

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 30, 2017**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Tyrone Thompson at 12:31 p.m. on Tuesday, May 30, 2017, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chairman
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Keith Pickard
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Becky Harris, Senate District No. 9
Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Craig M. Stevens, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs,
Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District
Lorne Malkiewich, representing K-12, Incorporated
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents;
and Nevada Association of School Administrators
Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards;
and Nevada Builders Alliance
Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; and representing
Nevada State Education Association
Ed Gonzalez, representing Clark County Education Association
Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department
of Education
Bradley Combs, Senate Intern
Bruno Moya, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Samantha Bivins, representing Consolidated Students of the University of Nevada,
Las Vegas
Randy Dexter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Leslie Lingo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Luis F. Valera, Vice President, Government Affairs and Compliance, University
of Nevada, Las Vegas
Constance J. Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs,
Nevada System of Higher Education
Kevin Burns, Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Council
Manny Lamarre, Executive Director, Office of Workforce Innovation, Office of
the Governor
Austin Slaughter, representing the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Brad Keating, Legislative Representative, Community and Government Relations,
Clark County School District
Ray Bacon, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association

Chairman Thompson:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We will hear
three bills today, and I will take items out of order. We will open the hearing on
Senate Bill 132 (2nd Reprint).

**Senate Bill 132 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public high schools.
(BDR 34-47)**

Senator Becky Harris, Senate District No. 9:

Senate Bill 132 (2nd Reprint) ensures that high school students have access to valuable graduation planning tools and ensures the students, their families, and their schools are actively engaged in seeing those plans to a successful conclusion. On the Senate side, Communities in Schools came to give a presentation to the Senate Committee on Education. They stated that a student who graduated high school is likely to contribute to society an estimated value of \$1.5 million during their adult lifetime. A student who does not graduate is very likely to consume from society an estimated \$1.5 million on needed support services from the criminal justice system, welfare, alcohol and substance abuse, cost of additional health-care needs, et cetera. I think it is critical that we provide Nevada's children with possibilities and potential instead of closing doors that will impact them for the rest of their lives.

Senate Bill 132 (2nd Reprint) expands upon existing individual academic plans by making the plans more specific, while creating an individual graduation plan as a tool to help certain at-risk high school students to get back on track toward graduation. An existing statute provides for the development of a four-year academic plan for high school students. This bill ensures that those plans are developed at the beginning of the student's ninth-grade year, and then updated annually by the student, their parent or guardian, and the school counselor.

The bill also ensures that families know what is needed on the ACT exam to get into the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), what diploma options are available and the related requirements, what advanced courses are available, and finally, how to apply for federal financial aid.

This is what S.B. 132 (R2) does for all of our high school students. It also addresses some additional needs for students who have fallen behind but still want to graduate. This would be accomplished by requiring school boards and charter high schools to adopt a policy that allows, but does not require, the use of an individual graduation plan for students who are not likely to graduate on time, have not scored well on college- and career-readiness assessments, or who meet other conditions established by the state superintendent. It also ensures that students needing remediation enroll in sufficient credits during their senior year of high school.

Right now, we are paying through the State Distributive School Account (DSA) for a full day of education for some students. Although they may be credit-sufficient, they might need remediation or be able to leave school at 10 or 11 a.m. This bill would allow for those students to continue to remain in school so that we are remediating them to be successful in our institutions of higher education. An individual graduation plan allows a student to remain enrolled in high school for up to three semesters after their scheduled graduation date. It provides a roadmap to a diploma and outlines the courses, semester credits, grade point average, and other benchmarks necessary for success.

However, no student will be entitled to a plan. If a student is not making adequate progress in passing their classes, the plan can be withdrawn at any time. To incentivize schools to use the individual graduation plans, S.B. 132 (R2) ensures that the plans are not detrimental to the school's graduation rate. For every successful outcome, that high school graduation rate will go up as those students graduate.

We have an amendment on the Senate side, because it has come to my attention that high-performing students who get invited to study abroad or get some grants to go elsewhere, because they do not graduate with their original cohort, actually graduate from high school and are counted as dropouts under our current system. This bill also rectifies that problem.

Chairman Thompson, and members of the Committee, I urge you to join me in supporting this piece of legislation.

Assemblyman Pickard:

Given that the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 requires a 67 percent graduation rate, I am wondering if the language in section 1, subsection 10(b)(2), "Has a graduation rate that is more than 60 percent . . ." was an intentional difference from the federal component?

Senator Harris:

Yes. We have a lot of charter schools that may participate but are not required to participate. We have defined a charter school in good standing along those lines.

Assemblyman Pickard:

Very good, thank you.

Chairman Thompson:

Are there any further questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Flores:

You have a lot of great stuff in here, and I really appreciate it. I just have a few questions about your roadmap. If you could walk me through it in a little more detail in a practical manner. Could you give me an example if a student walks in and does not perform well on the ACT, and how you see this whole thing playing out?

Senator Harris:

Say that a student will be a freshman in high school and they will have an opportunity to meet with a counselor to map out their graduation plan. They are credit-sufficient, things are going well, they are going to school every day, they take the ACT and receive a low ACT score. At that point in time they would meet again with their counselor as part of their annual review. While they may be credit-sufficient, in that they could graduate a little early at that point time, the counselor would sit down and counsel with the student and their family about higher education and opportunities—whether that be College of Southern Nevada (CSN), an apprenticeship program, or something like that to help put that student

on a roadmap with additional classes that they could take their senior year to help them remediate while they are still in high school—that would give them the best possible chance for success once they graduate from high school.

Another scenario might be that we have some transient students, or a child who does not go to school because there is a significant family illness. For whatever reason, some kids are just not able to make it to school on a regular basis, so they are credit-deficient. They would then, with their parent or guardian, or maybe even with their school counselor, have an opportunity annually to look at where they are and to plan out a roadmap recognizing that they may not graduate in four years—they might need another one or two semesters to be able to graduate. The student would then have the opportunity to enter into an individual graduation plan where they would have certain requirements. One of those requirements would be to pass their classes and work with their school, to be able to graduate with a high school diploma. In those situations, the school will get credit for that student who graduates with a high school diploma. In that way, we are not just furloughing them over into adult education. We are building those supports around that student and helping them achieve that high school diploma that becomes so critical as you are trying to advance after high school.

Assemblyman Flores:

To be clear, is it your opinion that some of that is not happening now—those conversations with the counselors—and that we do not necessarily create a roadmap for students now? Is that your opinion?

Senator Harris:

It is not only my opinion, it is my personal experience. I had two children graduate from Clark County high schools, and I was contacted only one time for only one of my children during the entire four years that both of them spent in high school. While they had a roadmap to success, because they had the support structures they needed at home, that led me to be concerned about other students with whom they were friendly, or whom we had come into contact with, that did not have those same supports at home and were literally falling through the cracks.

Assemblyman Flores:

I appreciate that comment. I was just confused by that because I had presented a bill and I had talked about roadmaps that were not happening. I think you stated that they were, and that they were unnecessary. I am confused.

Senator Harris:

No, I am not aware that I ever said that.

Assemblyman Flores:

I appreciate that, as it is a great concept.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

Things happen in kids' lives sometimes that take them out for a semester beyond their control. It can be devastating to be unable to finish. I am trying to remind myself what we do right now. I know we have adult learning and other alternative paths for people to finish a high school diploma, but are they not earning the standard diploma once they reach a certain age? I thought we had a system similar to this. Could you explain how this is different from what we do now? Also, I am curious if this is being tried elsewhere and if you have examples from other states?

Senator Harris:

Interestingly enough, yes. Vermont has actually implemented this program. I brought a bill similar to this last session, and was ultimately unable to get it out of the Senate Committee on Finance. Happily, S.B. 132 (R2) has moved through the Senate Committee on Finance. In National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) trainings that I attended as the Chair of the Senate Committee on Education, Vermont's system, which is similar to this, was touted as one of the most innovative ways to address high school graduation challenges.

High schools do not get credit for students who move out of high school and go into adult education. This is not about increasing our graduation rates so much as making sure that students still have access to counselors and social workers and those supports that they receive in high school. Once they have moved out of high school and into adult education, they do not have some of the structural supports that only come with being enrolled in our regular high schools. For our at-risk and vulnerable students who do not have those structural supports at home, those added benefits are worth retaining them in high school a bit longer until we can help to stabilize the situation.

Assemblywoman Miller:

The bill talks about a plan. We know that plans are just ideas that are written on paper. It is the commitment behind it, the enforcement behind it to ensure that it is actually completed, that matters. Much of the bill talks about notifying the parents about these items. I see in section 2, subsection 3 where it states that the plan should be with the student and the parent, and that both would be required to sign it. Then, paragraph (c) says "Review the academic plan at least once each school year in consultation with a school counselor and revise the plan if necessary." I definitely believe that, in most cases, without parental support, it is much more challenging for students to succeed, so there has to be a parental component in this. What happens when the parents do not comply with this requirement—either by their choice or their inability to meet on a yearly basis and sit down with the counselor and the student? Who is the penalty on then? Is this a reflection on the school or the counselor that it is not getting done, or is there some understanding that this component was out of the control of the school?

Much of this is what counselors do, because this is their job and scope. However, to now think that I, as a counselor, would have to sit down with every single one of my students and their parents and schedule a review, in addition to what I am already doing—I am wondering if we are getting more counselors? How is this going to be handled?

Senator Harris:

That is already existing law. It is in the black language. We are not really adding anything. To the extent that parents cannot be available, it would then be between the school and the student. We recognize that it is difficult to require a parent to come in and not every parent is able to, willing to, or even wants to come in and be a part of the process. I think there is a missing piece with regard to schools, and that parents are not often invited in and allowed to participate. This is already existing law, but it will strengthen having that additional support at home, to the extent that it can exist, by including the parents.

Chairman Thompson:

We will open for support for of S.B. 132 (R2).

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

We are here in support of S.B. 132 (R2). We appreciate the sponsor for working with us so hard. I am here to say that our superintendent believes that the senior year in high school should be about acceleration or remediation and not hibernation. We believe this bill helps us with that. Expanding the cohort to six years will help some of our high schools. While the graduation rate of some of our high schools may be lower than we want, if you look at those students who are there for the whole four years, they are actually at 80-plus percent. This bill will help us keep kids in school, get them the education they need longer, and not penalize the schools who are doing the great work that they need to do.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Mr. Stevens, do you have any numbers as to how many students we might currently have that are credit-deficient and are not on track to graduate? Just to get a sense for how many students would benefit from this policy advancing? Could Washoe County also answer that?

Craig Stevens:

I do not have that number, but I can get it for you ASAP.

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

We participated in the working group with Senator Harris over the interim. We have been engaged in this conversation for a while. We appreciate having options for kids. We do want to make clear that our expectation is graduation in four years. That is absolutely the standard expectation. However, if there are circumstances beyond the student's control, we do like having this option. We do have fifth-year seniors right now, but we do not have sixth-year seniors; that is new for us. We do try to encourage our fifth-year seniors to stay in their zoned high schools for all of the reasons that Senator Harris mentioned. Sometimes, for whatever reasons or behavioral reasons, having 19- and 20-year-olds on campus can be problematic, so they opt into our adult education program. That is absolutely their choice.

We do appreciate having this additional flexibility to keep them in school longer. We do know that the new Nevada School Performance Framework, which is the star system, will include the fifth-year graduation rate as a measure for acknowledging the hard work that our high schools are doing for these students that need just a bit of extra time.

I do not know the number of students that we have that are credit-deficient, but I will check for you.

Lorne Malkiewich, representing K-12, Incorporated:

We are in strong support of this bill. Quite simply, this bill will result in students graduating and getting degrees that otherwise would not have. The students who will be benefiting from this are those who are most at-risk and most in need of this assistance. Again, thank you, Senator Harris, for the bill. We are in strong support.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators:

This will give students another opportunity. Sometimes kids get into high school at 14 years old and start goofing off and not getting their credits. By the time they are 17 years old, they realize that they need that high school diploma. This bill will give them that opportunity. The other part is, if they are not serious and not doing their work, then the contract ends and they are out. We like that part of it too.

Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards; and Nevada Builders Alliance:

We are here in support of S.B. 132 (R2) and echo the comments of our colleagues. I would like to thank Senator Harris for all of the work she has done on this bill, and we appreciate the work that is done in this Committee as well.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; and representing Nevada State Education Association:

As a high school teacher, I feel that this is a very strong bill. I would like to just say ditto.

Ed Gonzalez, representing Clark County Education Association:

We are in support of S.B. 132 (R2). On the Senate side, we had many of our counselors come to testify in support. I believe the Clark County School District's Associate Superintendent did as well. For them it was simple—anything we can do to help kids graduate, even if it meant some additional work, they are more than happy to do it.

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education:

For the reasons already articulated, we are in support.

Chairman Thompson:

Do we have anyone in Las Vegas in support of S.B. 132 (R2)? [There was no one.] We will go to opposition for S.B. 132 (R2). [There was no one.] Is there anyone in neutral for S.B. 132 (R2)? [There was no one.]

Senator Harris:

Thank you, everyone, for your consideration of my bill.

Chairman Thompson:

We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 132 (2nd Reprint). We will now have a work session on Senate Bill 132 (2nd Reprint). We will bypass Ms. Welden since we just heard the bill. At this time I would entertain a motion for do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 132 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN FUMO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Pickard. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint): Provides for the award of college credit for military education, training and occupational experience. (BDR 34-1080)

Bradley Combs, Senate Intern:

I am here today on behalf of Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7, to present Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint). This bill provides for the award of college credit for military education, training, and occupational experience. The Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) has approved a policy in Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 22, the governance credit for prior learning. The policy authorizes each higher education institution to accept prior military learning; however, it does not require it. Because of this, NSHE staff reports that it is not known whether any of its institutions have actually accepted credits for military experience.

The NSHE policy approves the American Council on Education (ACE) military credit examination to be utilized in determining credit. The American Council on Education is a nationwide coordinating body for American's colleges and universities that helps institutions reward veterans for their previous training and experience by compiling recommendations and a career guide for every sector of the military.

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), more than half of our states have passed legislation to recognize the varied skills and knowledge veterans have acquired counting toward college credit. Some states require their board to adopt policies for applying military training or service toward academic credit, while other states require a commission of the board to set guidelines for institutions to adopt.

Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint) requires the Board of Regents of NSHE to collaborate with ACE to establish statewide standards for awarding credit for military education, training, or occupational experience. The measure provides that the standards must include identification of any military education, training, or occupational experience listed on a certain transcript for which the credit must be awarded; determination of the amount of credit that will be awarded for completion of identified education, training, or occupational experience; and identification of the specific academic program in a community college, state college, or university to which such credit is applicable. Finally, the measure clarifies that credit earned by a student for military education training, experience, or education must be applied toward coursework required for an associate's degree, bachelor's degree, or certificate in any university, state college, or community college within the system of NSHE.

This concludes my presentation, and I urge your support on this important legislation to provide our veterans with college credit for military training, education, and occupational experience.

Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7:

I think this is a very good bill and, as a point of introduction, I brought this bill forward at the request of a number of individuals, many of whom I see at the table in Las Vegas. They are the ones who brought this idea forward and asked that a bill be presented.

Bruno Moya, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here in support of S.B. 457 (R1). Yesterday, I went on a short hike with a couple of my brothers from the 2nd Battalion, 7th Marines. A couple of years ago they were deployed to Helmand Province in Afghanistan and lost numerous people. While on the hike, we started talking and found out that they have lost more people through suicide than they lost in combat. My point regarding that is, this bill would give purpose and a transitional tool for a lot of veterans, as it did for me. As soon as I started going to school, I started being involved with my wonderful peers here, and I started being involved in not only the university, but other institutions and organizations. It has really helped me grow as a person and a family member.

Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint) not only provides the community with resources to be able to go to school and to succeed, it also gives that sense of purpose and an understanding of your being able to go to school without having to start all over. That is really important for the veteran communities, specifically for those who are coming back from a theater where they saw a lot of action. It can give them a lot of purpose, as it did for me.

Samantha Bivins, representing Consolidated Students of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I am proudly testifying today, not only as a senator in Consolidated Students of the University of Nevada (CSUN), Las Vegas, student government representing veterans at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), but also as the widow of Craig Bivins, a marine veteran who died in 2004 as a direct result of his service to our country.

I have had the privilege to take legislative trips to Carson City this session in support of S.B. 457 (R1), as well as other legislation. I believe that S.B. 457 (R1) is the perfect example of how multiple entities are able to join together in support of legislation which can benefit so many. I am very proud to have worked on this bill with the UNLV Rebel Vets, and I am deeply appreciative of the sponsors of S.B. 457 (R1) who believed in this bill and have diligently worked to push it forward. Given the limited time we have left in this session, I respectfully ask that you pass S.B. 457 (R1) as it is currently written without amending the language of the bill. Thank you for allowing me to speak today, and thank you for your service to the state of Nevada.

Randy Dexter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

A special thank you to Senator Parks for working so hard on this bill with us, we really appreciate it. Passage of this bill along with up to three years of guaranteed in-state tuition for veterans can be a great recruiting tool for the highly talented members of the veteran community to the great state of Nevada—my home state since I was two years old. It would be a great thing for the state.

I am the current president of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Rebel Veterans. I was raised in Henderson, Nevada, and joined the Army after the terrorist attack on 9/11. I served in active duty for more than ten years as a combat medic. Twenty-seven months of that service was spent over two long deployments to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom as the only medical professional on my daily combat missions. I was awarded two bronze stars during my service.

During my time in the military, I was trained as a nationally registered emergency medical technician, and I received years of experience working under the guidance of medical doctors, physician assistants, and registered nurses. I learned anatomy, how to do very technical skills such as chest tubes, give morphine, write medical notes, push certain medications, and lead other soldier medics. To say that I am a very skilled combat medic would be an understatement.

However, when I was medically retired, I began my career as a student in higher education. I received a total of 11 credit hours for military experience. I really wanted to pursue a path of becoming a medical professional, but I chose not to for several reasons. First, I was angry that the education and training that I had received meant nothing to my higher education institutions. Second, I received Veterans Affairs education benefits that are funded by taxpayer dollars. I did not want to waste that money by repeating a lot of the education and training I received while serving. Last, I knew that I would be wasting

my time by repeating these classes. I am 35 years old now, and time is of the essence for me so that I can enter the workforce and begin to provide for my wife and three children—by the way, for the record, my daughter turns four today. Happy Birthday, Sophie.

As president of the Rebel Vets, I have had the distinct pleasure of meeting so many hard working student veterans at UNLV and across the country—my situation is not a unique one. Nellis Airforce Base is near the UNLV campus and many students serve, or have served, at the base. We are asking for the passing of S.B. 457 (R1), a bill that was originally proposed by Bruno Moya and Samantha Bivins, because it will help fill technically critical civilian jobs by the most qualified workers. Thank you so much for taking the time to listen to my testimony. I am forever grateful for all of the hard work that you do on behalf of the great state of Nevada.

Chairman Thompson:

Thank you, and we want to say Happy Birthday again to you daughter, and hello to Captain.

Leslie Lingo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I recently graduated with my master's degree in social work under the Advanced Standing Masters of Social Work Program at UNLV. The only reason I received that is because I was able to save a year, a total of 42 credits actually, when I went to North Carolina for my undergraduate studies. I was going to attend college here in Nevada, but Nevada was only willing to give me one credit for everything I had done in the military. I was a medic for 12 years, and as with Randy Dexter, I did all of the training and was cross-trained as a nurse.

When I found out that UNLV was only giving me one credit for physical education. I decided to go out of state to get my undergraduate degree. I was able to save at least one year of my education and save money for the Veterans Administration as well. This just shows how important it is for this bill to pass—not only to save money for the veterans and the state, but you are also going to be keeping all of the student veterans like me, who are looking at these credits for each university. With my graduate degree I can be working as a school social worker now, and I am getting ready to do that now. Thanks to the GI Bill, I am able to do that.

Chairman Thompson:

We will open for support of S.B. 457 (R1).

Assemblyman Pickard:

Not only did I think highly of this bill when I signed on to it, but it is consistent with what we have been doing with respect to our competency-based education initiative and some of the other things we are doing. I appreciate your bringing the bill.

Senator Parks:

I would be remiss if I did not also compliment Assemblyman Edwards for being primary cosponsor on this bill. Thank you.

Luis F. Valera, Vice President, Government Affairs and Compliance, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

Of course, we are very much in favor of this bill. I would also like to thank Assemblyman Edwards and Senator Parks for bringing this bill forward. We could not be more proud of our Rebel Vets and all of the work that they have done to help this along by doing their homework, coming here to speak with all of you, and expressing themselves on how important this is.

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

We would like to thank Senator Parks for, first of all, working with our students. Yesterday, I had the opportunity to spend several hours with them as we waited for the Committee to begin. It was a wonderful time in just understanding their passion, not only for themselves, but also for their peers that are experiencing some struggles with respect to their college education experience. I applaud them for stepping up for themselves and their peers to ensure that things go much smoother.

We are in full support of this legislation. As was mentioned in the introduction, we do have a current board policy that accepts military experience for college credit. However, we struggle with standardization among the institutions. This bill allows us to work with the Commission on Postsecondary Education and then, hopefully, to create a committee where we could work with each of the provosts of our institutions to ensure some standardization so that our students who are veteran students—we now have about 6,500—would be able to matriculate faster through their college experience.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Ms. Brooks and Mr. Valera, can you discuss what your institutions are doing now—what the system overall is doing in terms of military credits?

Constance Brooks:

It is handled very differently at each institution, and, as you can imagine, on a case-by-case basis. As a veteran yourself, if you were to come into the institution of which you are an alumni—UNLV—you would be assessed on an individual basis depending upon the degree or discipline that you would like to become involved in academically.

Speaking in general terms, as I do not work for an institution directly, each institution is handled in a different way. However, we currently serve about 6,500 veterans at primarily, six out of seven degree-granting institutions where we have veteran centers with actual staff who are veterans and are dedicated toward shepherding our veteran students through the sometimes arduous process of trying to determine credits and classes. I know, at UNLV, they have an extremely robust veterans center that provides a lot guidance and advice to students.

Luis Valera:

That about covers it, Assemblyman Anderson—the short answer is, not much. That is why this legislation is so important.

Assemblyman Edwards:

I just want to say very quickly that I have been working with the Rebel Vets on this as well. Bruno Moya has been fantastic in supporting it. I know you are working to do more, and I hope this will help out.

Luis Valera:

Of course, we plan on growing this and continuing to lead this process as we work with other institutions to make sure that we are all in sync and that we are doing this in a predictable, manageable way so that as students transfer from one institution to another, they can foresee what it is that they can transfer or have recognized. To clarify my earlier comment, what I meant by "not much," is not much in recognizing credits. Our veterans, on campus, do a tremendous amount for each other in support of other veterans in the community outside of UNLV.

Kevin Burns, Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Council:

I am representing the major veterans' organizations within the state of Nevada and a vast majority of the quarter-million veterans here. I can perhaps answer Assemblyman Anderson's question because I happen to run the Veterans Resource Center at Western Nevada College. When a student veteran comes onto the campus, the first place they sit down is in my office.

It is perhaps easier for those of us who are at the community college level rather than the university level, because many of the skill sets and much of the training that these student veterans walk in the door with are more applicable to vocational types of training. For example, a young man walks into a university, and he has been a machine gunner in the U.S. Marine Corps. Since Charles Dickens is not on the program of instruction for how to run a machine gun, that is where it becomes a lot more difficult for the universities to try to translate what someone has or has not done in the military and how that equates to the academic world.

You will notice in the bill that it calls out the American Council on Education. If you look at those websites, the American Council on Education has broken down thousands of military occupational specialties and the training that they have gone through. It goes so far as to recommend what type of credits and what disciplines to award for those kinds of training. The beauty of this bill is, as Dr. Brooks talked about and as you have heard from all of us, is that it will standardize how we attack this problem in the world of academia in NSHE. We strongly recommend that you adopt this bill.

Chairman Thompson:

We will go to opposition for S.B. 457 (R1). [There was no one.] We will go to neutral on S.B. 457 (R1).

Senator Parks:

I have two quick comments. First, the fiscal note was removed by the amendment that was proposed by the Nevada System of Higher Education. I also want to comment that I was just handed a document which was a proposed amendment for this bill. I think it goes far beyond what we would be doing and I think it would cause a fiscal note. Based on that, I do not know that I can support it at this time and this late in the session. I did want you to know that such a request was made.

Chairman Thompson:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint). We will now have a work session on Senate Bill 457 (1st Reprint). I will entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 457 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 457 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Edwards will take the floor statement. I will now open the hearing on our final bill, Senate Bill 66 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 66 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to work-based learning programs. (BDR 34-254)

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education:

I will move through this as expeditiously as I can, then Manny Lamarre can provide additional context from the employers' point of view.

Senate Bill 66 (2nd Reprint) is a work-based learning bill that fits into a larger package of bills around kindergarten through grade 12 to postsecondary readiness and transition bills that have moved through the Legislature this session. Employers consistently state that students do not have adequate career skills, and the work-based learning initiative contained within this bill will improve students' career readiness skills. As you will hear from Manny Lamarre, the Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN), students feel similarly that they do not have adequate access to work-based learning opportunities.

This bill is an attempt to be inclusive, which is why we are using the broader term "work-based learning" as opposed to other terms like apprenticeships and internships. Work-based learning is meant to be all-inclusive of those types of opportunities.

The program made available by this bill is entirely voluntary and does not require districts to apply. The first biennium is about developing a group of willing districts interested in exploring work-based learning and allowing the state to learn from this pilot program.

The joint subcommittee closed the budget, making available \$500,000 to \$750,000 from the College and Career Readiness Grant over the biennium to pay for the pilot. The total College and Career Readiness Grant increased over the biennium due to the last fiscal year's "times two" rule. That meant there was more money in this biennium for that grant than there was in the previous biennium, allowing for the expansion and the curation of this program without any adverse impacts on the previous programs paid for through the College and Career Readiness Grant.

The pilot will be established through the competitive grant process that begins with the request for proposals and concludes with selecting grant recipients through an evaluation and review that includes representatives from industry and from education. No more than three recipients will be selected for a two-year grant over the biennium to establish the pilot, and the three areas will be reflective of the geographic and regional differences across our state. The total number of students impacted will depend on the applications received and accepted, but we anticipate that at least 100 students across the state will be impacted by S.B. 66 (R2).

I will take you quickly through the law, section by section. Current law allows eleventh- and twelfth-graders an opportunity to receive one elective credit toward graduation by participating in an internship.

Section 1, subsection 1 establishes a grant-making program and the criteria to expand work-based learning opportunities across the state. It includes an incubator or a pilot for work-based learning with a goal to tap into the entrepreneurial spirit of a district's charters, nonprofits, and business communities across the state so that we can all, more fully, appreciate what work-based learning experiences are and how to scale those experiences. Any available money—the \$500,000 to \$750,000—would be made available to districts, charters, and nonprofits.

Section 1, subsection 3 prescribes that the State Board of Education would receive input from OWINN and the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) before prescribing the fields, trades, or occupations the pilot would support.

Section 2, subsection 1 eliminates the limitations on the number of credits a student can earn through a work-based learning opportunity, as well as the age and grade restrictions, because we know that work-based learning can occur earlier than eleventh grade. It also makes clear that the credits accumulated through a work-based learning experience are to count for elective credits, not toward a required class for graduation.

Section 2, subsection 3 outlines the requirements of a school district's application for a work-based learning program to be considered by the state board, and outlines that the requirements to participate cannot be overly demanding.

Section 2, subsection 3 outlines the requirements of a school district once approved by the state board to offer a work-based learning program including the designation of an employee to serve as the work-based learning coordinator. This could be an additional employee. It does not have to be a new employee at the district. Then, establish a list of approved worked-based learning business, agencies, or organizations.

Section 2, subsection 4, includes the requirements to become an approved program. Those include detailing of the training agreement and training plan for each participating pupil; the required numbers of hours to qualify for credit; on-site evaluation; completion of an assessment prescribed by the State Board related to a student's chosen career or pathway; and development of skills to allow a pupil to focus more narrowly on their chosen pathway.

Section 2, subsection 5, aligns participation in a work-based learning program with high school graduation. Section 2, subsection 6, allows a student to receive dual credit.

Section 2, subsection 7, prescribes for a school district reporting on the pilot to be provided to the State Board of Education and the Legislature in every odd year.

Finally, to round out my testimony before handing it over to Mr. Lamarre, the intent is to learn from this pilot over the biennium, to inform future policy and budget decision-makers, and to provide students with access to work-based learning opportunities aligned to high-growth, high-need, high-demand industries across our state. It is also a reminder that the participation in the pilot is entirely voluntary and that there was no testimony in opposition on this bill in the Senate.

Manny Lamarre, Executive Director, Office of Workforce Innovation, Office of the Governor:

I shared a full report to be uploaded for your review on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) ([Exhibit C](#)) and ([Exhibit D](#)).

There are two quick points I would like to make. One is we know that low labor force participation of young adults is consequential. Senate Bill 66 (2nd Reprint) will serve as a remedy to that problem. There is a financial impact of around \$402 to \$487 less a week to individuals that go long-term without experience. Number two is, anecdotally, we also hear from many employers about the aging workforce without adequate replacement. Their concern is supported by the last census data which shows that the number of individuals aged 65 and older grew faster than the total population.

Additionally, when we surveyed and spoke to hundreds of young adults—actually more than 700 young adults throughout the states—two responses consistently were received when we spoke to them. One was that they would say they wanted to get an internship or a job. Second, they asked how they could get experience if every job applied for required experience. Again, S.B. 66 (R2) will be absolutely transformational.

Finally, young adults expressed concern that their lack of job skills was strongly attributed to their inability to access training or gain relevant work experience. Voting for S.B. 66 (R2) to expand work-based learning will have significant, positive consequences for decades to come and will transform Nevada's workforce, economy, and sustainability. Thank you so much for your time.

Chairman Thompson:

Do we have any questions from our Committee? [There were none.] At this time we will open for support of Senate Bill 66 (R2).

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

We are here in support of Senate Bill 66 (R2). The Office of the Governor and the Department of Education really worked with us. We are really happy to see the private sector at the table on this. As you heard, oftentimes the challenge is not that we do not have students that are interested, it is that we do not have employers who are willing to take on 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds with no prior work experience. For the practicality of what that means, having the private sector at the table is really important. The fact that we carved out some money in the budget process to be specific for this bill is important; it made sure we did not have a fiscal note, and so we look forward to accessing those funds in our district.

Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards; and Nevada Builders Alliance:

I am here today on behalf of two of my clients. The Nevada Association of School Boards supports the bill, and also the Nevada Builders Alliance. I would like to speak on behalf of the private industry. We represent roughly more than 700 contractors throughout the state of Nevada and are here in support of the bill. We are hoping to close that gap between students at the high school level and those that maybe do not want to go on to higher education or need a path in a field that does earn a living wage. We are ready with open arms.

Austin Slaughter, representing the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce:

We want to be on the record in support as we recognize this bill will allow invaluable career experience for potential future careers for our students.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators:

We are in full support of this, and we like the idea of doing pilot programs to work the bugs out so that we can expand it later on for more students.

**Brad Keating, Legislative Representative, Community and Government Relations,
Clark County School District:**

We are happy to be here today in support of S.B. 66 (R2). This will expand a number of work-based learning experiences as we move forward. We do a lot of that right now in Clark County School District through our Career and Technical Education programs, as well as our Career & Technical Academies. We look forward to any expansion that we can have of those programs. We really support this bill and look forward to seeing it through.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I understand that this will allow for unlimited credits to be used for work experience, but only for elective courses. Why are you removing the age of 16-, 17-, or 18-year-olds? They could drive to this internship, but for a 13- or 14-year-old—I question how they are going to get there. I question if there are laws in the state that prohibit 13-year-olds from working at jobs if it is for an internship or money. If you could, please speak to that. Thank you.

Lindsay Anderson:

I will defer to the bill's sponsors. That was not a change that we requested or asked for. That was something brought forth by the bill's sponsor.

Brett Barley:

I will give it a quick try, and then perhaps Mr. Lamarre has some real-life examples that he can share. The way that the law is currently written, it allows for eleventh- and twelfth-graders to participate in internship programs. We did not want to be exclusive of a sophomore in high school who may be able to take public transportation to something aligned to an industry that they are very interested in, for example, computer science, or health sciences. If there is an opportunity down the road that they could attend or that there was a suitable placement, we did not want age to be a barrier to their participation.

Lindsay Anderson:

Companies that we work with like Renown Health, for example—that have a real partnership with us in terms of health sciences—have recently lowered their volunteer age to 14 to access more students who are interested in learning. We do have our Career and Technical Education programs which start in the freshman year. I am not sure about any conflict with federal or state law in terms of working requirements. I do know that we have freshmen and sophomores who are interested, and we want to engage them at that level.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I guess my concern is, when you are dealing with kids who are 13 and 14 years old, freshmen and sophomores, are you going to be requiring fingerprinting? Obviously, it is required to have fingerprinting of anybody that works with minors and now you are dealing with 13- and 14-year-old kids. Is everyone going to need to be fingerprinted, with background checks for every employer?

Brett Barley:

As a school district goes about applying for the pilot program, those are questions that the State Board can ask and have answered. That can be a part of the application. Then at the district level when they develop their plan and approve their partnerships, that is something the work-based learning coordinator that is designated by the district can monitor as well.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

As for transportation, do you envision the 13- and 14-year-olds taking the bus that you pay for, or are we going to now start paying for more buses to transport students?

Brett Barley:

That is something that could be covered by the \$500,000 to \$750,000 that was allocated through the College and Career Readiness grant to pay for the pilot program. It would be a permissible use of funds if that was a necessary expense.

Manny Lamarre:

Two quick points. One is to reiterate that S.B. 66 (R2) is not mandating students or districts necessarily participate in a specific work-based learning program, so the districts in their application could outline and consider those factors. Second, in terms of age, the work-based learning program is a more inclusive and comprehensive term, so an institution or a school can create or design a work-based learning program where a 14- or 15-year-old does get some kind of exposure or orientation. That would not preclude them from getting that initial exposure—kind of like a pre-apprenticeship or a pre-program where they at least get exposure and awareness of it. By eliminating the age restriction, it would allow for those opportunities.

Chairman Thompson:

Is there anyone else in support of S.B. 66 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition to S.B. 66 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral to S.B. 66 (R2)?

Ray Bacon, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association:

I was just looking to find the original genesis of a bill similar to this that was done by a leader of the student legislature in 2013—Grant Gabriel, who is a local Carson City student. When they brought this idea forward, it was student-driven at that point in time. Students had to go out there and find the jobs. The reason it was limited in the statute to juniors and seniors is that, in most locations, the criteria as to whether students can be in the workplace was set by the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Manufacturing has changed a little bit since then, but the government has not changed on their definitions. There is a basis for that.

There will be some constraints as far as age and which students can actually participate. They can do job shadowings at younger ages, as we found out going through the logistics. You are going to wind up with probably some mishmash between the existing statute and what is in this bill. This bill is being driven by the schools; it is a better program and actually

winds up with some funding. I think when we did this the last time we had one student who took advantage of the program. We have tried it; it worked really well for that one student but, with no funding, it did not go very far.

Brett Barley:

Thank you to the Committee for considering the bill today. We look forward to its hopeful passage.

Manny Lamarre:

Thank you. We appreciate the time.

Chairman Thompson:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 66 (2nd Reprint). We will now have a work session on Senate Bill 66 (2nd Reprint). I will entertain a motion for do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 66 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Krasner:

While I am okay with allowing the credits for elective courses to be unlimited, I have concerns about changing the age down to 13 and 14 years old, for freshmen and sophomores. If you would be okay with leaving it with the eleventh- and twelfth-graders or 16-year-olds, I would be fine with the bill. Otherwise, I will have to vote no.

Chairman Thompson:

We will vote on the bill as is. If you have time between now and the time it goes to the floor to talk to the bill's sponsor, feel free to do so. Your vote can change.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Anderson. We will open up for public comment.

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

We have a good news minute because we do have an answer for Assemblywoman Diaz's question. For the last cohort we had 5,900 students who were deficient in credits, which is about 600 students less than the cohort before. Basically, that equals a 75 percent graduation rate, which is an increase from the previous year of about 3 percent. We believe bills such as what we heard earlier today are going to help us get kids more on the graduation track, and I hope this answered the question you asked.

Chairman Thompson:

At this time we will close public comment. The meeting is adjourned [at 1:37 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a document titled "Connecting Nevada's Young Adults to Training and Employment: Perspectives from Nevada's Young Adults and Employers," prepared by the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN), dated November 2016, submitted by Manny Lamarre, Executive Director, Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation.

[Exhibit D](#) is copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Office of Governor Brian Sandoval," prepared by the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN), submitted by Manny Lamarre, Executive Director, Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation.