

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
June 3, 2017**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Tyrone Thompson at 5:34 p.m. on Saturday, June 3, 2017, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://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

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senate District No. 2



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District  
Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association  
Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District  
Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards  
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators  
Nick Di Archangel, Director of Communications, Nevada State Education Association  
Elisa Cafferata, representing Computer Technology Link Corporation  
Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education  
Craig M. Stevens, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District

**Chairman Thompson:**

[Roll was called and standard rules of the Committee were reviewed.] We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 467 (2nd Reprint).

**Senate Bill 467 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to technology in public schools. (BDR 34-1120)**

**Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senate District No. 2:**

I am here to present Senate Bill 467 (2nd Reprint). The Nevada Ready 21 Technology Program is a critical component to the educational investments that have been made in public education since 2015. Its vision is to ignite economic development by delivering a twenty-first century workforce, and by ensuring student equity through personalized access to a connected, twenty-first century education. In other words, our schools need to empower teachers to facilitate instruction using technology as a tool to help meet the needs of today's learners so they may be successful in the workforce.

Nevada Ready 21 operates as a competitive grant program that allows middle schools across the state to become one-to-one device schools. This means each student receives a laptop, and each teacher receives educational and technical training to deliver instruction in a twenty-first century fashion.

The Commission on Educational Technology, which is staffed by the Department of Education, oversees this grant program. Unlike many other education investments and reforms from 2015, Nevada Ready 21 did not have a companion policy bill. It was simply a budget line item. This left some of the program details to be determined without a policy framework.

Given this information, and working with stakeholders, I believe a policy bill such as Senate Bill 467 (R2) is an important piece in ensuring a sustainable framework for future cohorts that benefit from this critically important investment in our schools.

The amendment adopted in the Senate allows for a fair, level playing field for schools wanting to apply for grant funding to implement Nevada Ready 21. In turn, schools will have more buy-in and ownership, resulting in greater success and sustainability.

Similar to other programs such as Zoom and Victory schools, this bill and amendments provide a framework of accountability and transparency for the Legislature to ensure the funds are being used in accordance with the Nevada Ready 21 plan requirements. It allows for the state to contract with a single vendor, and allows all qualifying schools to choose their own vendor to provide the services outlined in the Nevada Ready 21 Technology Program.

We have representatives from both Clark County School District and Washoe County School District to provide additional testimony. I will say that I have served on the Commission on Educational Technology as a parent and as a legislator in both the Assembly and the Senate, in several iterations many years ago when it was first created. We have come a long way when it comes to technology and education. Nevada Ready 21 makes that accessible to middle schoolers. In addition, there is some flexibility for the districts to be able to use devices that they already have infrastructure for.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Can you share how many students, or schools, throughout Nevada are benefiting from this program? Also, I am reading language about the Commission, which has a lot of control over this program. Does the Commission determine which schools benefit, or is this something that happens locally at the district level?

**Senator Denis:**

The respective representatives will be able to answer your first question. I will also say there are schools that have one-to-one devices that are not part of this program. While this is a grant program, the cohorts who are already participating in this program continue to be funded. There was a concern that some of the rural schools would get less money now and would not be able to do the program. They will be funded first, and then the new schools will be funded.

In regard to the Commission on Educational Technology establishing procedures, section 3, subsection 3, states, "In administering the Program, the Commission shall establish procedures by which the board of trustees of a school district, the governing body of a charter school or the governing body of a university school for profoundly gifted pupils may apply to the Commission for a grant of money. An application for a grant must: . . . ." The school completes a grant application and the Commission approves the applications.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

So it happens at the Commission level and not at the district level.

**Senator Denis:**

Correct. The districts will bring their plans and applications to the Commission.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Will those decisions be made based on funding? Is there a certain amount of funding allocated per district, or is it through the demonstration of the need from the grant application?

**Senator Denis:**

It is not an unlimited amount of money, so there has to be some allocation as a block grant. I believe it is then, in an equitable way, given to the districts, depending on the number of students.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

Is this going to apply to high school students who we want to be career- and college-ready, and whose test scores we care about and constantly see in the newspaper that are below where they should be? Will it apply to persons who are going out into the real world? Also, do you foresee this going to every single student in every high school across the state, or will it be implemented in parts?

**Senator Denis:**

This program is only in the middle schools.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

Why would you decide to start in middle school and not high school? Obviously, high school students are trying to focus on being career-and college-ready. We are constantly focusing on the test scores of high school students. Why would we not be starting this in the high schools?

**Senator Denis:**

This is an ongoing program, and I do not remember all of the initial work. This is based on a national program that has been successful. I know that the Nevada Ready 21 is modeled after a program from Maine that has been going on for 15 years. Others may be able to address that specific issue of why middle school only. We also have some programs that are running outside of this in other middle schools. I do not have the material in front of me as to why the middle schools were chosen.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

This just seems it would be more appropriate at the high school level.

**Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

This bill was part of the 2015 Legislative Session. It was a model to be administered by the Department of Education. It was modeled after Maine. The decision to focus first on middle schools was largely due to data of disengagement of middle school students and to infuse technology and twenty-first century instructional practice. The idea is that as this grows, those cohorts move into high school.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

If we want to alter the program and make it applicable to the high schools, can we do that? It just seems that we are constantly focusing on career- and college-ready. We are constantly focusing on test scores. We are constantly focusing on engaging high school students and getting them into the real world, whether it is the workforce, junior college, or college. It just seems that it would be more appropriate to give those high school students these laptops.

**Steve Canavero:**

That is certainly the Legislature's prerogative to do so. The thinking in 2015 was consistent with the Victory and Zoom school's programs, or other categorical programs that were evaluated to ensure that as we implement them—before we scale it too broad or get into additional areas—we have objective feedback on the efficacy of the program and those dollars before we move forward with a substantial change. That, of course, is obviously part of your purview as Legislators.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

I really like the idea of the program. I do not think it is disputable anymore that jobs of today, and certainly jobs of tomorrow, are based on technology and an understanding of technology and equipment and how to use it. If you do not know how to use this technology, you are homeless and unemployed. I always hesitate when we see the words, "To the extent that money is available . . . ." I am looking specifically at section 3, subsection 4,

which has to do with how much we are providing to each person intended to be served. I am wondering, do we have any idea of the costs involved in this? Not only just for those who are being served, but overall. Is this a massive undertaking, or is this a relatively minor one, and we are just trying to start the program?

**Steve Canavero:**

We do have a clear understanding of the costs associated with the Nevada Ready 21 program as implemented in 2015—approximately \$900 per seat, which includes the device, professional development, some infrastructure costs, and coaching. In the budget presentation, we laid out what the device costs are under the contract, what the professional development costs are, and what all of those costs total.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

I noticed that there is a letter on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) that addresses a concern with the language: "All qualifying grantees shall receive equal per seat funding to implement the program" ([Exhibit C](#)). I do not see that in this second reprint. Am I missing that?

**Senator Denis:**

I think there was some clarification when we had the hearing because of the concern that some of the schools in the rural areas thought they were going to get less money because of the way it is allocated. We were trying to clarify that it goes first to the cohorts who have it, then the allocation of the block grant.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

As I read this, it has been addressed in this latest reprint, correct?

**Senator Denis:**

That is correct.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Also, as I compare the 2nd reprint with the 1st reprint, section 3, subsection 4, adds in the language, ". . . but shall not give preference in the awarding of a grant to an applicant solely on the basis of the vendor that the applicant intends to use pursuant to the grant." As I interpret that, it means that perhaps the Commission may give some discretion if a school wants to use a different vendor.

**Senator Denis:**

That is correct. If a school already has infrastructure in place, rather than starting over, that school can get the same type of devices or use the same infrastructure.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

So, they can continue to use the same device, or if they choose to, they can switch to another device and technology changes and new grant programs that are available, and so forth?

**Senator Denis:**

Also, they have the ability to purchase the devices through the state, and the districts also have their own vendor agreements.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I will now open up the hearing for support of S.B. 467 (R2).

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

We are here in full support of S.B. 467 (R2). We have been working with Senator Denis and Senator Hammond, who have a particular interest in this legislation, to make sure that we get it right. I will offer a couple of thoughts to try to answer the questions. In the 2015 biennium, the Washoe County School District actually opted not to apply any of our middle schools to the Nevada Ready 21 grant. That was because the Commission on Educational Technology ultimately did choose a device-specific program. Districts had to get the whole package; if that did not work, there were no other options. That did not fit in with our strategic information technology infrastructure so, unfortunately, we had to pass on those resources, which was a loss to our district. We were disappointed that was the direction they went.

If there ever was an area in which we should allow districts to be innovative and flexible in meeting their needs, it is technology. This is what is changing quickly. We have millions of dollars of infrastructure within our 93 schools, and we were trying to put a square peg into a round hole. We would have had to spend extra time and money to make that work.

We particularly appreciate the part of this bill that will allow us to plug-in. We do know that the Commission has the ultimate say, and we have to put together a very compelling grant application. If we are not selected because our application does not make sense, the money would go to the schools that have bought into this idea.

I would say to Assemblywoman Krasner—Dr. Canavero used big, fancy words like disengagement because he is smarter than I am, but what we see is that we lose kids in middle school. They get bored and are not interested. When a student shows up in sixth or seventh grade, and he gets a device, suddenly he is excited about wanting to go to school. He becomes more interested and does better in school. Middle school is where we lose a lot of kids, even before they get to high school. Having something new, different, and exciting at the middle school level is a real priority for the Washoe County School District. We actually think that is the right place to start. We would like to see this expand as those kids matriculate into high school. Also, the middle schools are a little smaller with fewer students, and from an implementation perspective, I think it is a little easier to get started there. We think this is really great in terms of expanding this opportunity to districts across the state, including Washoe County.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

You just said that it is because you lose a lot of kids in middle school, so you are starting this program there. Do you happen to have the statistics of how many kids drop out of middle school versus how many kids drop out of high school?

**Lindsay Anderson:**

I do not have the numbers with me, but I do know that middle school dropouts are often a lost number. When we talk about high school dropouts, we are only talking about kids who actually enter the ninth grade and do not finish by the time they are twelfth graders. That does not capture the students who never show up on the first day of ninth grade. I do not have those numbers; I am sure it is a smaller number than the high school dropouts, but just one student is too many.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

If your reason is because we do not want these kids to get bored and drop out—and you just said you think more kids are dropping out of high school—with that rationale, it would really make sense to apply this to the high school level first.

**Lindsay Anderson:**

I think it should certainly be part of the program.

**Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association:**

I am here to testify in support of S.B. 467 (R2). I would like to say that we support beginning in middle school because there are reasons for children dropping out. They do not just decide to dropout in the twelfth grade. Much of this begins in elementary and middle school. There is a reason we have Read by Grade Three, and not Read by Grade Twelve. You have to start early. You have to catch these children and give them the strong basic block supports in order to build upon that, so that when they get into high school, they are ready and capable of entering the program.

If you start this program in high school, think of the number of children who would not have the classes or the technology to build upon. If you introduce this in high school, you are only targeting a small select number of students. As an educator, I know that you have to start young and establish those building blocks, so when they get to high school, they have a wider variety of subjects and skills to use so that they do not drop out. I do not have statistics in terms of the high school dropout rate, but I can give you my experience as a classroom teacher and tell you that starting young, in elementary and middle school, makes a child more successful in high school, so they do not have to drop out.

**Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

We are here in support of S.B. 467 (R2). We have nine schools that participated in the program over the last year and implemented the Chromebooks with great success. My son had one and just had to turn it back in, much to his chagrin. I think the most valuable piece that we found in this is the curriculum and the tie-in and digital coaching that went with it.



Our teachers felt that was valuable in how they utilized these tools. I can tell you, it enabled my student in particular, and all students really, to log in to Google Classroom, which is how they submitted assignments. They had tools to create videos for assignments, certainly all parts of the curriculum, tools that enabled them to do presentations beyond PowerPoint. It really was a learning tool. This is not just about technology, but also about creating new tools that are engaging.

Middle school is a time when students start to disengage. There is certainly a lot going on. I know our middle school teacher on the panel fully understands. I honor those teachers tremendously because I think that age is a challenge, having been a parent of two. I fully support the work we are doing here because I think that more of our schools would participate if there were additional choices in the type of device available. You have to understand—we have schools that have chosen different platforms for implementation throughout their building, and we want to encourage schools through our reorganization to have that choice. We want them to be able to say, I am on this platform and I want to extend that experience through a one-to-one device program. We started one-to-one device programs in middle school prior to this program with great success, and we are able to continue it through Nevada Ready 21.

**Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards:**

I would like to add a few things to the comments that have been made. We are here in full support of the bill, especially as currently written. I would like to thank everyone who has worked very hard on this piece of legislation to include the districts and school boards in terms of local control. This bill really gives us the mobility that we need because every school district is different, and as was mentioned, they have different platforms. This gives us the flexibility that we need in our rural and urban districts.

Another point I would like to make is that in our underprivileged and underserved populations, sometimes middle school is the first time some of these students are seeing technology. I know many of us use technology every day, but that does not exist in the world for a lot of families. I think this gives an opportunity for those children to experience technology in something they are going to have to use for the rest of their lives, and opportunities they would not see if it were not in the classroom. I appreciate the local control in the bill, and all of the work that has gone into it.

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

We are in full support of the bill. I think one of the most important issues is that there is professional development for the teachers. This way, you do not just hand the kid the device; you work the device into the curriculum. That is an important piece.

**Nick Di Archangel, Director of Communications, Nevada State Education Association:**

Our president already gave testimony on behalf of Nevada State Education Association, so I am giving my testimony and support as a husband to a special education teacher in a Title 1 school in Clark County. My wife teaches at William E. Orr Middle School.

This year she received Chromebooks for her students. She told me that it changed their lives, these special education students. She told me every day what a difference it made in the students' lives, learning and the responsibility of taking care of the Chromebooks.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone else in support of S.B. 467 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition?

**Elisa Cafferata, representing Computer Technology Link Corporation:**

Computer Technology Link Corporation (CTL) is the current vendor for the Nevada Ready 21 program that provides the Chromebooks that have been spoken so highly of. We think this is an amazing innovative program that the state has spent quite a bit of time working with the stakeholders to develop. It is an integrated program, not just a device program, but instruction and professional development. We have been working hard in the last couple of days, trying to get in touch with the bill's sponsors to raise our concerns. We think the program is amazing; there is no doubt about that.

We do, however, have some concerns with the amendment in terms of the implementation. Specifically, we are hoping to have a little bit of time to work with the sponsors to work out a conceptual amendment that does two things. The first thing is, the state has put together an extensive program that is very thoughtful and is working well, as you have heard from a few folks. We want to ensure that if the school districts or charter schools are coming in with grant applications, that they end up not just getting money for devices, but putting together plans to ensure they are living up to the high standards that are currently being met in this state.

The second thing we want to work with the sponsors on is making sure that the administration of the program remains workable. I do not know if it has been mentioned specifically, but Cohort 1 is on Chromebooks. For the next round of grants, CTL is offering not only Chromebooks, but also Windows devices, or a coupon to get a device of the school district's own choosing. If the school district has made investments in other technology, that is fine.

The concern is specifically with section 4, subsection 3, where it talks about a school district or charter school applying for these grants. It says they can apply for a grant for ". . . any or all of the services described in paragraphs (a) to (e), inclusive, of subsection 2." The challenge with that is that the rest of the program, outside of the devices—the professional development, classroom management tools, and curriculum development pieces—are not priced separately. We can say a Chromebook is a \$250 device, and if you want to use existing technology, we will give you a coupon for \$250, but the information technology support, the replacement of lost and damaged devices, and the professional development is all created as a package, and it would be very difficult to price out, in terms of providing those services. It is not insurmountable, but we would like to work through those issues. Those are the two things we would like to work out with the folks behind the bill. We think it is a fantastic program.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

I certainly appreciate the fact that when you have to provide support and the like for different platforms, you have different costs. I think that they are pretty marginal on the training side. We are talking about hours, not a significant difference in content. The thing that puzzles me is that section 4, subsection 2, which is referenced in subsection 3, says, "The Department shall enter into an agreement with a person or entity to carry out the Program." Does that agreement contemplate the discussion you are concerned about—that we are going to figure out what those costs are, so you can build it into the structure of the grant and the pricing? It seems as though your concerns have already been dealt with.

**Elisa Cafferata:**

Yes, the concern is that the grant program is created and then the Department can enter into these agreements. Section 4, subsection 3 allows school districts to also enter into agreements with a person or an entity to provide any or all of the services described in subsection 2. They could pick and choose—a la carte—from those services. The concern is how to structure the pricing of the grant. This version of the amendment requires that the money is spent per seat.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

Let me just put my cards on the table. It sounds to me like you are saying, we want to be the ones who provide everything as a package, and we do not want to have to carve it out; we do not want to share the responsibility. We do not want the district to be able to find someone else who they might think does a better job of training, for example. As a former contractor, I was expected to do line item bids. I had to carve out what I thought it would take to do the underground or the framing, for example. I had a pretty good idea, but I was never terribly precise. It sounds to me like you are saying this should be a package deal, all-in-one, and you do not want to have to compete at any level.

**Elisa Cafferata:**

The position of CTL is that the program, as designed, was a package deal. It has been evaluated by an outside evaluator. They have found that the program is working well, and they are seeing improvements. It is not that it could not have different devices or allow for some flexibility on the devices, but the rest of the package was developed as a package deal, and it works together as a package deal. We would like to at least spend some more time discussing how we transition from something that is working right now, in the first year, and is seeing positive results. If you start changing how many parts you can interchange in and out, how can you effectively compare "apples to apples" if you change all the pieces of the program?

**Chairman Thompson:**

I would like representatives from Washoe County and Clark County School Districts to come up and explain what their procurement process is. I know that most government entities have a certain process, in which you can only sole-source if that product is the only product out there.

**Nicole Rourke:**

I can tell you in layman's terms—I am certainly not a purchasing agent with the kind of experience that I think Assemblyman Pickard has, however, I will try to walk you through it. We would put out a request for proposal (RFP) with the requirements for what we would like. When we did that in our one-to-one program, we put in not only for devices but also for whatever support, including any training and curriculum development, which would go along with it. Just speaking agnostically, someone who responded to that RFP would then be selected. Going back to our reorganization, we would want a choice in those devices and programs, with similar training, curriculum development, et cetera, so that schools would have options at their discretion, based on their school improvement plan and support, and an innovational team choice.

**Lindsay Anderson:**

Our vision is that schools would put together these grant applications and the Commission still retains total control over awarding to the best proposals. I would say to Assemblyman Pickard that if the proposal is \$900 per seat, if almost all of the money is being spent on the device, and only a little bit of money on the other things, it seems that would not be the ideal application. There will be a lot of schools who spend less on the device and more on the curriculum side, which is the real important part of a successful program. Those applications would be prioritized and funded in terms of who has the best plan. If there was one that was really out of whack and spent way too much money in one place, it likely would not make the cut to get the actual state dollars to support it.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

It is rather problematic sometimes when you take a package and try to make it into a line item breakdown and still have it make sense with that structure. As you read this bill, are you suggesting that you want the line item, so you can pick and choose, or is this more to really dive into the substance and understand the package better? How do you see that working out in practicality?

**Lindsay Anderson:**

Since we have not participated, we do not have a real vision. This is based on what has been happening in Maine; they implemented this approximately 15 years ago. Even Maine has transitioned to more of a device-agnostic program. I think that is what we are getting at. I did want to state that Washoe County is on a Microsoft platform, and the Commission on Educational Technology acknowledged that in the second round it plans to offer a Microsoft option. In no way am I implying that we would not go with that option because it is part of the package deal. I think it is just the idea that, if it was not working for any reason, we would not have the opportunity to do something different, which feels restrictive.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Competition is good; adapt or die. I think the government has the procurement means to make sure the kids get the best that they can get out of the program.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

As I read this, it says, "any or all," so it still gives the flexibility on the local level to go with the package deal or line items, whichever works best, is that correct?

**Lindsay Anderson:**

Yes, that is what we are envisioning. We can decide what works best, apply it, and if the application is selected, then the Commission on Educational Technology could make the judgment call on whether it is a good idea.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Regarding the discussion about middle schoolers versus high schoolers, I am seeing here that this can apply to whomever. I do not see any restriction on that. This is just creating the framework for the districts to be able to implement, is that correct?

**Lindsay Anderson:**

The Department of Education can better answer that question, but it is my understanding that it is within the purview of the Commission on Educational Technology. They have prioritized middle school as the place to launch the program. I do not think there is anything statutorily that prohibits them from expanding that. I am not on that Commission, and I do not want to speak for them.

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

I think it is in the budget language that says the program starts in middle schools, and expands to high schools over time.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

So as far as this bill is concerned, there is nothing restrictive to one or the other?

**Brett Barley:**

Not in this language.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone in here in neutral?

**Brett Barley:**

I want to reiterate that the external evaluator who evaluated this program found it to be highly effective and recommended to continue funding for this program as it exists, based on the law that was passed in 2015. As we have been looking at the bill language, there are two key considerations that the Department has in mind. The first is around economies of scale.

We are agnostic as well about the device that is used, but want to ensure that as many kids get access to this type of technology and this type of program across the state as possible. That is the reason why we started with Chromebooks, because with a \$250 price tag, you can get to a lot of kids. That is exactly why we tried to be flexible to bring out a Microsoft device by offering the coupon while keeping the economies of scale high and the costs low, so we can expand to a greater number of kids.

One of the concerns that we have is, depending on the type of applications that came in, if a bunch of the applications were for an \$800 device, then less kids will be served, and there will be less money for professional development and the type of services that need to happen in classrooms to ensure that this technology is being put to good use. This is changing instruction; that is the intent of the program. It is not a device program; it is an instructional delivery program to evolve instruction and to better differentiate instruction to kids.

The last piece from the external evaluator was really clear: if they had one criticism, it was that the professional development across school sites implementing the program varied greatly. That is an area we want to focus on. If we have different folks using different professional development providers across the state, it makes it a little more difficult to have that community of practice to bring that cohort together and have them learn from each other.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I will close the hearing for S.B. 467 (R2). Is there any discussion from the Committee? [There was none.] At this time, I will open a work session and entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 467 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

It sounded like there were some folks who wanted to work with the sponsor with some potential amendments. I am wondering why that is not being considered. This is going a little too fast for me.

**Chairman Thompson:**

It is my understanding that the person bringing forth the amendment was not able to get in contact with the bill's sponsor, is that correct? Will you please clarify that for the record?

**Elisa Cafferata:**

We have been trying to catch Senator Denis and Senator Hammond, but they have been in committee or on the floor, so we have not had a chance to speak with them, except in passing. We have not had a chance to specifically talk about the amendment concepts.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

My thought is that we probably have time between now and when we hear this on the floor to get with Senator Denis. I think in order to keep this moving, it might be more appropriate for us to pass it out of Committee and let Senator Denis decide if he wants to recruit one of us to bring a floor amendment. I am concerned that, given the amount of time that we do not have, we might hang this bill up.

**Chairman Thompson:**

This is what I would like to consider: if you would withdraw your motion, we will wait and vote behind the bar.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

I withdraw the motion.

**Chairman Thompson:**

The motion is withdrawn, and I will close the work session on S.B. 467 (R2). In my viewpoint, this is a great bill, and I want to move it forward. This is the last opportunity for the person presenting the amendment to try to reach out to the bill sponsor. We will be meeting behind the bar today. At this time, I will hear public comment.

[([Exhibit D](#)) was provided but not heard and will be included in the record.]

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

In recognition of the Nevada Ready 21 debate you just had, we wanted to recognize a school that is actually utilizing this program. The School Innovation and Change Award was presented to Jerome D. Mack Middle School on June 1, 2017, by the National Principals Leadership Institute. The award is given to only five schools a year, and this is the first time a school in Nevada received this award. It is a very rigorous and competitive process.

The award recognizes struggling schools that embrace new and innovative strategies in order to see dramatic improvement. Some of these strategies include: every student is issued a Chromebook, and all assignments are posted in Google Classroom. Teachers conduct structured walks each day to classrooms; the professional development has all come together and they all work together. Approximately 390 high school credits will be earned by Mack Middle School students this year. Over 1,000 students are engaged in the performing arts. The faculty is engaged in professional learning regarding home visits and engaged in dozens of home visits this year as well. These are the many things we are trying to do to improve our schools—our struggling schools specifically. We are very proud of Mack Middle School.

**Chairman Thompson:**

At this time, I will recess the Assembly Committee on Education until the call of the Chair [at 6:25 p.m.].

[The meeting was reconvened at 9:26 p.m. behind the bar of the Assembly. There was a quorum present.]

**Chairman Thompson:**

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 467 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 467 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN FLORES AND WOODBURY  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The meeting is adjourned [at 9:27 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sharon McCallen  
Recording Secretary

---

Nancy Davis  
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chairman

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



## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a letter dated June 1, 2017, regarding Senate Bill 467 (2nd Reprint), addressed to Senator Goicoechea, written by Susan L. Jensen, Principal, White Pine Middle School.

[Exhibit D](#) is prepared testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 467 (2nd Reprint), written by Dr. David White, Chair of the Nevada Commission on Educational Technology.