

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 2, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Becky Harris at 3:33 p.m. on Thursday, April 2, 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, and to the Modular Conference Room, Chilton Circle, Great Basin College, 1500 College Pkwy, Elko, 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 Don Gustavson
Senator Mark Lipparelli
Senator Joyce Woodhouse
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis
Senator Tick Segerblom

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Counsel
Betty Kaminski, Committee Manager
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement,
Department of Education
Marva Cleven, Director, Office of Special Education, Department of Education
Gary W. Olsen through Andrea Juillerat, sign language interpreter,
Nevada Association of the Deaf, Inc.; Commission on Services for
Persons with Disabilities
Summer Wright

Senate Committee on Education
April 2, 2015
Page 2

Karen Taycher, Executive Director, Nevada P.E.P., Inc.; Commission on Services
for Persons with Disabilities
Crystal Abba, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System
of Higher Education
Michael D. Richards, Ph.D., President, College of Southern Nevada
William McCurdy II, Student Body President, College of Southern Nevada
Ebeth Palafox, Latino Leadership Council
Ray Bacon, Nevada Manufacturers Association
Frank Woodbeck, Executive Director, Nevada College Collaborative, Nevada
System of Higher Education
Dan Gouker, Executive Director, Division of Workforce and Economic
Development, College of Southern Nevada
Maria Sheehan, Ed.D., President, Truckee Meadows Community College
Collie Hutter, Chairman, Click Bond, Inc.
Chet Burton, Interim President, Western Nevada College
Justin Harrison, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Rob Hooper, Executive Director, Northern Nevada Development Authority
Randy Robison, Institutional Advisory Council, College of Southern Nevada
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District
Laura Granier, Nevada Connections Academy
Scott Baez, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority, Department of
Education
Lauren Hulse, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada
Manuel Mederos
John Griffin, Amazon.com
Marla McDade Williams, Amazon.com
Jason Lundgaard, Apple, Inc.
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Peggy Lear Bowen

Senator Hammond:

I will open the meeting today with Senate Bill (S.B.) 13.

SENATE BILL 13: Revises provisions relating to the provision of public
education to pupils with disabilities. (BDR 34-311)

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

Senate Bill 13 is a cleanup bill. The first change in the original bill appears in section 1, subsection 6 where we struck some language and changed the definition of pupil with a disability to align it with the federal definition.

In section 2, subsection 2, we deleted the words best feasible and changed the language to only include the word appropriate.

On page 4, section 3, subsection 3, paragraph (a), we deleted the words “or an adjusted diploma.”

On page 5, section 4, subsection 4, paragraph (g), we changed serious emotional disturbances to simply emotional disturbances. We also deleted all of section 5 on page 5 of the bill. That was the original bill.

We had a lot of conversation for a few changes—we worked extensively with various stakeholders including Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, to appreciate the work that was done last Session.

We have a proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) to S.B. 13 and I will go through it for you. On page 3 of the amendment, section 1, subsection 6, we maintained the federal definition of pupil with a disability to align it to the federal code.

In section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (g), we reverted to “best feasible” from the original bill’s change to “appropriate.” We also reverted to the same original language in section 2, subsection 2. Our intention was to align some of the language to federal law, but while meeting with stakeholders and Assemblyman Anderson, it was pointed out that the individual education plan team just needs to consider these options. It is not a mandate.

In section 3, subsection 3, paragraph (a) of the amendment, we maintained the language taking out “or an adjusted diploma.” The adjusted diploma does not exist, nor does the obligation to serve pupils until they have received a standard diploma. That change comports with law.

In section 4, the change to subsection 4, paragraph (g) remains, changing serious emotional disturbances to emotional disturbances. This fits with the federal definition.

In section 4, subsection 5, we no longer strike through the entire section. We maintain the first language: "The minimum standards prescribed by the State Board for pupils with hearing impairments, including, without limitation, deafness, pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection 4." We maintained the strikethrough of paragraphs (a) and (b) in section 4, subsection 5. We included the language referencing a series of federal laws to ensure we are always in line with federal law.

Senator Hammond:

In section 4, subsection 4, paragraph (g) where you changed serious emotional disturbances to emotional disturbances to fit the federal definition, is there a nuanced difference or just a different word with the same definition?

Dr. Canavero:

I do not know but can get the answer for you.

Marva Cleven (Director, Office of Special Education, Department of Education):

The definition of emotional disturbance remains the same, but in Nevada we had the word serious in there and we did not feel we needed to quantify emotional disturbance so we removed the word serious because an emotional disturbance is an emotional disturbance.

Senator Hammond:

The word serious is just a nuance or gradation?

Ms. Cleven:

Correct. Nothing has changed in federal or State law regarding emotional disturbance.

Gary W. Olsen through Andrea Juillerat, sign language interpreter, (Nevada Association of the Deaf, Inc.; Commission on Services for Persons with Disabilities):

I support S.B. 13 with the new language. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

Senator Denis:

Are the amendments you have seen consistent with your issues?

Mr. Olsen:

Yes, I agree with the amendment. It is different from the original bill. The amendment makes a significant difference and includes better definitions that will help parents understand how to process these issues. The schools will need to comply with those rules.

Summer Wright:

As the parent of a deaf child, I support S.B. 13. I have had some struggles this year with communication methods in the school district, so to have this in place to make working with my child and the school district easier is appreciated.

Senator Hammond:

Do you support the amendments?

Ms. Wright:

Yes.

Karen Taycher (Executive Director, Nevada P.E.P., Inc.; Commission on Services for Persons with Disabilities):

We support S.B. 13. We serve many families with deaf children that this bill and the amendment will help us support.

Senator Hammond:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 13 and open S.B. 399.

SENATE BILL 399: Creates the Nevada Boost Grant Program. (BDR 34-890)

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis (Senatorial District No. 2):

This bill creates the Nevada Boost Grant Program. Nevada is one of the few states without any significant state-funded, need-based financial aid. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

Crystal Abba (Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education):

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) supports S.B. 399. I have a friendly amendment ([Exhibit F](#)). We have a severe need for State-supported

financial aid in Nevada. The hole was \$434.5 million for academic year 2012 to 2013. Even though this bill proposes only \$4 million, it is a step in the right direction. In a perfect world, this would be a companion to S.B. 227, because I want to get as much money as I can to those students of need.

SENATE BILL 227: Creates the Silver State Opportunity Grant Program.
(BDR 34-216)

We are proposing three main changes in our amendment that we think will strengthen the measure. For those who attended the affordability summit in December, we heard from experts across the Nation that we have a huge need for educating adult learners.

In the amendment, [Exhibit F](#), because we want to make sure this grant would be available to adult learners, we propose to amend section 3 by eliminating paragraph (c) of subsection 4, which states: "Have never previously enrolled in any public or private college and university." This way, it is clear that adult learners with college credits or those coming back for a degree would be eligible for grants.

The residency provision as written is slightly problematic. On page 3, section 3, subsection 5, paragraph (a), it says a person who graduated from high school in another state would have to be a resident of Nevada for 2 years or more. In that section, the term resident has the meaning ascribed to it as written in *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 396.540. That provision of statute pertains to residency for the purposes of taxes. There is another residency provision in NRS 540 that governs NSHE which makes more sense because it is consistent with State Board of Education policy. The term used in NRS 396.540 is "bona fide resident," so we just made it consistent through that section of the bill. Rather than referencing NRS 360.1040, which has to do with taxes, we reference NRS 396.540.

Section 3 has to do with eligibility for the program in the second semester. The way the bill is now written, to be eligible for the grant in a student's second year or subsequent semester, a student has to have been awarded the grant in the first semester. We wanted to open it up in case there are instances where that requirement is not possible. It also creates an administrative burden. We want to make it more flexible to benefit our students.

Senator Lipparelli:

Regarding the residency change amendment, would it be right to say that one is a stronger residency requirement than the other or are they equal?

Ms. Abba:

It depends on how you define strong. The current bill is for 2 years. Under the provisions of NRS 396.540 and the Board of Regents handbook, the requirement is 12 months. You have to prove you are a bona fide resident of the State and have essentially given up domicile in your prior state.

Senator Lipparelli:

That is why I asked. By moving it to the NSHE standard, we would be reducing by half the residency requirement from what is purported in the bill. It would go from a 2-year requirement to a 1-year requirement.

Ms. Abba:

That is correct. It would make the language consistent with other provisions related to students attending our institutions. It also makes it easier to administer, so we do not have to deal with a completely separate requirement as opposed to the requirement that works now in NRS 396.540.

Senator Denis:

We originally had the residency requirement at 2 years, but after talking to experts, we realized one of the benefits of consistency is that new residents have the opportunity to go to school, graduate, and thus help fill our State's workforce development needs. This could help those who may not have gone to college without the financial help. If someone does go to college here, he or she is more likely to stay in Nevada.

Senator Lipparelli:

It sounds like it does so at the expense of someone who has been in the State longer than the other has. Therefore, a new arrival, if he or she is eligible, would have the mathematic effect of diluting the person who was here longer. It is equal in terms of access, but in a sense, if everyone takes advantage of the program, it would reduce the funds available to someone who has been here longer than someone who showed up a year ago.

Ms. Abba:

That is a fair description of the change, but from the standpoint of a student, is it fair to say you are considered a resident for tuition purposes after 12 months, but for the provisions of this one and only grant program, you are not? I know I would get some phone calls on that.

Senator Hammond:

You mentioned that by making this small change to bona fide, there is an ease of administration. Would that ease of administration also come with a cost reduction?

Ms. Abba:

I do not know that I could estimate that cost because we would have to create a protocol for addressing the 12 months versus the 2 years. The savings may be in the form of an application we would not otherwise need or use. There would be some cost, but it would be minimal.

Senator Hammond:

I asked because if by going to 2 years we are helping those who have been in our State longer, but if the cost of doing business was cheaper by going to the other definition, then we would be saving money that we could then apply to the grant program. Sounds like it would not be enough to make a difference, though.

Ms. Abba:

I agree. It would not be much.

Chair Harris:

I know it is a variable scale based on factors outside your control to calculate student, family and federal contributions, etc., but do you have any sense as to how many students would be helped with this boost grant?

Ms. Abba:

It would be \$4 million divided by 2,000.

Chair Harris:

The bill reads "up to 2,000," so it could be less. It will not be more, but it could be less.

Ms. Abba:

You are correct. That is part of the challenge of blending a capped model for the grant, which was essentially what we originally proposed to the interim committee with a shared responsibility model proposed under S.B. 227.

We are trying to meld those two with the cap, but the bill is very clear that you are still going to be looking at the total cost of education less the student and family contribution to calculate that amount. In most cases, we would expect that amount to be very close to \$2,000 based on the examples we provided for the shared responsibility model.

Chair Harris:

In section 3, subsection 4, paragraph (e), it requires a student to "be enrolled in a program of study leading to a recognized degree or certificate." Does this mean the students will have to declare a major in their first semesters of community college to qualify for the grant money?

Ms. Abba:

The student would simply have to be degree-seeking so he or she could be at the point in his or her program where there had not been a major declared. We have a mechanism in our student services software where we designate these students as degree-seeking or non-degree-seeking.

Chair Harris:

How to you classify a student as degree-seeking versus non-degree-seeking?

Ms. Abba:

When the student fills out the application to enter the institution, he or she tells us what the goal is.

Chair Harris:

So it is self-reported.

Ms. Abba:

Correct.

Chair Harris:

Ultimately, with this grant money, does it matter who is helped, or is the main goal to help a large number of students? Are you aiming to assist a certain population or group, or is it just anyone wanting to further his or her education?

Senator Denis:

The student has to have a need as he or she is starting school or returning to school. In a way, there is a cohort in that respect—that we are trying to boost someone who is just starting or help someone who needs to get going back to school again—like a single mom returning to school, for example. The student also has to be college-ready, not in remedial classes but ready to move forward.

Chair Harris:

Therefore, you are not necessarily trying to help students already enrolled and progressing. As I read the bill, I think it could be broadly applicable to anyone with a need who wants to apply, not necessarily returning or first-time students. With the amendment, as I understood it, anyone in community college who is degree-seeking and meets the qualifications can apply.

Ms. Abba:

Correct. The fact is, \$4 million will not go nearly as far as we would like. The need is so great. We are not targeting a specific population other than the fact that the student has need, is ready to hit the ground running in college level course work and able to take at least 12 credits.

Senator Hammond:

It seems like many students start in college and then sort of trail off. This leaves the juniors and seniors who go on with a lot of money to make up to pay for those who have dropped out of the system. Why are we not offering something to these students to encourage them to finish?

Senator Denis:

With the amendment, [Exhibit F](#), that could happen. This is only for community college funding, so it would only be for a second year, unless the student was enrolled in one of the new 4-year programs that some schools have been incorporating.

Michael D. Richards, Ph.D. (President, College of Southern Nevada):

I support S.B. 399 because it allows Nevada to leverage grant aid programs for greater student completion while keeping higher education affordable for Nevada's families and individual students. Speaking to Senator Hammond's point, I believe these grants will help students complete school, graduate and get out into the marketplace like we all want them to. The College of Southern Nevada (CSN) has thousands of students needing assistance to complete their studies in a timely manner. I underscore the word timely. We remind students to finish in 2 years or enroll in a 12-6-12 program so the credits they take move with them along to completion without any disruption. Yet, many students cannot afford to stay in school. They have to stop to work or see to family responsibilities and they may return to school or they may forget it altogether. State grants will keep students in school longer, allowing part-time students to become full-time students and graduate. That is good for Nevada and why I support this bill.

William McCurdy II (Student Body President, College of Southern Nevada):

I support S.B. 399. There are many students at CSN with many needs. This bill may not be the absolute answer, but it is a step in the right direction to get students through college and to the next level, hopefully at a university, to go on to be an economic driver in Nevada. My CSN senators are in the audience and are standing for this bill, too. As you deliberate this issue, keep the students in mind and continue to strive to make things happen for Nevada's students.

Ebeth Palafox (Latino Leadership Council):

The Latino Leadership Council supports S.B. 399. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

Ray Bacon (Nevada Manufacturers Association):

The Nevada Manufacturers Association is neutral on S.B. 399. We work with the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) and that Department has recently purchased a new tool called Burning Glass. This tool looks at the application database and what we have in the way of job needs versus training needs. We could take this tool along with S.B. 227, match these two databases and make them more consistent between the two bills. More importantly, we can start matching the programs we are funding with the needs of the State. If we are putting in State money, this is a logical step.

Senator Denis:

This bill is a little different from S.B. 227, and it could be a boost to our students. It will not fix every problem, but it will provide a tool to get to some of the students we have been unable to reach. With this tool, we can get them graduated and into the workforce. There is also an option for people to donate into the program, which would make it go even further.

Chair Harris:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 399 and open S.B. 496.

SENATE BILL 496: Establishes the Workforce Development Rapid Response Investment Program. (BDR 34-592)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse (Senatorial District No. 5):

This bill establishes a grant program to provide rapid response funding for new programs to help address the needs of Nevada's changing workforce. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

Frank Woodbeck (Executive Director, Nevada College Collaborative, Nevada System of Higher Education):

This bill will give us an ability to develop curriculum directly related to growth and economic development in the State. We do not have that mechanism now within the community college system and this \$6 million fund would help to do that. The bill also has provisions to require a defined purpose and use for those funds. It has accountability measures built in and an industry tie-in so we have a specific need that would create the reason for the curriculum.

Many states—Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, Utah, Colorado and Louisiana—that compete with Nevada for industry already have funds such as this. I visited Louisiana and met with the president of the community college system there who told me they have a similar fund directly related to growth in specific industries there. Their fund is about \$10 million a year, directed to the community colleges. Ours is about \$6 million. There are many other funds out there that are much larger, but we feel \$6 million is sufficient in this biennium to get us started.

Senator Hammond:

You mentioned that \$6 million is a good place to start. Would you be coming back in future sessions to ask for more money? If so, what criteria would you be using?

Mr. Woodbeck:

When an application is made for the fund, it has to be signed by the president of the college where the program will be installed. It will be tied to a specific need from an industry or a company for curriculum that we currently do not have. The application will also have tied to it the number of students who would be served, the number of graduates and their employment following their education. We could quantify the use of those funds and give you a cost benefit analysis for that curriculum being set up.

There are two items to look at—one now and one for the next biennium. We have to figure out if we can develop curriculum and we have to figure out how to sustain it. Tuition and fees would do that, but in most of these programs, they are fairly high in cost and low in terms of the number of students we can serve. There could be some ongoing cost involved in this, but there is a yield factor we can demonstrate and give you.

Senator Hammond:

It sounds like you are planning to do this, so when you come back you can give us firm data telling what the \$6 million did for this program.

Mr. Woodbeck:

Mr. Bacon referred to the Burning Glass system we invested in with DETR. It is a job-matching system. We can better quantify where we use funds like curriculum development funds and workforce development funds, matching more closely than we could before. We will be able to come back to specific data. Any one of our college presidents can give you very specific uses of funds and needs for funds right down to the bolt, and how much that bolt costs.

Chair Harris:

Could you give us an idea of the type of curriculum that needs to be developed in, for example, health care, medical services, information technology (IT) and the aerospace industries you mentioned?

Mr. Woodbeck:

Right now, we are working on an education pathway in advanced manufacturing technology. That pathway will serve a number of manufacturing companies across a wide spectrum in the State. We are developing that pathway in concert with the Governor's Office of Economic Development and the Washoe County School District. It is based on a German model of education which begins in the junior year of high school. We are developing it, and hopefully, in the next few weeks, we will be able to tell you it will end with a degree in engineering at the University of Nevada, Reno. It will be a condensed, accelerated program where a person can start as a junior in high school to be on the pathway. There are off-ramps, so the person can make choices to be a machinist or some other specialty. The student could also come back on the pathway after exiting and continue with the course work, eventually earning an engineering degree down the road. The pathway is designed so young people can see a career before them. We hope to pilot it this fall. It will be a model for us to replicate in IT, health care and other fields.

Chair Harris:

I have a child who is in an engineering program and maybe really wants to be a machinist based on the comments that are being made. That child had to go to college, is halfway through and figuring that out on their own. It would be nice to have it in place where kids who have an affinity for a particular area would then be able to be on a pathway and see the variations they can opt for within that field.

I have a question about section 9, subsection 3, where it says: "an application for a grant to more than one community college must be approved by the president or other chief administrative officer of each community college that would be awarded the grant." We have community colleges in southern Nevada with more than one campus. Are we talking about two different community colleges, or campuses within one community college?

Mr. Woodbeck:

Two distinct community colleges. For example, we are working on this program with Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) and Western Nevada College (WNC), so each of those presidents would have to sign off on that application. If it was at CSN, it would be President Richards signing off on the application for that college.

Chair Harris:

Are you saying the intent is not for the Henderson campus of CSN to compete with the Charleston campus of CSN for the same pool of money?

Mr. Woodbeck:

Correct. I would suspect in that case that Dr. Richards may be establishing a program in more than one of the CSN campuses, but there would be sufficient funding requested and hopefully granted to do that.

Dr. Richards:

I support S.B. 496. This is a marvelous concept because it invests in the strengths of community colleges. Those strengths include agility, nimbleness and responsiveness to new businesses and industries in need of training. The investment supports curriculum and training to build the qualified workforce Nevada needs. There is committee oversight in this bill and considerable public accountability. We want that because it gives us a chance to explain to the public the advantages of the training we are providing. Many states have this funding tool.

Dan Gouker (Executive Director, Division of Workforce and Economic Development, College of Southern Nevada):

I testified in front of the 2013-2014 interim Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning Community Colleges that was formed as a result of S.B. No. 391 of the 77th Session. This rapid response is how fast we can actually respond to a business.

The Division of Workforce and Economic Development is unique in not being funded by the State. The Division is revenue-generating and all of our programs are developed based on federal grants or the tuition we charge students. For the fiscal year ending June 2014, our Division at CSN had 15,315 enrollments. When we have a new project that comes up, we can move forward quickly because we have this cookie jar of money available. We do not have the benefit of full-time equivalent because we are the noncredit side, but we have the fortunate task of responding to businesses the fastest.

For example, Dr. Richards had a request recently for food service handling instruction. I got an email about it this morning, made a phone call this afternoon, and tomorrow morning one of our staff members will be contacting the individual requesting the instruction and we should have a class set up in a

few days. We will refer that to our credit side for an inclusion in our culinary program. All of our culinary students need this class anyway. We satisfied an immediate need for the businesses and in the long-range approval and curriculum process as required by NSHE to put this into place. Sometimes something like this can take a year to implement, but we can often operate very quickly. If there is equipment or short-term curriculum involved, this type of fund will allow us to move rapidly to make that happen.

Ms. Palafox:

I support S.B. 496 and have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)) from Leo Murietta of the Latino Leadership Council.

Maria Sheehan, Ed.D. (President, Truckee Meadows Community College):

This is an incredible piece of legislation. Community colleges do not have the means to support new curriculum during the upcoming biennium. We want to be ready, prepared and able to produce what the workforce and community employers need within a short period of time. Currently we do not have that ability. We utilize grant dollars and every means possible to serve the population with the training needs for our employer community.

We are undergoing a \$2 million budget reduction, so with our limited funding, we are not able to look forward to how we can meet the needs in the future. Today, we are handling the needs with the fortunate support of grant dollars. We are looking at addressing the substantial backlog of new students wanting training by redesigning curriculum and using our grant dollars to redesign space to accommodate these needs. We are leveraging every ability we can but are concerned about how to answer the question of how are we going to serve the needs of the employer community in the future. We do not have an answer, but we would with this legislation.

We want to be able to fulfill our mission as community colleges, to be able to train the workforce of the future. The National Governors Association says middle skills jobs are becoming a job gap. There will be an avalanche of need and we are not ready. I support S.B. 496.

Collie Hutter (Chairman, Click Bond, Inc.):

I started my aerospace manufacturing company in 1987 with five people. We now employ 322 here in Carson City and 100 more in other states and around

the world. We have had a marvelous partnership with TMCC and WNC in educating our workforce.

There is a nationwide skill shortage. I sat on the board of the National Association of Manufacturers and this is a national problem. There is a shortage of workers with middle skills, those skills we need for manufacturing and other industry jobs. With the economics of this area improving, my company and other industrial companies located here are hiring. We are looking at a 20 percent to 30 percent increase in those jobs with some of the new companies that are coming here. We simply do not have the capacity to train all these people.

This bill is on track with addressing what we identified at our first meeting of the Institutional Advisory Council at TMCC. We are at the critical point because we cannot train enough computer numerical control operators or quality assurance people for those jobs in the next 3 years. Once we can move beyond this and develop those curricula, we will have that to teach our workforce. We have to identify clearly what our needs are to our colleges. After that, it is the responsibility of the educational system to develop curricula and provide training for the teachers and students.

Chet Burton (Interim President, Western Nevada College):

This bill is important to us. Last summer, when all the accolades were coming in with the announcement that Tesla was building a battery mega-factory in our area, Dr. Sheehan and I looked at each other and knew the hard work was just beginning. We have met with Tesla. Officials there cannot give us specifics yet, only that when the demand for the workforce comes, it will be fast and it will be large. We have to be ready to meet this demand, because frankly, we have one chance to get it right. The current funding formula is great for ongoing needs but it is not nimble enough to meet these emerging requirements. There is a 2- to 3-year lag and when you look at businesses moving in and wanting to ramp up quickly, that funding formula does not meet the need. This bill does.

As Mr. Woodbeck mentioned, we have models around the country and frankly, we are in competition with them. This will give Nevada parity with what is going on in the other states with which we are competing. It will be a sales point when companies are looking at relocating. I support S.B. 496 because it will allow the community colleges to meet these needs as they come up, to help us continue to diversify and expand the economy in our State.

Justin Harrison (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

I support S.B. 496 and echo what the college presidents have said. We believe this investment is critical to economic and workforce development in the State and will allow for that flexibility within our community colleges.

Rob Hooper (Executive Director, Northern Nevada Development Authority):

I support S.B. 496. I am here as your economic development team for the Sierra region of Nevada. We have five people on our executive board including three manufacturers, one contractor and one employment service. We all support this bill. We need this. As economic development recruiters out in the field, when we try to recruit people to come and do business here, they ask us what are we going to do for them. They ask about our workforce. This tool will give us something to show them that we can use to train their workforce. This issue comes up all the time.

The economic drivers within the global economy have changed—rapidly. Here in Nevada, what is required by our current employers and our future companies is very different, even from what it was only 5 years ago. The community colleges and what they do are the lynchpins in our economic development. This bill offers us one arrow in our quiver and we need a lot more arrows to move forward with economic development.

I recently attended the SelectUSA Investment Summit in Washington, D.C., with 2,500 attendees there from 72 countries and 50 states. President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry spoke to us at this impressive conference. I was impressed by what all the states are doing to compete with each other and the resources they are bringing to the table.

One of our speakers was the chairman of a petrochemical company that had decided to move to Louisiana, where there is already a fund in place to develop curriculum, as Mr. Woodbeck said earlier. The way that state's economic development won that deal was to use that training program and chip in another \$23 million to build a learning center next to the expansion area to be operated by their community college. These community colleges are the key to us meeting the promises we give to bring and keep companies here.

We have a lot of demand in our region now. We have medical technology companies and information technology companies looking at us. We have one consumer goods manufacturing company interested in coming here that

requires a whole new level of manufacturing technology. I will sit down with President Burton from WNC and tell him what we need. I know he is ready to jump in with WNC, but they need the resources to do it. I know they have the intellectual capital and the ability, but they need the resources, which this bill will provide.

Mr. Bacon:

When this came out of the interim study from S.B. No. 391 of the 77th Session, it was aimed at existing companies, new companies, new technologies and skills. Part this bill fills in the gap, but exactly where and how, we do not know.

This could become a critical link between higher education and our career and technical education programs in our K-12 education system. If we wind up with students on a track, but they need additional skill sets for certain jobs, we can focus the program to get them on track sooner. In this State, there are about 1,000 technical positions open. The Burning Glass program will allow us to focus on what those skills are. This is going to be an invaluable tool.

Randy Robison (Institutional Advisory Council, College of Southern Nevada):

I support S.B. 496 because it directly supports one of the fundamental missions of our community colleges in Nevada. I am also a member of the Board of Directors for the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance and have seen this challenge from the other side.

I have a letter from Dr. Nancy Brune, the chair of the CSN Institutional Advisory Council ([Exhibit J](#)).

Senator Hammond:

Looking at the testimony submitted by Dr. Brune, it shows some of the other funds for similar programs that exist in other states. For example, Florida invests \$20 million, Wisconsin invests \$35 million, Georgia invests \$30 million, Arkansas invests \$15 million and Utah invests \$3.3 million. Mr. Hooper, when you went to that conference and talked to other state representatives about how their funds were working, was there any talk about how the international competition is for this area? How are other countries trying to get companies to move there?

Mr. Hooper:

It was an international conference; much of our conversation was with global companies. Workforce education and training through their networks was paramount. I mostly talked with companies. One company out of Poland has a cybersecurity technology that wanted a U.S. base. That company's representative wanted to know what coding classes we offered locally. I told them we were developing these programs and could do more. We need this tool.

Senator Hammond:

I do not think we are only competing with other states—we are competing with other countries. There is a movement to attract businesses to other places, and there will always be an incentive.

Mr. Hooper:

That is true. The attraction opportunity for Nevada is huge right now. Nevada is geographically in the right spot at the right time. Tesla put us on the radar map. Large companies are asking why Tesla picked us. They want to know if it came down to workforce.

Sadly, I took a company up to the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center to show them land some time ago, and they ended up going to Phoenix because we could not provide the workforce or the programs to create the workforce. It is an Achilles heel if we do not do this. It is a huge opportunity if we do.

Chair Harris:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 496 and turn the meeting over to the Vice Chair.

Senator Hammond:

I will open S.B. 461.

SENATE BILL 461: Provides for an individual graduation plan to allow certain pupils enrolled in a public high school to remain enrolled in high school for an additional period to work towards graduation. (BDR 34-1091)

Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):

This bill creates an individual graduation plan, which is a tool to help a student who is experiencing difficulties get back on the path to graduation. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).

Senator Hammond:

I like this bill. I have read several books about different education systems throughout the world and the one thing many other countries admire about our system is our ability to give students a second, third and maybe even a fourth chance. It allows students to develop and to figure out who they are. It allows them to make mistakes and move on. As soon as a student embraces a career path, he or she typically grabs hold and moves forward. This bill has benchmarks and high achievement standards.

Dr. Canavero:

Here is how this bill is different from the existing academic plans in NRS 388. Academic plans exist. We have academic plans for junior high, middle school and high school. There is a requirement for the Board of Trustees to have a plan and policy to develop a 4-year plan for students as they enter the ninth grade.

Where this initiative sits is on the other side, so the planning in the ninth grade and the 4-year plan is almost a compact with kids as a result of their eleventh grade year. Based on the criteria—credit deficiency, the result of their college and career readiness (CCR) test—brings the third leg of the stool. The intersection is the CCR, administered in the eleventh grade. The student must participate but does not have to receive a particular score to graduate. It is written into the law that the CCR would be used to determine or redefine what a student's twelfth grade classes should be. The specific language is: "that the CCR, presently the American College Test (ACT), will allow teachers and other educational personnel to use the results of that assessment to provide appropriate interventions for the people to prepare for college and career readiness."

It is a logical intersection of those plans on the front side in the ninth grade. Then when the student is in the eleventh grade and we get new information from the CCR, and we can then have this compact.

Senator Segerblom:

I am surprised this does not exist already. You talked about eleventh grade; you are ready to graduate and a triage team comes in and says okay we want you to graduate, let us make a plan and work with you. Is that right?

Senator Harris:

The student has a responsibility. He or she has to remain compliant. Once the plan is developed, hopefully in concert with parents, the student and administrators work together to put that student back on a path, the student would then be required to show appropriate progress and comply with that graduation plan to be able to continue and qualify for the right to have a regular diploma. What is exciting about this bill to me is that someone can struggle in school and still have the opportunity to graduate with a regular diploma so that student's opportunities are not limited by the type of diploma he or she earns.

Craig Stevens (Clark County School District):

The Clark County School District (CCSD) supports S.B. 461. As a school district, our goal is to graduate everyone from high school in 4 years, but we know this is sometimes not possible. We provide plans for graduation for each of our students, so this part of the bill is something we already do. We believe the use of Infinite Campus Parent Portal will make this much easier, more transparent and accountable for not just the schools but for the parents and students. We did have two points our staff wanted to mention about the bill.

First, the mention of the ACT exam that students take in the eleventh grade is something we are making sure everyone has a chance to take. The cut score is high right now, but when everyone starts taking it, the number may dip. It is important to know this is a number that changes as more test results are entered.

Second, we would like to keep statistics on this effort. When we calculate our graduation rate, these students are not counted because the federal government wants us to do it that way. These students should still be celebrated and our schools should still get the recognition for graduating these students even if it takes longer than 4 years.

Senator Hammond:

I agree with you on your second point, that we should celebrate the positives. On your first point about the ACT cut scores, this is used as a tool to measure where a student is and what may be added to their graduation plan in the twelfth grade. In that scenario, do you see a need to adjust the cut scores?

Mr. Stevens:

We just wanted everyone to be aware that the ACT cut score numbers can change. So when we are creating these plans for students and if there is going to be any further regulation, be aware that the variable cut score issue is out there.

Senator Hammond:

I understand the ACT or CCR result is being used as a tool to be able to tell a student he or she might want to take, say, a math class, or an English class, before graduating.

Mr. Stevens:

One thing we really like about this bill is that it is localized, so it allows the school to work with the students and parents to create the best plan for each student.

Laura Granier (Nevada Connections Academy):

Nevada Connections Academy supports this bill. It is important policy to support reengagement of these credit-deficient students. Nevada Connections Academy serves a significant number of these students, up to 35 percent of our high school population. We have highly individualized programs for all our students so this bill fits our goals well.

We have the same comment about performance accountability that was mentioned earlier. Schools are sometimes penalized for taking these credit-deficient students because it negatively affects their reported graduation rate. On the State's graduation report card, these schools can have lower scores, even though they are taking these students and graduating them. We would be happy to work with the bill's sponsor to provide additional insight and incentives to get these students reengaged and graduated.

Senator Hammond:

I see the sponsor nodding her head in the affirmative. Yes, there are schools that these students might gravitate to because of their ability to motivate and accommodate each student.

Scott Baez (Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District supports S.B. 461. Washoe County schools currently provide fifth-year seniors, or credit-deficient seniors, the opportunity to

apply to graduate with a traditional diploma during their fifth year. For that reason, we have no problem complying with the new language in this bill and we are eager to support it.

Mr. Bacon:

One thing that happened over the last interim was an alternative test approved by the State Board of Education—the National Career Readiness Certificate, talked about in the S.B. No. 391 of the 77th Session study. That is also a product of ACT, but it has an advantage in that it does not have a pass/fail; it has a bronze, silver, gold, platinum scale.

The secondary thing it has, which is valuable for this tool, is the option to take a student's ACT or CCR scores and use them to illuminate the types of careers he or she could be qualified for based on areas of interest. That gives the school a tool to say a student could get into a certain field if he or she is interested, but may need an extra math or English class. It could be a very powerful tool to get those kids we are losing to earn a high school diploma and into programs beyond that.

Mary Pierczynski (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents supports S.B. 461. Jessica Ferrato with the Nevada Association of School Boards had to leave, but they are also in support.

Patrick Gavin (Director, State Public Charter School Authority, Department of Education):

We support this bill, both the intention and the language. We will work with the sponsor to ensure we are doing everything we can to performance manage not only our schools, but also our individual students towards success.

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

The Charter School Association of Nevada supports S.B. 461. We think rewarding schools for graduating these students and having it not count against their performance is the right way to go.

Manuel Mederos:

I am a positive social change entrepreneur. This bill is essential. I have some suggestions to specify who will be responsible for overseeing the success of the student. Will it be a counselor or a teacher? It says in the bill that it will be the

superintendent of public instruction, which is a great initiative, but specifically, who is going to be following that student after they have determined he or she needs additional help?

Senator Hammond:

Before we end the hearing, the sponsor will have a chance to speak and maybe she will answer that question.

Senator Harris:

Regarding the 5-year seniors mentioned earlier, we would very much like the schools to get credit for graduating the students so we will definitely incorporate that into an amendment. I do have a letter from Tambre Tondryk from the Beacon Academy of Nevada to submit ([Exhibit L](#)).

Dr. Canavero:

I just wanted to address some of the concerns mentioned today. Regarding the concern about the ACT exam, we do use the CCR benchmarks, which is a pretty wide net.

Further, on page 2, section 1, subsection 3, it states: "The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall make a determination each year concerning the maximum number of pupils for whom the individual graduation plan may be established" This is based on those three criteria that are enumerated in section 1, subsection 1, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). This enables the State to thoughtfully weigh the needs of and where to set the bar on the CCRs for each student.

Lastly, the process in this bill involves the student and is essentially a compact between the student and the school. The student knows the conditions that must be met, the grade point average that must be maintained, and the required or recommended enrollment in specific units of credit he or she must take and pass. The student must make progress in the plan or the compact is broken. That student would then lose the graduation plan and the ability to continue for the 18 months toward a regular diploma.

Senator Hammond:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 461 and open the hearing on S.B. 463.

SENATE BILL 463: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-411)

Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):

This bill addresses the need for student data privacy. I recently attended conferences on education and the growing industry of computer applications that are being developed to help students better understand what is being taught in their classes. I thought that was fantastic. However, I learned that third-party vendors are not regulated in the significant amount of data they can collect from these students. That is what S.B. 463 addresses. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit M](#)).

Senator Hammond:

If a teacher uses a certain program in a classroom, how would your bill make it possible for the parent of a student to be informed that their child might be using a program that would share personal data? For example, I use a program in my classes called Quizlet. It enables my students to complete quizzes at home on their own computers. At the time I started using it, I did not realize the application was collecting data from each student. How does S.B. 463 inform parents that this is happening?

Senator Harris:

I do not know if that information is transferred to the parent. The student or parent would have to provide the ability to use the application, but federal law allows a child at 13 years of age to opt in and use the technology.

Senator Lipparelli:

Can you give me an example of how this would work?

Senator Harris:

There is a code of ethical conduct that will be established for the vendors of third-party applications to abide by regarding student data. For one thing, these parties will not be able to sell or use students' personal information. When you sign up for these applications, they typically get a name, age, school, class and teacher name. That information could be used to market materials and other school applications, etc. There would also be a district-wide policy and teacher development education so teachers could know what they are getting into when they use a program in their classrooms.

Senator Lipparelli:

Therefore, the school district would set the policy, the policy would maybe include a license agreement saying, for example, if you are going to collect

information, you must do it pursuant to a set of rules that include no remarketing, etc. Is that how it works?

Senator Harris:

Yes. We would allow aggregate data to be employed so the programs could use personal data to tailor-make quizzes or applications designed for each student's aptitude or weakness. As long as it is an educational component limited solely to that product and that child for some adaptive learning, data collection would be allowed.

Senator Lipparelli:

To take it to the next step, in the cases where the third party violates the agreement, to what are they subjected?

Senator Harris:

A civil penalty up to \$5,000.

John Griffin (Amazon.com):

We have had some discussion with trade groups that Amazon is a member of, including State Privacy and Security Coalition and NetChoice, which includes Apple, Google and Facebook. The amendments we are working on ([Exhibit N](#)) accomplish the goals of the Chair while keeping some flexibility for the system. There is a letter from Carl Szabo, the policy counsel of NetChoice ([Exhibit O](#)).

Marla McDade Williams (Amazon.com):

Everyone understands the need for privacy of information. The challenge is ensuring it is not so restrictive that companies do not want to come into the State to work with the school systems. Data portability is one area that needs to be allowable so parents and students can transfer information between schools.

Ms. Granier:

We support a balanced approach and appreciate the need to protect the student data and privacy. Our concern is that we do not inadvertently ban technologies to help students advance their success in education. The challenge is to harness the power of the data enabling student success, while still protecting privacy. We are working on some conceptual amendments to address these issues. We want to clarify definitions to specify that directions to service providers should it come from the school or school district rather than an individual parent who

might want certain information to be deleted that the school wants to retain. Allowing for the use of aggregated data is important to enable improving educational products.

Jason Lundgaard (Apple, Inc.):

We have worked with the sponsor on this bill to strike the right balance between protecting student privacy and continuing to allow adaptive and customized learning to take place in the classroom. We want to make sure we do not cut off innovation in the name of privacy.

Senator Denis:

Technology is becoming a bigger piece of education and these privacy issues are coming up. As an industry, are you talking about these issues? Are there solutions? We can put policies in place that will help, but those will only work if there is available technology behind those policies.

Mr. Griffin:

There has been a lot of discussion with the industry and trade groups on this topic. There is a Software & Information Industry Association Student Privacy Pledge to which many industry members are signatories. Most companies are working together in different states because these types of bills are coming up repeatedly, and there are some very innovative things being done.

Nicole Rourke (Clark County School District):

We are neutral on this bill. We have some amendments and know there will be some additional changes as mentioned before, so we would like to review the bill when it is completed so we can see what is applicable to the CCSD.

Senator Hammond:

This bill addresses third-party vendors making deals with school districts, then limiting what these vendors can use afterwards with collected data. The scenario I brought up about Quizlet might need to be more of a district policy where teachers in a classroom find software that is so inviting and then find it is collecting data that parents might not want out there. Is there a CCSD policy in place to deal with this issue?

Ms. Rourke:

This is a policy we are looking at as we are working on our data policies. It is our understanding that this bill is not meant to apply to our Infinite Campus and student data system.

Senator Harris:

I look forward to the amendments and feedback from everyone when we have them in place.

Senator Hammond:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 463.

Chair Harris:

I will open the work session with S.B. 211.

SENATE BILL 211: Revises provisions governing public schools. (BDR 34-426)

Todd Butterworth (Policy Analyst):

I have prepared a work session document for S.B. 211 ([Exhibit P](#)). The original bill regulates start times for elementary, middle and high school as well as the addition of a mandatory course on ethnic studies to be designed and added to high school curricula across the State. There are conceptual amendments and fiscal notes accompanying this bill. The amendments drop the school start time regulation and make the ethnic studies class optional instead of mandatory.

Chair Harris:

Those fiscal notes were significant, as in hundreds of millions of dollars, but since we struck the school start portion of the bill, those fiscal notes will shrink dramatically. Senator Segerblom decided to make this ethnic studies class available instead of mandated. It is in the best interest of our children to know more about the world around them.

Senator Segerblom:

Nicole Rourke will work with us as the school district creates the ethnic studies curriculum.

Senator Hammond:

I support this amendment. The only question I have pertains to the smaller charter schools. Typically, in spring the schools will send out a list of the

elective classes being offered. If we comply with the intent of this bill, this ethnic studies class will be on that elective list. After summer begins, when administrators look at how many students take a class and if there are not enough sign-ups to warrant the class, what will be the consequence of removing the class from the curriculum list? Would the school be out of compliance with the bill?

Chair Harris:

As I understand it, by allowing it to be taught as a distance learning option, there is a higher probability of access to the class.

Ms. Rourke:

We make many of our distance education courses available to other schools and other school districts, so we usually have an agreement for other students to take these courses. We would do that with a class like this.

Chair Harris:

Are you saying a charter school would not be out of compliance if it did not have enough students to teach the class?

Ms. Rourke:

Yes, it would not be out of compliance.

Mr. Gavin:

I concur with Ms. Rourke's analysis. There would be a slight cost the school would have to pay to access the course, but it would be less than paying for an instructor for only three students. That would mitigate some of the potential fiscal impact of this worthy course of study.

Senator Lipparelli:

My intention was to be a no vote on these four different proposed programs, but with the amendments, I will vote yes.

Senator Gustavson:

I agree. I was going to vote no on the course being mandatory and I had some issues with the start times, but with the amendments, I can support the bill.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 211.

SENATOR LIPPARELLI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Harris:

I will close S.B. 211 and open S.B. 313.

SENATE BILL 313: Authorizes the governing body of a private school to develop and provide a program of distance education. (BDR 34-1032)

Mr. Butterworth:

I am submitting a work session document on S.B. 313 ([Exhibit Q](#)), which authorizes a private school to create distance learning options for certain students. There is a conceptual amendment but no fiscal notes.

Chair Harris:

As I understand it, the Davidson Academy of Nevada is one of the premier educational facilities in the State. There is necessity for this legislation because that facility cannot expand and offer distance education without it. This bill would allow the Academy to provide a high quality education to a much larger number of students in both northern and southern Nevada.

Senator Denis:

Initially, I had some concerns about why we had to go through a private school to offer this. I think this is the only public school in the country that works with profoundly gifted. It would be difficult to find another public school to find that curriculum. Since our last meeting on this bill, I took my wife and son over to the school. They were very impressed, but that school is over capacity. This will give them the opportunity to work with more kids throughout the State. I appreciate the amendments, but cannot remember what NRS 388.820 does.

Mr. Butterworth:

That is the distance education statute, I believe.

Risa Lang (Counsel):

Correct, those are the distance education programs established in statute to authorize the regular public schools to provide distance education.

Senator Denis:

In the amendment, what does that change from the original language?

Ms. Lang:

Since the Davidson Academy and the schools for profoundly gifted are covered in another chapter, this just says they would cover it in their own way instead of having to be subjected to the same things that are applicable to the other public schools.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 313.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Harris:

I will close S.B. 313 and open S.B. 390.

SENATE BILL 390: Revises provisions relating to charter schools. (BDR 34-78)

Mr. Butterworth:

I have a work session document for this bill that contains amendments from Chair Harris and no fiscal notes ([Exhibit R](#)).

Chair Harris:

We have a better bill than we originally created. I appreciate the compromise with preferences, so children can remain in their neighborhood and charter schools thus are representative of their communities; and for vulnerable children in overcrowded schools having the opportunity to access the charter school.

Senate Committee on Education
April 2, 2015
Page 33

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 390.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Harris:

I will close S.B. 390 and open S.B. 414.

SENATE BILL 414: Encourages the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada to enter into a reciprocal agreement with the State of California to provide full waivers of nonresident tuition to certain residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin. (BDR S-993)

Mr. Butterworth:

I have a work session document for S.B. 414 ([Exhibit S](#)) with one amendment and no fiscal notes.

Chair Harris:

As a Legislature, we cannot enact this bill, but we can urge the Board of Regents to act in this reciprocal agreement.

Senator Woodhouse:

I struggled with this bill because I believe it is the responsibility of the Board of Regents in both states to do their jobs and act on this. I will vote for it, though, because it is an encouragement, not a mandate.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED S.B. 414.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Education
April 2, 2015
Page 34

I will close S.B. 414 and open S.B. 13, the bill we heard earlier today that we are going to put into this work session.

Senator Hammond:

This bill was basically cleanup language to make the language consistent with federal language defining disabilities regarding the hearing impaired. There was no opposition to the bill.

Senator Denis:

I had earlier asked members of the community who work with this population how they felt about the bill, and they were comfortable with it and also with the amendments.

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 13.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Harris:

I will close S.B. 13 and open S.B. 461, another bill we heard earlier today.

Mr. Butterworth:

This bill is related to individual graduation plans.

Chair Harris:

I am grateful we can provide some services for students to find success in education and realize their full potential.

Senate Hammond:

Was there conversation about adding something to the bill?

Mr. Butterworth:

There was testimony about potentially amending the bill to address how serving these kids will impact a school's graduation rate.

Chair Harris:

My intention would be to allow the schools that provide the services to these students to be able to count them as graduated students for purposes of their star rating.

Senator Denis:

Is it only in the star rating that we care about, or do we count them as graduates in other statistics?

Chair Harris:

I would love to be able to give them full credit for graduating these children who would not otherwise be able to graduate. I will put together a conceptual amendment that would allow credit to those schools in terms of data, statistics, star ratings, etc.

Dr. Canavero:

Right now we collect a 4-year cohort graduation rate, so when students enter ninth grade, they get 4 years and we calculate the graduation rate based on that 4-year window. Nothing would prohibit the department from creating a fifth-year graduation rate. It could live in the reporting system, so our public accountability system, the Nevada Report Card, could be amended to include a fifth-year graduation rate. On the accountability side, you could incorporate it into the statewide system of accountability. That way, it would be part of the statewide system of accountability which yields the star rating.

Ms. Rourke:

We would support an amendment that would include fifth-year seniors who earn a diploma in our graduation rate.

Mr. Gavin:

I would encourage in the language of the statute or the rulemaking done by the Department, that we distinguish between a student who is reengaged by a school, who for whatever reason, disconnected, and a student who has been reengaged by a school to ensure that school got the credit. I would argue that there is a distinct difference between that situation which is entirely laudable on the part of the adults, and a situation where a student may have languished for whatever period of time and not been successful in a school. We should differentiate between those two circumstances to ensure as many students as

possible graduate within 4 years. That is what we all want, for the benefit of the child and the public.

As a result of A.B. No. 205 of the 77th Session, Dr. Canavero developed this concept of a statewide performance framework for our charter schools. As part of that measure, there is a statutory provision for creating rigorous alternate metrics that are mission-specific for schools.

One of the challenges we have faced, particularly with counting graduation rates, is how to create something that is objectively verifiable so we can truly give credit where credit is due. I am excited by the opportunity to create a statewide system which would allow us to look at 6, 7 or 8 years out. We know there are schools that claim to be doing this work and I would love to be able to give them credit and move from anecdotes to facts.

Dr. Canavero:

There is a bill, S.B. 460, creating an alternate performance framework for alternate schools. That opens much of the statute for which this idea would apply.

SENATE BILL 460: Revises provisions related to the statewide system of accountability for public schools. (BDR 34-1108)

Senator Harris:

We are hearing that bill tomorrow. Should we pull back this bill and wait until tomorrow, or should we distinguish between a languishing student and one who has been reengaged for purposes of clarification and make sure we are providing the schools with the correct data as well as the credit for graduating these kids?

Senator Woodhouse:

I like the direction this conversation is going. I think that since a number of issues have come up, we should pull back this bill today until we can see what our amendments should look like, especially since we are listening to a bill tomorrow that may impact this bill.

Senator Denis:

I agree. This is important and I want to move forward, but there are issues.

Chair Harris:

I agree. We do not want to be in such a hurry to get our work done so we are tripping over things that are important. I will close S.B. 461 and open S.B. 496, another bill we heard earlier today that we are bringing to the work session.

Mr. Butterworth:

The third bill from today's meeting for potential action is Senator Woodhouse's Workforce Development Rapid Response Investment Program.

Chair Harris:

This bill was universally supported. All the community colleges weighed in and think it is wonderful. It will be an opportunity for us to work on our economic development. There is significant support from major economic partners.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 496.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

Chair Harris:

I will close work session and move to public comment.

Peggy Lear Bowen:

I observed the starting times given for the children. We faced this a long time ago in Washoe County with bus drivers and trying to get them to have a better schedule so they could work and have the elementary schools starting earliest and the high schools starting the latest. That was the concept.

I am not a morning person, but I had to go against my personal constitution here. I said, let us face reality—the elementary kids, the babies, you are going to have on the street. For the families of less economic means, you have the babysitters, meaning the middle school students, still in class. They then reworked it for the child care issue I brought forth. So against my internal constitution, the middle school started first, so child care would be available when the elementary schools were released. I wanted to relate this to you

Senate Committee on Education
April 2, 2015
Page 38

because I heard someone say we should have elementary school kids start first, which means they end first.

Chair Harris:

I will adjourn this meeting at 6:29 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Becky Harris, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness or Agency	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	7		Attendance Roster
S.B. 13	C	8	Steve Canavero, Ph.D.	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 13	D	1	Gary W. Olsen	Written Testimony in Support
S.B. 399	E	3	Senator Moises (Mo) Denis	Written Testimony
S.B. 399	F	2	Crystal Abba	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 399	G	1	Ebeth Palafox	Written Testimony in Support
S.B. 496	H	3	Senator Joyce Woodhouse	Written Testimony
S.B. 496	I	1	Ebeth Palafox	Support Letter from Leo Murietta, Latin Leadership Council
S.B. 496	J	1	Randy Robison	Written Testimony from Nancy Brune
S.B. 461	K	2	Senator Becky Harris	Written Testimony
S.B. 461	L	1	Senator Becky Harris	Letter of Support from Tambre Tondryk
S.B. 463	M	4	Senator Becky Harris	Written Testimony
S.B. 463	N	10	John Griffin	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 463	O	2	John Griffin	Letter from Carl Szabo of NetChoice
S.B. 211	P	10	Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst	Work Session Documents
S.B. 313	Q	4	Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst	Work Session Documents
S.B. 390	R	1	Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst	Work Session Documents
S.B. 414	S	2	Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst	Work Session Documents