that the public thought the money was spent to beautify the classroom when, in fact, the money was spent on lesson plans that were instructionally sound for the students.

Chair Anderson requested testimony in opposition to or neutral on the bill. There was none. He requested closing remarks from Senator Roberson.

In closing, Senator Roberson thanked the Committee for hearing the bill.

There being no additional comments or questions, Chair Anderson closed the hearing on S.B. 133 (R1).

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, announced that the Committee needed to introduce three of the five money bills necessary to implement the 2015-2017 biennial budget.

BDR S-1290 — Provides for compensation of state employees. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 489](#).)

Sarah Coffman, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, provided an overview of the Unclassified Pay Bill. Section 1 of bill draft request (BDR) S-1290 contained the individual salaries of each position in the unclassified service.

Section 2 of the BDR provided that classified employees who were reclassified to unclassified service could retain their classified position status and salaries. Ms. Coffman noted that when those positions were vacated, the position would become unclassified. Additionally, a mechanism was contained in this section to allow the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to correct errors contained in this BDR.

The provisions of section 3 stated that unclassified salaries established in section 1 would be increased by 1 percent, the cost-of-living allowance (COLA) for 2016, and 2 percent for 2017.

Moving to section 4, subsection 1, Ms. Coffman pointed out that this section provided State General Fund appropriations needed to fund the unclassified COLA in the amount of \$1,054,304 for fiscal year (FY) 2016 and \$3,176,910 for FY 2017. Section 4, subsection 2, provided for State Highway Fund appropriations in the amount \$41,018 in FY 2016 and \$123,802 in FY 2017.

Ms. Coffman stated that section 5 provided State General Fund appropriations needed to fund the non-education, classified COLA of 1 percent in FY 2016 and 2 percent in FY 2017, for a total of \$3,216,448 in FY 2016 and \$9,968,836 in FY 2017.

Ms. Coffman moved to section 6, which provided Highway Fund appropriations needed to fund classified COLAs of approximately 1 percent in FY 2016 and 2 percent in FY 2017. The appropriated amount was \$850,707 in FY 2016 and \$2,604,111 in FY 2017.

Section 7, subsection 1, provided General Fund appropriations to fund the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) classified COLAs of 1 percent in FY 2016 in the amount of \$1,472,320 and 2 percent in FY 2017 in the amount of \$4,506,683. Ms. Coffman noted that section 7, subsection 2, provided the General Fund appropriations to fund the NSHE professional COLAs in the amount of \$3,289,368 in FY 2016 and \$9,916,445 in FY 2017.

Continuing with section 8, Ms. Coffman said that this section provided General Fund appropriations to fund the Legislative Counsel Bureau staff COLAs of 1 percent in FY 2016 in the amount of \$195,157 and 2 percent in FY 2017 in the amount of \$593,759.

Section 9 of the BDR contained the carryover language that provided on-call pay of \$60 for weeknights and up to \$100 for weekends for senior psychiatrists, senior physicians, and pharmacists within the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Corrections.

Ms. Coffman stated that section 10 contained carryover language from the previous Unclassified Pay Bill that provided \$5,000 annually for unclassified employees within the State Gaming Control Board who possessed certain professional certificates and qualifications.

Ms. Coffman also noted that section 11 stated that unspent balances would revert at the end of FY 2017, and section 12 stated that General Funds could be transferred within other sections in the pay bill with similar provisions for the Highway Funds. Section 13 retained certain positions within the Enterprise Information Technology Services Division, Department of Administration, in the classified service. Lastly, section 14 indicated the bill would become effective on July 1, 2015.

Assemblyman Kirner inquired whether there was a section governing NSHE professionals.

Ms. Coffman responded that section 7, subsection 1, had funding for the classified personnel for NSHE, and section 7, subsection 2, contained provisions for the professional staff employees.

There being no additional comments or questions, Chair Anderson requested a motion to introduce BDR S-1290.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR S-1290.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick was not
present for the vote.)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, advised the Committee that the next bill draft request was the Authorizations Act for state agencies to accept and expend funds such as fees and grants.

BDR S-1291 — Authorizes expenditures by agencies of the State Government for the 2015-2017 biennium. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 490](#).)

Karen Hoppe, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, provided an overview of bill draft request (BDR) S-1291 for consideration by the Committee. This BDR authorized all expenditures, except State General Fund and State Highway Fund appropriations, with the exception of the State Gaming Control Board and Nevada Gaming Commission. The Department of Transportation also received authorization to spend Highway Funds.

Ms. Hoppe began the presentation with section 1, which listed all of the authorizations for each budget that contained these revenues and reflected the closing actions of the finance committees.

Section 2 provided that the tobacco settlement funds were allocated to the Attorney General Administrative Fund and the Department of Taxation for enforcement and support of the Master Settlement Agreement and auditing functions. Ms. Hoppe noted the remainder of the section provided that remaining tobacco settlement funds were committed 40 percent to the Millennium Scholarship Trust Fund and 60 percent to the Fund for a Healthy Nevada.

Ms. Hoppe explained that section 3 was the State General Fund authorizations for the State Gaming Control Board during fiscal year (FY) 2016 and FY 2017. Subsection 4 provided that money approved for technology investment requests for the State Gaming Control Board might be transferred between both fiscal years with the approval of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC).

Section 4 provided for the General Fund authorizations for the Nevada Gaming Commission.

Section 5 contained carryover language from the previous biennium and indicated all authorizations included in sections 1 through 4, except for the Legislative Fund and judicial agencies, must be expended in accordance with the State Budget Act.

Ms. Hoppe continued, noting that section 6 was also carryover language and provided the Chief of the Budget Division of the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor, with the approval of the Governor, the authority to augment or reduce any authorization through the work program process.

Ms. Hoppe moved to section 7, which was continuation language and provided that General Fund or Highway Fund appropriations must be decreased to the extent that other revenue sources exceeded their authorization, except for the sections noted.

Section 8 provided for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) and listed for each institution the fees and tuition for registration of students that might be expended by NSHE. Subsection 2 provided that NSHE might expend the additional registration fees beyond the budgeted enrollments. Any additional fees resulting from fee increases could also be expended. The NSHE must report to IFC every six months regarding the additional fees and expenditures funded with those fees.

Ms. Hoppe noted that section 9 showed the allocation of county reimbursements made for the use of the Office of the State Public Defender, Department of Health and Human Services, and related services.

Section 10 contained carryover language and provided for the allocation of motor vehicle fuel tax from fuel used in watercraft, which would be split equally between the Department of Wildlife and the Division of State Parks of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

Section 11 was carryover language and provided that the Division of Forestry of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources might expend special reserves for extraordinary costs of operation, repair, and maintenance of firefighting vehicles.

Ms. Hoppe stated that section 12 contained carryover language and provided the State Fire Marshal, Department of Public Safety, must use the Contingency Account for Hazardous Materials for training programs prior to expending General Funds.

Section 13 was also continuation language and provided that the Division of Forestry of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources could carry forward unexpended funds of the central reporting unit for use in the next fiscal year.

Section 14 was carryover language and provided that the Forest Fire Suppression Account could carry forward up to \$250,000 for FY 2016 and \$250,000 in FY 2017 to the next fiscal year for the repair of firefighting and emergency response vehicles.

Ms. Hoppe advised that section 15 provided that the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education Loan and Stipend Account might balance forward any unexpended receipts after May 15 of each year to the next fiscal year for health-care access program slots.

Section 16 was continuation language and provided that the Emergency Operations Center Account of the Office of the Military could carry forward the unexpended balance to the next fiscal year.

Section 17 was described by Ms. Hoppe as carryover language, which provided that the three child welfare agencies could accept monies from sources other than the State General Fund and apply the money to augment child welfare services.

Section 18 was carryover language and provided that NSHE could balance forward unexpended funds as provided in section 8.

Section 19 was new language for the biennium and authorized the General Services Division of the Department of Public Safety to expend reserves not to exceed \$132,819 in FY 2016 and \$124,569 in FY 2017, for the purpose of adding not more than two positions. The positions were limited to the purpose of adding, modifying, or repealing Nevada Offense Codes for both state and local jurisdictions.

Ms. Hoppe continued with section 20, which provided transfer of the commissions and penalties from the government service taxes collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) in FY 2015 in an amount not to exceed \$23,724,000 to the General Fund for unrestricted use.

Section 21 was new language that provided that the Division Administrator of the Nevada Athletic Commission could apply to the General Fund for a temporary advance.

Section 22 indicated that if Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469 did not become effective, any reference in this act to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor would instead refer to the Budget Division of the Department of Administration.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out that section 23 stated that this section and section 20 of this act would become effective upon passage and approval. All other sections would become effective on July 1, 2015.

There being no comments or questions, Chair Anderson requested a motion for introduction of BDR S-1291.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR S-1291.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick was not
present for the vote.)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, advised the Committee that the next bill draft request was the Capital Improvement Program bill.

BDR S-1289 — Authorizes and provides funding for certain projects of capital improvement. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 491](#).)

Brody Leiser, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, provided an overview of bill draft request (BDR) S-1289. The finance committees closed the 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on May 20, 2015. The program included 69 projects at a cost of \$215 million. The projects consisted of 9 construction projects, 45 maintenance projects, 3 planning projects, and 12 statewide program projects. The 2015 CIP was to be adopted through BDR S-1289. Mr. Leiser noted that many projects had multiple funding sources and would be listed in multiple sections of the bill.

Mr. Leiser described the following sections of BDR S-1289:

- Section 1 appropriated \$6,403,083 of State General Funds to support a portion of the total funding in the 2015 CIP for projects identified under this section.
- Section 2 of BDR S-1289 limited the authority for expenditures through June 30, 2019, and established a reversion of any remaining funds from the projects identified in section 1. Similar language was included throughout the BDR following each section that appropriated or authorized funding. Mr. Leiser advised that he would not repeat this description for those sections.
- Section 3 appropriated \$5,162,832 of State Highway Funds to support a portion of the funding of the 2015 CIP for six Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) and Department of Public Safety (DPS) facility projects identified in this section.
- Section 5 restricted the transfer of funds from the Highway Fund for projects identified in section 3 until contract payments were required.
- Section 6 authorized \$98,500,000 in general obligation bonds for projects identified in this section.
- Section 8 authorized \$22,950,650 in general obligation bonds for CIP Project 15-C04 for construction of the new DMV service office at the East Sahara Complex in Las Vegas. This section also established the required annual debt service payment on the bonds for this project from the Highway Fund and the Pollution Control Account. The Highway Fund was responsible for 87.5 percent and the Pollution Control Account was responsible for 12.5 percent of the annual debt service required by this section.
- Section 10 specified that the State Board of Finance would issue general obligation bonds for the 2015 CIP when it was deemed appropriate. Subsections 2 and 3 allowed the State Controller to advance General Fund and Highway Fund money if bonds had not yet been sold to finance the projects approved in the 2015 CIP. If General Funds or Highway Funds were advanced, the amounts must be immediately repaid to the General Fund or Highway Fund upon sale of the bonds.
- Section 11 reallocated \$530,842 from the 2005 CIP to fund a portion of CIP Project 15-P02, the Las Vegas Readiness Center for Nevada National Guard advanced planning.

- Section 13 transferred \$47,132 from the 2007 CIP projects identified in subsection 1 to support costs for the 2015 CIP projects identified in subsections 2 and 3.
- Section 15 transferred \$138,681 from the 2009 CIP projects identified in subsection 1 to support the costs for the 2015 CIP projects identified in subsections 2 through 4.
- Section 17 addressed the reallocation of \$240,000 in General Funds from CIP Project 09-C05, Medical Education Learning Lab Building, University of Nevada Health Sciences System, to fund a portion of Project 15-M42, a deferred maintenance project for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE).
- Section 19 transferred \$3,288,241 from the 2011 CIP projects identified in subsection 1 to support the costs for the 2015 CIP projects identified in subsections 2 through 9.
- Section 21 transferred \$1,315,000 from the 2013 CIP projects identified in subsection 1 to support costs for the 2015 CIP projects identified in subsections 2 and 3.
- Section 23 of the BDR authorized approximately \$71.8 million from funding sources other than the General Fund or the Highway Fund for projects identified in this section. This included roughly \$43.6 million in federal funds; \$24,395,417 in donor funds to support Project 15-C78, the construction of the new Hotel College Academic Building at University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV); and about \$3.8 million in agency funds. Subsection 2 required the State Public Works Division of the Department of Administration to not execute a contract for construction of a project approved in the 2015 CIP that included federally authorized receipts until the Public Works Division had determined that federal funding authorized was available for expenditure.
- Section 24 required that the State Public Works Division use only qualified personnel to execute the 2015 CIP.
- Section 25 required state and local government entities to cooperate with the State Public Works Division when carrying out the provisions of the CIP.

- Section 26 approved \$1 million for a cultural affairs bond program.
- Section 27 approved \$3 million in general obligation bonds for the purpose described in subsection 1 of section 2, subsection 2 of section 2, and subsection 7 of section 2.
- Section 28 approved \$1.5 million of bond funding for the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, and section 29 approved \$1 million in bonds to provide grants for water conservation and capital improvements to certain water systems.
- Section 30 approved ad valorem taxes for the Question 1 (Q1) Bond Program and for general obligation debt service. For the state general obligation debt, 15.45 cents on every \$100 of assessed valuation of taxable property would be used to support the bonds sold for the CIP. For the Q1 Program, 1.55 cents for every \$100 of assessed valuation of taxable property would be used to support the bonds sold for the Q1 Program. The overall rate of 17 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation of taxable property remained the same as approved for the 2013-2015 biennium.
- Section 31 required the State Treasurer to estimate sufficient funding and determine whether that amount existed in the Consolidated Bond Interest and Redemption Fund to pay the principal and interest on CIP issuances. If there was not enough money in the Consolidated Bond Interest and Redemption Fund, the Treasurer could request that the State Controller reserve money in the State General Fund to pay those debts.
- Section 32 authorized the State Board of Finance to pay expenses related to the issuances of general obligation bonds.
- Section 33 authorized money to pay for bonds in the Consolidated Bond Interest and Redemption Account in the amount of \$145,911,940 in fiscal year (FY) 2016 and \$147,090,897 in FY 2017.
- Section 34 authorized the State Public Works Division of the Department of Administration and the Nevada System of Higher Education to transfer money within the same agency from one project to another, with the approval of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC).
- Section 35 approved \$5 million from the Special Capital Construction Fund for Nevada System of Higher Education, CIP Project 15-M42 Deferred Maintenance.

- Sections 37 and 38 extended the reversion dates for three prior-year CIP projects. This included two project extensions from the 2009 CIP (section 37) and one project extension from the 2011 CIP (section 38).

In conclusion, Mr. Leiser noted that sections 1 and 26 would become effective on July 1, 2015, with the remainder of the act becoming effective on passage and approval.

There being no comments or questions, Chair Anderson requested a motion to introduce BDR S-1289.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIRNER MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR S-1289.

ASSEMBLYMAN ARMSTRONG SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick was not
present for the vote.)

Assemblywoman Carlton thanked the Fiscal Analysis Division staff for their hard work and dedication.

Chair Anderson opened the hearing for public comment.

Kevin Ranft, representing Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), testified that AFSCME was appreciative of the Committee's approval of the cost-of-living allowance (COLA) for the state employees. He believed the state employees deserved the pay increase, but he asked for assurance that there was revenue behind the increase.

Assembly Committee on Ways and Means

May 29, 2015

Page 29

There being no additional public comments, Chair Anderson adjourned the hearing at 8:46 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anne Bowen
Recording Secretary

Linda Blevins
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Committee Name: <u>Assembly Committee on Ways and Means</u>			
Date: <u>May 29, 2015</u>		Time of Meeting: <u>6:38 p.m.</u>	
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 241	C	Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment 7759
S.B. 511	D	Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education	Letter of support
S.B. 511	E	Melissa M. Burnham, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Nevada, Reno	Letter of support
S.B. 511	F	Bart Patterson, President, Nevada State College	Letter of support
S.B. 511	G	Kim Metcalf, Dean, College of Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Letter of support