

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Eighth Session  
April 23, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Becky Harris at 3:31 p.m. on Thursday, April 23, 2015, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Becky Harris, Chair  
Senator Scott Hammond, Vice Chair  
Senator Mark A. Lipparelli  
Senator Joyce Woodhouse  
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Don Gustavson (Excused)  
Senator Tick Segerblom (Excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Assembly District No. 15  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District No. 31

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst  
Risa Lang, Counsel  
Betty Kaminski, Committee Manager  
Beth Ann Reykers, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Dale A.R. Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Craig M. Stevens, Clark County School District  
Jessica Ferrato, Nevada Association of School Boards  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Erin McMullen, R&R Partners Foundation  
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees  
Mike McLamore, Nevada State Education Association  
David W. Carter, Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee  
Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority  
Mendy Elliott, Capitol Partners  
Lauren Hulse, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada  
Mary-Sarah Kinner, Academica Nevada  
Carrie Buck, Ed.D., Principal, Pinecrest Academy

**Chair Harris:**

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 112.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 112 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing the policy concerning a safe and respectful learning environment for children enrolled in public schools throughout the State. (BDR 34-220)

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson (Assembly District No. 15):**

Assembly Bill 112 clarifies the existing provisions of the safe and respectful learning environment law. This measure purports to stop adults from bullying each other, to promote a positive and successful learning environment for all of Nevada's children and to set a positive example to prevent children from bullying each other.

We need to do more to ensure teachers, administrators and school personnel have a safe and respectful workplace. Many of us are aware of an administrator at the highest level being bullied or threatened and as a result left a high-visibility position. School board members themselves have publicly and privately threatened administrators. Teachers have been bullied in different schools throughout our State. The definition of bullying includes retaliation and intimidation behaviors. Bullying is more than simple name-calling. If top-level

administrators can be bullied, just imagine what can happen to regular teachers just trying to help children learn. I am sure everyone here heard about the situation at Dooley Elementary School in Las Vegas as outlined in my handout ([Exhibit C](#)). The long-festering situation among staff led to changes at the school and the turnover of teachers will most likely negatively impact the performance of the current 5-star school.

This type of bullying and fighting among adults affects students. Social and emotional development, as well as learning, requires adults to set good examples. Adults should teach children not to bully other children by demonstrating respectful attitudes through positive examples. "Do as I say, not as I do," is not an effective social emotional learning strategy. Studies show academic achievement increases in a positive learning environment. Nevada law contemplates that already. Many qualitative and quantitative examples give credence to these assertions.

The safe and respectful learning environment law currently applies to school personnel as outlined in my handout ([Exhibit D](#)). We often hear of this law in the context of students being bullied. The *Nevada Revised Statute* 388.135 prohibits any trustee, employee, administrator, principal, teacher or other staff member or pupil from engaging in bullying. Assembly Bill 112 ensures the law will be enforced, as written. *Nevada Revised Statute* 388.122 defines bullying. Section 1 of the bill updates the legislative declaration of intent to explicitly note the law applies to adults as well as children. It provides guidance for courts and regulatory authorities. Section 2 of the bill requires the school districts to alter their current policies or create policies to ensure violations of the safe and respectful learning environment among adults can be reported. It further requires school districts to update their training policies to include methods for facilitating a positive learning environment.

I wonder what moral authority we have to lecture students about bullying when there are so many examples of adults fighting inside of the school district. They fail to meet the standard we demand from our students. Assembly Bill 112 benefits students and those who serve them as teachers, administrators and staff in the schools.

**Senator Woodhouse:**

This Committee passed the Governor's anti-bullying bill, Senate Bill (S.B.) 504. Is A.B. 112 a companion piece to that bill?

**SENATE BILL 504 (1st Reprint)**: Amends provisions relating to a safe and respectful learning environment in public schools. (BDR 34-1201)

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

I have spoken with members of the Governor's staff. The amendment to S.B. 504 changed the substantive definition to eliminate "persons" in favor of "pupils." The Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor worked with me to ensure the problem of bullying among school district personnel is addressed through A.B. 112.

**Senator Lipparelli:**

Given the capability of the school district to reassign personnel as demonstrated in the information provided to the Committee, what will A.B. 112 authorize that the school districts do not already have the authority to accomplish? How are we adding to their capability to respond to staff bullying?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

Assembly Bill 112 ensures all parties are on notice that bullying is more than children versus children. I do not think this is always taken into account. The word bullying to many people, depicts the actions of children. This is a clarification bill and defines the legislative intent to address the overall problem of bullying in our schools. We all know setting a good example is the best way to teach children. Our actions have an effect on our children; and teachers' actions have an effect on their students. This bill states there is an expectation of respectful behavior in our schools; and facilitating a positive environment is treating everyone, adults and children, with respect.

During the Assembly hearing on A.B. 112, we heard countless testimonies from teachers stating they have been disrespected by their peers and supervisors in front of students, parents and other staff. This is a way to ensure the expectation of a safe and respectful learning environment is a school-wide endeavor. It also gives the courts and other regulatory agencies guidance on this issue.

This bill will not fundamentally change the bullying policy. It is designed to close any gaps in S.B. 504.

**Chair Harris:**

There are some language inconsistencies within the bill. Is there a reason for the distinction between "personnel of a school district" and "education personnel"?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

No, there is not meant to be any substantive difference. It is meant to match the existing language and put the school districts on notice for those particular groups because that is where there seems to have been the most concern. Section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (a) conforms to the existing bullying definition, which will change if S.B. 504 is passed. The new definition will be persons in general. We are open to any stylistic changes. We do not want to send any mixed message to the courts. We have no objection to amending the language of the bill for consistency.

**Dale A.R. Erquiaga (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):**

The Department of Education (NDE) supports A.B. 112. Section 1 of this bill is contained in S.B. 504, but this language adds-in neatly. Section 2 of A.B. 112 is not in the other bill. If there are any conforming changes necessary, the Legal Division will make them, should both bills pass. This bill will work in tandem with S.B. 504. The administration supports A.B. 112.

**Craig M. Stevens (Clark County School District):**

The Clark County School District (CCSD) supports A.B. 112. A safe and respectful learning environment is key to everything we try to do in our classrooms and school communities. The adults working in our schools need the same amount of attention and care as our students.

Speaking with Assemblyman Anderson has caused the CCSD to review its harassment policies to see how we are appropriately serving adults. As a result of A.B. 112, the CCSD will probably add provisions regarding bullying for adults as well procedures for reporting bullying behavior.

**Chair Harris:**

Section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (c) describes quality of instruction and the standard the Legislature requires of teachers. The quality of instruction should

not be negatively impacted by poor attitudes and interactions among various school personnel. Does the CCSD have a definition of what constitutes a poor attitude or a bad interaction among the staff?

**Mr. Stevens:**

This has a lot to do with relationships and training to identify these situations. It is important that we have a good reporting mechanism. I am not sure the CCSD has policies defining what constitutes poor attitude, bad interaction or bullying behaviors relative to staff. It is important that our staff receive training to identify these issues and how to deal with interactions with adults as well as students.

**Chair Harris:**

With the passage of S.B. 504 and A.B. 112 there will be a mandated professional development component. Is it your understanding these issues will be addressed through professional development so school personnel will be clear on expectations and definitions?

**Mr. Stevens:**

Absolutely; this will be a component of the professional development mandate.

**Senator Hammond:**

I can already envision another video at the beginning of the school year. That is how this type of information is usually relayed. Teachers get a checklist of all the information that we are required to know.

**Jessica Ferrato (Nevada Association of School Boards):**

The Nevada Association of School Boards supports A.B. 112. We think it is important to have a safe and respectful learning environment. That starts at the top, from both a parental perspective as well as an educator prospective. We appreciate the inclusion of adults in anti-bullying legislation.

**Lindsay Anderson (Washoe County School District):**

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) supports A.B. 112. The WCSD has had several incidents of bullying. We have interpreted the existing law to include adults. This bill provides clarification and validates the processes within the school district.

**Erin McMullen (R&R Partners Foundation):**

The R&R Partners Foundation supports A.B. 112. We have a history of advocating for anti-bullying legislation. This top-down approach of setting a good example for both children and adults is wise.

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

It is a sad reflection on all of us when legislation governing interactions between adults, adults and children and others is necessary. I have worked for many years with students, teachers and administrators in the education field who have genuinely been bullied. There is nothing more insidious and destructive to an institution. We support A.B. 112.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

In summation, "I want to ensure teachers are teaching high school and not reliving it."

**Chair Harris:**

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 112 and Vice Chair Hammond will preside over the hearing on A.B. 117, as I must testify in another committee.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 117 (1st Reprint)**: Authorizes a school district to lease school buses or vehicles belonging to the school district in certain circumstances. (BDR 34-510)

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson (Assembly District No. 15):**

I will now read from my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

Chair Harris and I had a discussion relative to requiring a security deposit for the security of the vehicles. I do not have a problem with that idea. I think it makes sense and the security deposit can be made part of the contract. It gives the school district protection.

There were also concerns raised relating to competition with commercial operators. Section 1, subsection 5 states an agreement cannot be made with a school district if a commercial bus is reasonably available.

This measure was brought forward in response to a request made by Clark County Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani. Concerns have been expressed

by the proprietors of the Electric Daisy Carnival (EDC) regarding the unavailability of commercial buses for EDC attendees. The EDC must lease buses for the event. Interstate 15 gets terribly congested during the EDC. When A.B. 117 was heard in the Assembly, there was testimony from the proprietors of EDC stating they had to go out of the State to get buses for the event. It is unreasonable for them to go to Arizona to lease buses. Assembly Bill 117 will provide revenue into the school bus fund, and give our school bus drivers some extra work. School bus drivers would have the right of first refusal when school buses are leased. In a small sense, this is a jobs bill. This will provide an opportunity for our school bus drivers to earn extra money during the summer.

**Senator Hammond:**

Are the buses from Arizona commercial buses or are they school buses?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

The EDC rents commercial buses. There are not enough commercial buses reasonably available in Las Vegas. If an entity has to go to a different state, that is not reasonably available. It costs the EDC more money to go to another state to rent transportation. There is no reason why we cannot enter into this agreement. Our commercial industry is overloaded with the regular transportation requests they receive on a daily basis in Las Vegas.

Assembly Bill 117 is drafted with permissive authority. If other events come up, this would give the school district the flexibility to help fill the gap and to ensure the people coming to Nevada have their transportation needs met without having to go to great lengths to fill their needs.

**Senator Hammond:**

How many buses were rented during the last EDC?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

I do not remember the number. It was presented during the hearing on A.B. 117 in the Assembly. It was quite a lot, but I will provide the number to you.

**Senator Hammond:**

Assembly Bill 117 grants permissive authority to a school district to rent buses. Does the permissive authority extend to school bus drivers?



**Assemblyman Anderson:**

Yes. This is permissive authority and the bus drivers have the right of first refusal. We wanted to give the drivers the option because they are employed by the school district. They are the personnel who are best equipped to drive and take care of these buses because they use them on a fairly regular basis during the school year. For the sake of protecting our equipment and investment, we thought this would be a good option.

I did wholly accept the school districts' amendments to ensure they are comfortable with the language contained in A.B. 117.

**Senator Lipparelli:**

I am concerned with the EDC event itself and the kinds of people who enjoy it and what conditions they might be in after the event when riding our school buses. It raises potential liability concerns.

Assembly Bill 117 will potentially convert a school bus into a commercial bus. Does the use of a school bus for commercial purposes create any type of obligation relative to the transportation authority?

Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a) requires a fee be paid for any wear and tear related to the use of the vehicle. The language is broad to ensure buses do not get destroyed. Entering into a lease agreement cannot interfere with the regular use of the school bus.

I have not spoken with the transportation authority. I will do so, and provide the information to you subsequent to my conversation.

**Senator Denis:**

I have spoken with the commercial transportation providers in Las Vegas. Certificated carriers perform commercial work in Nevada. When there is not enough inventory to perform the work, the entity has to apply to the transportation authority in order to bring buses in from another state. Buses from other states are not coming in on their own, they are coming in through one of Nevada's certificated carriers. Assembly Bill 117 allows certificated carriers to procure school district buses if the school district is interested, before they look out of state in order to meet the transportation requirements of a specific event.

School bus usage cannot interfere with the use of the school bus for its primary purpose; transporting children.

The event organizer will be responsible for the maintenance of the school bus.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

Assembly Bill 117 sets a minimum of what the transportation department of a school district has to provide within an agreement. At the minimum, the bus has to be made whole. Paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of section 1 contains the operable language that ensures the wear and tear and maintenance of the school bus is addressed. Paragraph (d) of subsection 2 of section 1 states that the lessee has to accept responsibility for any damage to the school bus or vehicle while leased as determined by the transportation department of the school district. The bill intentionally includes language outlining the minimum requirements that shall be used by a school district to create a contract. The district can add more restrictive language to a contract.

**Mike McLamore (Nevada State Education Association):**

The Nevada State Education Association supports A.B. 117. We appreciate the bill's sponsor including the indemnification of the drivers in the amended version of the bill. We support giving preference to school district bus drivers and vehicle drivers who have familiarity with the vehicles. We think that will be the safest choice for the lessee.

**David W. Carter (Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee):**

School districts in California have formulas for billing outside entities for school bus usage. I am sure Nevada school districts have the ability to calculate the cost of leasing a school bus. They probably already have the cost calculated for use of a school bus by an in-district entity. I do not think it would be difficult to create a rate for school bus usage by a nonschool district entity. I support A.B. 117.

**Mr. Stevens:**

The CCSD is neutral on A.B. 117. It is permissive and allows the CCSD discretion. The bill includes some legal protection for the school district, thus our neutral position.

**Senator Lipparelli:**

I suggest the school district include some accommodation for the depreciation of the asset.

**Mr. Stevens:**

The CCSD will develop some type of menu for school bus rental. The CCSD still has some unresolved concerns regarding the leasing of a school bus. For example, if a bus breaks down while in the service of a lessee and as a result has to be taken out of service, who will bear the cost? How is the bus replaced? We still have some questions. We try to be prudent with the purchase of school buses. We need to prepare for all circumstances, which is why the CCSD is neutral on A.B. 117.

**Senator Woodhouse:**

What are the terms of the contracts for school district bus drivers? Are they on hourly contracts, 9-month contracts or 12-month contracts? How many drivers do you project will choose to augment their income through A.B. 117?

**Mr. Stevens:**

I am not sure what types of contracts pertain to school bus drivers.

**Senator Hammond:**

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 117 and since Chair Harris has returned she will resume the duties as Chair and open the hearing on A.B. 351.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 351 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to projects to benefit charter schools. (BDR 34-1012)

**Assemblywoman Jill Dickman (Assembly District No. 31):**

Charter schools are at a distinct disadvantage for facility funding. Charter schools receive the same per-pupil allocation as traditional schools, but they must also use the funding to pay the lease or mortgage on their facilities. This drastically affects a charter school's ability to provide quality facilities for its students. The Legislature addressed this issue in, part, through the passage of S.B. No. 384 of the 77th Session. This bill provided our best charter schools with access to the public bond market, which enables them to raise capital for improved facilities and to repay the debt over longer periods of time.

While this approach did not put charter schools on the same footing as our traditional public schools, it was a major improvement. I am aware of only one school, Somerset Academy, which was able to take advantage of this funding option.

To prequalify for the bond financing program, a school must have received one of the two highest State accountability rankings for 3 consecutive years. Section 1 of A.B. 351 requires a charter school that wishes to use bonds to finance a project to have received one of the three highest performance ratings from the statewide system of accountability within the immediately preceding 2 consecutive school years.

Assembly Bill 351 is not a complete solution for charter school facility funding, but it continues to expand the good work of this Committee and the 76th Session of the Legislature.

**Patrick Gavin (Director, State Public Charter School Authority):**

Assembly Bill 351 will expand the availability of facilities for some of our most deserving charter schools. There are seven schools; four charter schools sponsored by the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), one school sponsored by the CCSD, and two schools sponsored by the WCSD, which are eligible under the current statutory scheme. This legislation will double that number. Assembly Bill 351 improves facilities-funding eligibility for charter schools through bonding from 18 percent to 34 percent. Eligibility will remain based upon consistent academic achievement and the preexisting stipulations within statute. The school must remain in good standing with the SPCSA in three areas: academic performance, fiscal performance and organizational viability as measured through the performance framework.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

This is an additional component of funding available to alleviate overcrowding in schools, giving us more options.

**Mendy Elliott (Capitol Partners):**

I am a former director of the Department of Business and Industry (B&I), and will try to answer any questions regarding the bonding process.

**Chair Harris:**

What is the bonding process for charter schools? I believe it begins with a charter school making a request to the director of the B&I who ultimately issues the bond to finance the project. Please provide a brief overview for the Committee of the bonding process.

**Ms. Elliott:**

The application is presented to the director of B&I, which is the State's bank. The application is vetted against established criteria. A bond is issued for a specific project for a defined purpose. The bonds will be sold on the secondary market to an institutional investor. The proposed project is limited in scope. The bond can provide a charter school with a longer term and a lower interest rate on the loan.

There are safeguards in place and an approval process for the issuance of the bond. The B&I reviews the application first, if approved, it is submitted to the State Board of Finance that determines whether it will move forward.

The operating history of the school has to be made available both from an academic and fiscal perspective. The bondholders want to review the fiscal capacity to ensure the school has a linear creditworthy history.

In the application, charter schools are required to provide a 5-year operating history and if the bonds do not meet some of the qualifications, the bonding agency can require a guarantor who can provide additional collateral.

The State has no exposure for a tax-exempt bond for charter schools, since it is just a conduit issue. This is no different than the State selling school district bonds. It does not affect the State's credit rating because it is simply a conduit issuer.

**Senator Hammond:**

Bonds are issued for a project-specific purpose; one campus has one bond. The academic history and financial capability are reviewed one campus at a time.

**Ms. Elliott:**

A bond is issued for a specific project for a specific purpose for a specific time.

**Chair Harris:**

In the unlikely event there is a problem with the school and it has to be closed, what becomes of the property?

**Ms. Elliott:**

The issuers of the bonds have the option to foreclose on the property, work with the entity or seek any other legal remedy.

The bonds are vetted all the way through the process as well as subject to annual ongoing vetting. They are fiscally prudent bonds. Interest rates and terms are subject to change by the issuer of the bond, so it is advantageous to the school to maintain fiscal integrity and academic achievement as set forth in the legislation.

**Chair Harris:**

If a charter school with multiple campuses wants to build another campus, will the amalgamation of their star rating be utilized? Is this the rationale for making 3-star schools, in addition to 1- and 2-star schools, eligible for bond funding through A.B. 351.

**Ms. Elliott:**

Yes, that is accurate.

**Mr. Gavin:**

The B&I and the underwriter look at individual campus data as well as an amalgamation of data for the school. In the case of an expansion of an existing campus, it makes more sense to look at individual campus data. If a charter school wants to refinance its debt, campus-specific data is more useful. If a charter school is proposing to add a campus, a review of the amalgamated campus performance would be beneficial. The review of the combined finances and academic track record of the entity would be essential to the underwriters. Assembly Bill 351 makes allowances for both methodologies. These are sophisticated investors and they will review all information prior to making any type of calculated risk.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

This is a major project started a 2 years ago and unfortunately, not a lot of schools have been able to take advantage of it. We want to expand the program so more schools can access bond funding.

**Lauren Hulse (Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada):**

We support A.B. 351. We appreciate the sponsor working with the Charter School Association of Nevada and other stakeholders on the language of the bill. Charter schools do not receive any facility funding from the State. This bill will help them to manage their million-dollar leases.

There have been occasions where a charter school earns a 5-star rating in its first year. After 2 years of performing well, we want to assist it to obtain funding for a facility. The sooner a charter school can receive assistance to fund its facility, the sooner it can use the per-pupil allocation received from the State on academic programs and services.

**Mary-Sarah Kinner (Academica Nevada):**

Academica Nevada supports A.B. 351.

**Carrie Buck, Ed.D. (Principal, Pinecrest Academy):**

I will now read from my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)). Senate Bill No. 384 of the 77th Session demonstrates how quality school choice can impact a State's educational system and alleviate some of the overcrowding issues in the CCSD. Somerset Academy took advantage of this law and was issued bonds through the B&I. The Somerset Academy was provided the opportunity to use more Distributive School Account (DSA) dollars to directly benefit its students through increased investments in staff, instructional materials and other resources.

Assembly Bill 351 broadens the eligibility of a charter school for bond funding to include 3-, 4-, and 5-star rated schools within 2 years of establishment.

I am currently the principal of Pinecrest Academy Horizon Campus, a public charter school authorized by the Nevada Charter School Authority, serving 940 students. We are opening Pinecrest St. Rose and Pinecrest Inspirada this coming school year. The three campuses will be serving 2,356 students. We have over 1,000 students on waiting lists for admission. We would have to build another school to meet the enrollment demand. The children, parents, teachers and staff make a conscious decision to be there every day creating a learning environment focusing on students first. Many parents love the school, in fact, to quote one of our parents on a recent survey, "I feel so good about this school, I recommended it to others and their children now attend." Another

states, "I love Pinecrest and the education my kids receive. Pinecrest is outstanding."

I support A.B. 351. After turning C.T. Sewell Elementary School in the CCSD from 35 percent proficient in all subjects tested to 85 percent proficient in reading and writing, and 90 percent proficient in mathematics, I moved to the charter world a little over a year ago. Pinecrest was a 3-star school in both elementary and middle schools. A little over a month later, our students took a test and earned a 3-star rating for the elementary school and a 4-star rating for the middle school. This year, we are giving a good-faith effort to take the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium tests; however, with technical difficulties, the testing has been classified invalid because of insufficient server space from the vendor. Combined with the hold-harmless provision from the NDE for this next year, we will retain the 3-star elementary school and 4-star middle school ratings.

The neighborhood school ratings range from 3- to 5-stars. Although our small growth shows a promise of progress, we started implementing a rigorous plan to focus on student academic achievement and students are showing great improvement every day. With the strategic instructional model in place, we have been consistently showing grade-level growth according to our school's interim assessments given this year.

So how does this conversation change? Charter schools function with only \$6,500 per student, with no additional monies for facilities or categorical funds. Charter schools face financial challenges. Paying a lease or a loan for start-up costs is estimated between 14 percent to 18 percent of the school's per-pupil \$6,500 DSA allocation. Unlike public schools, charter schools must use DSA dollars to pay facility leases and start-up costs such as desks and chairs.

With a significant percentage of our per-pupil funding, or around a million dollars, at Pinecrest Academy Horizon going to pay the facility lease and start-up loans, there is less money available for instructional supplies, curriculum, and teacher salaries. The financial challenge for most charter schools is the limited per-pupil allocation that goes to a lease payment instead of paying for quality talent or buying necessary resources for our children. There is a limited teacher pool. We are competing for qualified teachers with Texas, California and other school districts. We are forced to recruit teachers from



across the Nation with less funding. It places us at a disadvantage from the beginning.

The passage of A.B. 351 will make a difference for children attending public charter schools. They deserve the same funding as other children in the Nevada public education system. Every dollar a charter school does not have to send to a landlord can be used for teachers in classrooms and resources for students.

**Mr. Stevens:**

The CCSD "Good News Minute" for today is: The Nevada Restaurant Association's Educational Foundation hosted the Nevada ProStart Invitational earlier this year at Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts. Southeast Career Technical Academy's team placed first in the restaurant management category and we also had two winners in the individual competition categories. They earned the awards for cake decorating and attend East Career & Technical Academy and Southwest Career and Technical Academy. Our schools prepare students for a career after graduation.

Also at the event, Mary Ferrari from Coronado High School was named 2015 teacher of the year.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Education  
April 23, 2015  
Page 18

**Chair Harris:**

I now close the hearing on A.B. 351. There being no further comment or business before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Beth Ann Reykers,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Becky Harris, Chair

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

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness or Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
A.B. 112	C	1	Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson	<i>Las Vegas Review-Journal</i> Article, "Dooley Principal Reassigned ..."
A.B. 112	D	1	Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson	Handout, NRS 388.135
A.B. 117	E	3	Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson	Written Testimony
A.B. 351	F	5	Carrie Buck/Pinecrest Academy	Written Testimony