

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

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

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 10:10 a.m. on Saturday, June 3, 2017, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Anderson
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5
Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3
Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Janice Wright, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After a call of the roll, Chair Carlton asked the audience to silence their electronic devices and identify themselves when they testified. She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to instruction in computer education and technology. (BDR 34-266)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 200 (2nd Reprint). She explained she would present her same testimony from the earlier hearing of the Senate Committee on Finance because of the short notice on this. She presented similar legislation during the 78th Session (2015) to heed the call to action contained in the Brookings Institution report "Cracking the Code on STEM" (science, technology, engineering, and math). [The Brookings Institution published a report on November 12, 2014, titled *Cracking the Code on STEM: A People Strategy for Nevada's Economy*.] She would provide a brief overview of the bill and then ask Mark Newburn, Vice President, State Board of Education, to make a presentation. Mr. Newburn was a key advisor and facilitator of stakeholders related to education issues and a researcher on computer literacy and computer science.

Senator Woodhouse advised that it was more important than ever for Nevada students to be well versed in technology when they graduated from high school. A student who planned to continue to a higher education or enter the workforce needed computer skills and the technical knowledge to succeed. Access to technology instruction should begin early. Students needed the opportunity to explore and be challenged by rigorous computer science courses and problem-solving strategies that were inherent in computational thinking.

Senator Woodhouse stated that with those goals in mind, S.B. 200 (R2) established various requirements regarding computer education and technology. Among other stipulations, the bill required all high schools to offer a computer science course approved by the State Board of Education. More effort was required to enroll students who were underrepresented in those fields, including female students, students from racial and ethnic groups, and students with disabilities. The bill also required all students in public schools and detention facilities to receive instruction in computer education and technology before the sixth grade. In addition, S.B. 200 (R2) emphasized computational thinking. It specified that when the State Board of Education prescribed a high school course in computer education and technology, the Board would adopt regulations identifying the percentage of instructional time for the course. State standards for computer education and technology were required to include computer science and computational thinking.

Senator Woodhouse relayed that to help schools develop solid courses and train teachers effectively, the bill required the Advisory Council on STEM to appoint a subcommittee to make recommendations about instruction in computer education and technology. The bill allowed students to use one credit from certain computer science courses to count toward the math and science requirement for high school graduation, the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship, and admittance to a public Nevada college or university.

Senator Woodhouse advised that the appropriation in S.B. 200 (R2) provided professional development for educators. The total cost for the 2017-2019 biennium was reduced in section 8.5 of the bill by the Senate Committee on Finance from the original cost of \$1.4 million in each year. The dates were changed to allow the State Board of Education sufficient time to develop the necessary standards; thus the school districts would not begin the course work as soon as originally planned.

The reduced amounts of the State General Fund appropriation were shown below.

| Entity | FY 2018 | FY 2019 |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Clark County School District | \$700,000 | \$800,000 |
| Washoe County School District | \$100,000 | \$200,000 |
| Department of Education (for rural school districts and charter schools) | \$200,000 | \$400,000 |
| Total | \$1,000,000 | \$1,400,000 |

The amounts authorized for the Department of Education would be available to the rural school districts and charter schools based upon noncompetitive grants. In FY 2019, the appropriation would increase because there was more involvement. The total appropriation for the 2017-2019 biennium would be \$1 million in FY 2018 and \$1.4 million in FY 2019.

Senator Woodhouse asked that Mr. Newburn make his presentation next. He would explain why the group worked so hard over the interim to ensure that the needs of students entering schools were addressed. Sections 2 and 8.3 of the bill became effective on July 1, 2022, to allow time for educators to receive the proper professional development training, which could be provided by school districts or other organizations that were available in the state.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions about the bill.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked for details about the significant fiscal note submitted by the charter schools.

Senator Woodhouse responded that the original bill lacked the appropriation, which was added in the 1st Reprint but reduced in the 2nd Reprint. Funding for the rural school districts and the charter schools was provided to the Department of Education. She did not want to require competitive grants for those funds as some schools would never receive any funding because they lacked grant writers, which made it difficult to compete for grants. Noncompetitive grants were added to resolve that problem. Some of the charter schools

would require more time to adopt the program. That was why the date was changed to 2022 for the program to begin.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked whether some allocation of money to the charter schools still remained in the bill.

Senator Woodhouse responded that the charter schools would receive funds, as would the rural school districts based upon their student numbers. When she developed the appropriation figures, she started with how much it would cost based upon the information she had for Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and the rural school districts. She saw the huge fiscal note from the charter schools and knew the bill would not be approved with a large fiscal note. That was why she reduced the cost and extended the time for teachers to be trained. When the schools began the program in the classrooms, the teachers would be providing the right type of instruction.

Mark Newburn, Vice President, State Board of Education, and Chair of the Special Task Force on K-12 Computer Science, read his written testimony.

We are here because computers continue to radically change our world at an accelerating rate. The number of connected smart phones is expected to exceed 6 billion by 2020. The Internet of Things is computerizing our cars and our homes. Recent advances in artificial intelligence now threaten to eliminate 83 percent of jobs that pay less than \$20 an hour and up to 47 percent of all jobs within the next two decades.

Our children will enter a world where every job may be a computer job. For most Americans, this computerized world might as well be built from magic. But it is not magic. It is built from the computational problem-solving techniques embodied in the field of computer science.

Over the last two years, there has been the growing recognition that we are not providing the well-rounded education needed for this century. This has led to a national movement to expand the equity and access to computer science. When New York City did their analysis, they determined that only about 1 percent of their students were receiving any type of computer science education. In 2014, we learned that there were 14 states where no African American students took the AP Computer Science exam. In contrast, Gallup has released the results of a national poll that showed 9 out of 10 parents want their children taught computer science.

This gap in K-12 computer science education has become a serious problem for industry. The advocacy group Code.org did an analysis showing there are currently about one-half million open jobs related to computer science and predicts that by 2020 that number could grow to 1 million. For many of our

top technology companies, their only limiting factor is their ability to recruit a skilled workforce in computer science.

Currently, this is a workforce with an almost complete lack of diversity. In 2014, Google released the demographic breakdown of their technical workforce. While women receive 60 percent of all bachelor's degrees in all fields, women only made up 17 percent of the Google technical workforce. African Americans and Hispanics together make up about 31 percent of the national population but only 3 percent of the Google technical workforce. They are simply not in the workforce because they were never given access to a computer science education.

Since a computer science workforce is now key to every New Nevada Economic Sector, 16 months ago the Nevada STEM community established a special Task Force on K-12 Computer Science. The goal of the task force is to identify national best practices and make policy recommendations to the Legislature and State Board of Education. This bill embodies the recommendations of the Nevada Task Force on K-12 Computer Science. If adopted, the bill will grant a competitive advantage to both our students and our efforts to attract companies to the New Nevada.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee had any questions. The world was changing and had progressed since her children played Oregon Trail many years ago. She did not use computers until she became a legislator. Her children knew more about computers than she did. The children could teach the older population. She asked for any testimony in support of the bill.

Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now, testified as a proud mother of a boy who had just received an award for most improved student in robotics. It was important to give students in the public school system the opportunity to learn computer programming, robotics, and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). She had seen a complete transformation in her son from someone who thought he could never code to someone who was now considering a career in robotics and coding. This was the success story that everyone wanted to see for all Nevada children.

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education, testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). He explained that the Department received a \$25,000 grant to begin work related to this bill, and that amount should cover the cost of the previous fiscal note on the bill.

Lindsay Anderson, Government Affairs Director, Washoe County School District, testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). The bill included some of her favorite things, a great ramp-up time to give the school districts a chance to prepare to deliver the instruction, and the resources to pay the educators to perform the additional work. She was excited about the bill. Her

daughter was two and one-half years old and knew more about how to use her iPhone than she did.

Nick DiArchangel, Director of Communications, Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). He represented more than 40,000 teachers and education support professionals in Nevada who were committed to a quality public education for all Nevada students. He thanked Senator Woodhouse for presenting the bill. He built his first Heathkit computer in the late 1970s. A public school taught him how to code, which led to his first job at a television station at the age of 16. He had used coding at every job he had since. He used coding at his present job to build and improve relational databases and develop background code for his social media work. He stated that it was not enough to know how to tweet, but students should also understand problem-solving and logic, which could be used throughout a lifetime.

Craig M. Stevens, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Clark County School District (CCSD), testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). He thanked Senator Woodhouse who had worked diligently with CCSD on the bill. He also appreciated the appropriation for professional development to help CCSD realign its curriculum to accomplish all the goals of the bill.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., Foster Consulting, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and the Nevada Association of School Administrators, testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). She thanked Senator Woodhouse for extending the time for professional development and for the noncompetitive grants.

Paige Ritzman, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards, testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). She appreciated working with Senator Woodhouse on the bill and looked forward to a better future for all students.

Ed Gonzalez, Policy Analyst, Clark County Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 200 (R2). He highlighted section 5.5, which related to professional development and why it was so important. The main challenge for principals and teachers in schools throughout Nevada was not getting the computer equipment for a coding class, it was the professional development needed for teachers to be able to teach those classes. He thanked Senator Woodhouse for her work.

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Crystal Abba, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), testified in opposition to S.B. 200 (R2). She submitted [Exhibit C](#), which was a two-page data sheet about college readiness by diploma type. She said [Exhibit C](#) highlighted the tip of the iceberg about her concerns with respect to the bill. She had numerous conversations with Senator Woodhouse and Mark Newburn, but unfortunately,

they were unable to reach a compromise. She wanted NSHE's concerns on the record, and she read some of her written testimony submitted as [Exhibit D](#).

For the record, I am Crystal Abba, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs with the Nevada System of Higher Education. I am here to put on the record, NSHE's strong opposition to the provisions of Senate Bill 200 and urge the deletion of section 6, which concerns university admissions. . . .[W]e support the goals of Senate Bill 200 and its purpose to recognize the importance of not only the availability of computer science courses for high school students, but also in providing incentives for students to take such courses. Computer science is a growing, high-demand field for which there are too few qualified men and women available to meet the workforce needs in Nevada and throughout the country. However, we are concerned there may be unintended consequences that may result in the weakening of primary skills in mathematics and quantitative reasoning that are critical to the college and career readiness of Nevada's high school graduates.

Section 6 of the bill would impact university admissions. The Board of Regents has defined in Board policy high school course requirements for university admissions. Among the course requirements for university admissions, a student must have three units of mathematics and three units of science. Section 6 of the bill provides that if a student completed two units of science, then a computer science course taken in high school may count for the third unit. Section 6 further provides that if a student successfully completes three units of math then a computer science course approved by the State Board of Education may count for the fourth unit in university admissions.

Our objections to the bill are two-fold. First, we object to including provisions regarding admissions in state law when such policies have historically been established by the Board of Regents. In general, the Board of Regents has taken a data-driven approach to any revisions in admissions policies. I will discuss in greater detail the data we have compiled, but in general, we have no data to support such course substitutions in admission decisions. The goal of getting students to major in and obtain a degree in computer science and related fields is perhaps, ironically, undermined where students do not take adequate mathematics in high school. Further, students who do not complete their first college math course are highly unlikely to complete college. Thus, this well-intended policy change is, in our view, likely to undermine the results it seeks to promise. It is also very likely that having an external entity like the Legislature influencing admission decisions in this way will gain the attention of accreditors who traditionally see the role of admissions as within the purview of the institution and its faculty. Second, we also object to the provisions of section 4 that we believe will dilute the

advanced diploma, which we have long held as the gold standard for preparing students for college.

Our data clearly indicate that computer science is not a substitute for mathematics or science. And that such a substitution will likely result in higher remedial placement rates, fewer gateway course completions, and ultimately fewer college graduates as those students will not be prepared for college, and students pursuing a STEM degree, including a degree in computer science, will be particularly disadvantaged. This measure has the potential to increase time to degree due to [an] increase in remediation and will mean that the cost of a degree will be higher for students as they will have to pay for remedial courses that will not count towards degree requirements. We believe that these risks outweigh the potential advantage of incentivizing students to pursue computer science as a career option. Further, there is additional concern for students who may choose to go to college outside of Nevada. It is likely that lowering the advanced diploma requirements will also reduce the admissions competitiveness of students who leave Nevada to pursue higher education.

Ms. Abba chose not to continue reading the remainder of her written testimony because of its length, but asked that it be entered into the record as [Exhibit D](#).

Linda Heiss, Senior Director of Institutional Research, Nevada System of Higher Education, testified in opposition to [S.B. 200 \(R2\)](#). She referenced [Exhibit C](#), which covered general overall college readiness for students entering NSHE institutions who graduated from a Nevada high school. Data specific to those students entering a computer science degree and the readiness for the rigors of that degree was shown on [Exhibit C](#). She pointed out that the ACT [American College Testing] established a benchmark for math, science, and English. A benchmark score for an ACT subject test meant that a student had a 75 percent chance of receiving a grade of C and a 50 percent chance of receiving a B on the corresponding college-level course. She had looked at the average ACT scores by diploma type. For math, the ACT benchmark was 22. Students who received an advanced diploma that required four years of math received an ACT score of 23, which exceeded the benchmark. Students who received a standard diploma in high school scored an average of 18 and did not reach the benchmark. The ACT benchmark was 23 for science. The advanced diploma students who completed three years of science scored 22, but students who earned a standard diploma scored 18.

Ms. Heiss studied the placement of students in the college-level math courses based on the highest math course they completed in high school. For students who completed Algebra 2 as their highest level of math, their placement into a college-level, credit-bearing math course was 36.8 percent, meaning about two-thirds of students were unprepared. Those students who completed an additional year of math (trigonometry and precalculus) were placed into college-level courses at 67 percent, which was close to double the previous group. The fourth year of math made a huge difference in college preparation. She looked at

computer science majors by their minority status and at the universities. The increase in minority students who enrolled in a computer science major was 45.5 percent in 2011-2012 and 63.8 percent in 2016-2017. At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) in 2016-2017, 76.7 percent of the computer science majors were minority students, and at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), 47.3 percent of the computer science majors were minority students, which was an increase from 27.4 percent in 2011-2012 at UNR. The minority student population was growing in the computer science major.

Joseph I. Cline, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education, Professor of Chemistry, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), testified in opposition to S.B. 200 (R2) and read his written testimony.

For the record, I am Joe Cline, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Professor of Chemistry at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Although UNR recognizes and supports the intentions of S.B. 200 (R2), UNR has significant concerns about the unintended consequences it will have on Nevada's high school graduates who pursue higher education.

Computer science has become widely recognized as the "Third Pillar" of science. There is no doubt of its technological and economic importance. However, the study of computer science should not displace the prime importance of mathematics for success in higher education. High school computer science courses are not a replacement for mathematics courses, and even the most demanding high school computer science courses do not build the higher-level mathematics skills that promote success in college and particularly in science and engineering majors.

Washoe County high school graduates who earn an advanced diploma, which requires four full years of high school mathematics, are nearly three times more likely to pursue a STEM major in college than those who earn a standard diploma.

Regardless of major, mathematics preparation is the strongest predictor of student success in college. And mathematics is no spectator sport. Use it or lose it. The provisions of SB 200 would allow advanced diploma students to take a "senior year" math vacation, reducing their mathematics preparation to that of the standard diploma. The consequences would be tragic for our students.

Fifty-three percent of standard diploma students who enter NSHE institutions require mathematics remediation. Twenty percent of those who earn an advanced diploma require mathematics remediation. These students who require remediation incur additional costs in student fees associated with those courses and suffer delays in completing their degrees. College algebra and

calculus are prerequisites for the introductory science courses that serve students majoring in science and engineering. At UNR, that includes introductory courses such as CS 135 Computer Science 1. Students delayed taking these remedial mathematics courses become frustrated in their aspirations to pursue a STEM degree. The result is that they frequently abandon their dream and switch to a non-STEM degree program, and students with significant remediation challenges often drop out of college.

In my years as an academic advisor for chemistry majors, it was all too common for a new freshman to take a year of remedial mathematics prior to embarking upon their first course in chemistry. I have been witness to how this is humiliating and discouraging for the student. After that year of delay, the student had lost his enthusiasm for science and for chemistry.

Section 6 of SB 200 would force NSHE institutions to adjust their admissions requirements to accommodate the changed math and science graduation standards. These admission standards are not set arbitrarily: they are set with student success in mind. Also, keep in mind that many Nevada high school graduates choose to go out of state for their education. Just like in NSHE, math and science preparation is closely scrutinized by competitive colleges and universities outside Nevada. SB 200 will weaken the competitiveness of our high school graduates who leave the state.

In summary, while the intentions of SB 200 are meritorious, it should be understood that computer science is complementary to and builds upon the fundamental preparation in math and natural science. SB 200 will actually reduce the success of our students pursuing computer science degrees at the university level. There is a better means to this end.

Chair Carlton expressed concerns about the opposition testimony. There had been a number of conversations at the Legislature about college- and career-ready students. What she heard was that university representatives assumed every student who graduated would continue to college. She had heard many times that workforce development entities projected that jobs of the future would not need that four-year degree. There were apprenticeship programs and many other types of programs. Not every student who left high school was college-bound. She was concerned that the opposition presented these testimonies without prior notice. The bill had been public for a long time and was introduced on February 22, 2017. There had been several reprints. This opposition was presented just a couple of days before *sine die*. She realized that some of the opponents had discussed the problems with the sponsor, but the opponents knew the bill would be heard by the second house. None of those concerns had been heard before today and that was troublesome to her.

Ms. Abba responded that she recognized that not all students were college-bound. However, those students who were college-bound needed to understand that if they did not take that fourth year of mathematics or that third year of science, they might put themselves in

jeopardy when it came to their ultimate goal for college success. She felt strongly that she had an obligation to make the Committee aware of the data.

Chair Carlton said the data had not changed since Ms. Abba had spoken to Senator Woodhouse. She was concerned because she had not heard about this opposition and was unsure whether any other members of the Committee had been made aware of this opposition before the hearing. She wished the opponents had made their concerns known before today's hearing. Chair Carlton asked for further testimony from those individuals who opposed S.B. 200 (R2).

Frederick C. Harris, Jr., Professor, Computer Science and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno, testified in opposition to S.B. 200 (R2). He had been a faculty member for 23 years and had taught thousands of students in his courses over those years. He grew up in a household with parents who were advanced placement mathematics and science teachers, and he valued computer science education at all levels. He spoke against parts of S.B. 200 (R2), particularly allowing computer science to count in place of mathematics and science courses, which, in his opinion, set students up to fail when they continued to college. He opposed section 6, which required NSHE to accept students with fewer math and science courses than were currently required.

Mr. Harris explained that the enrollment in computer science programs at UNR had doubled twice in the last ten years. The economic growth caused many of those students to remain in the state. He was concerned about the consequences of the bill hurting that growth. Computer Science 135 was the first course in the programming major, and it required Math 128, college algebra, and trigonometry as prerequisites. The longer a student delayed taking college math, the more likely the students would leave the field. The less prepared they were for math at the beginning of their college career, the more they struggled in all the engineering fields throughout their academic career.

Mr. Harris noted that he was also an accreditation program evaluator and now a chair and commissioner of computer science education. There were two fields in which he had to ensure he counted enough college credits, and those were math and science. Courses below Math 128 were remedial and did not count. This bill would allow students to possibly not succeed in that field. He said he was excited to see computer education being valued across K-12 grades. That was important for the state. However, he opposed decreasing the number of math and science courses taken at the high school level, and he urged the Committee to remove section 6 from S.B. 200 (R2). He asked the Committee to please not set up his students to fail and hurt the overall economy by having fewer computer science professionals ready to enter the job market in the future.

David H. Sanders, Ph.D., UNR Foundation Professor, Center for Civil Engineering, Earthquake Research, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno, read his written testimony and presented [Exhibit E](#), a chart titled "Recommended Schedule for the Four Year Civil Engineering BS Program."

Thank you for the time to comment on SB 200 which will reduce the math requirement for advanced diplomas. While I am very supportive of students taking computer science in high school, I did back in the late 70s, I am very concerned about the reduction in the required math even for students with advanced diplomas. Of students coming to UNR, more than 60 percent had diplomas where this reduction in requirement would be allowed. Therefore, this change impacts the majority of students coming to UNR.

A trend in higher education is for students to complete as many higher education requirements while in high school and, once they are at an institution, to complete in four years, such as the program "30 to finish." This change is in the opposite direction of this trend.

In engineering, we see a direct correlation between performance in math, and success in engineering and the student's time to completion of a degree. Math is at the center of what we do in engineering, and all of our courses have calculus as a prerequisite. A delay in math will cause a delay in all engineering classes. Success in math provides a firm foundation and the ability to focus on other classes. Great math skills lead to higher success in all of their engineering and science classes.

I have attached a copy of our advising flow chart for Civil Engineering. Engineers love charts. The reason I have brought this is to show that math is in the center of all that we do, and it starts with calculus. All the lines stem from math, and there is a reason why math is in the center and at the beginning. Math is extremely important for all of engineering and science.

[For] other degrees where math is not at the core, math skills are still important. Many students, even the best ones, struggle with math. The thinking and problem-solving skills that you learn while doing math extend beyond math into all courses. Maintaining the current standard will assist all students and improve their chances for success beyond high school and to college classes and to other areas outside of NSHE and university courses.

I am also very concerned that section 6.3 dictates NSHE admission requirements. I feel strongly that this should not be set externally.

While computer science skills are important, they are not a substitute for math skills. I ask that you not approve a bill that will have the direct effect of increasing the math remediation at all NSHE institutions and, therefore, increasing time to graduation and decreasing student success.

Thank you for your time, service, and consideration.

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in opposition to, or neutral on the bill and, hearing none, asked Senator Woodhouse if she had any closing comments.

Senator Woodhouse thanked Chair Carlton for hearing the bill this morning. She was aware that NSHE representatives would present testimony in opposition to the bill, but she was surprised at the strength of the opposition. She had tried to work out some compromise, especially in section 6 of the bill. The language was changed in two different amendments as a compromise. She believed they had made progress. The goal was to ensure that computer science and technology were available to the students at the highest level of professionalism and that the teachers had an opportunity for professional development so that they could deliver that instruction to students and make those experiences available. It was time to advance computer science and technology education, and that was why she kept pushing for this bill. She thanked the Committee.

Chair Carlton thanked Senator Woodhouse and closed the hearing on S.B. 200 (R2). Mr. Newburn wanted to add some additional testimony, but Chair Carlton explained that closing comments were only allowed from the sponsor of the bill. He had been given the opportunity to testify earlier, and his remarks were part of the record. She said if he had anything else, he would like to submit, he could provide that information to the secretary for inclusion in the record. The Senate had some important work that needed to be done this morning, and members were needed on the floor at 11 a.m. She would recess the Committee because the bills that she had were Senate bills, and she did not want to process those without the Senators. When the Committee reconvened, Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint), Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint), and several other bills would be processed. Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint) would be a priority because it included the weighted student funding formula. It was important that education funding be addressed as soon as possible. She asked for the members and the audience to remain flexible. The Committee would return to its hearing room many times today to get its work done.

Chair Carlton recessed the hearing at 10:52 a.m.

Chair Carlton reconvened the hearing at 4:11 p.m. She thanked Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3, for coming to present his bill, and she opened the hearing on Senate Bill 187 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 187 (2nd Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the establishment of a fine arts museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, and the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in Reno, Nevada. (BDR S-267)

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 187 (2nd Reprint). He gave a brief history of the bill. It provided a total of \$1 million—\$500,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and \$500,000 in FY 2019—as seed money for a statewide museum that would be based in Las Vegas. The Nevada Museum of Art was located in Reno, and this new museum would be combined with that museum on the property in his district in Las Vegas next to The Smith Center for the Performing Arts and the

Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health. This was the third time he brought this bill to the Legislature.

Senator Segerblom commented that in 2013 he came up with an idea after his mother, former Assemblywoman Gene Segerblom, passed away. He wanted to honor her, and her major bill was a museum of art in Nevada. He proposed a \$10 million-per-year appropriation bill in her honor. That idea evolved into the bill today. Individuals suggested that rather than build individual museums, it would be best to build one big museum in the state, and that was what this bill proposed. It was a fantastic concept. Las Vegas was the largest city in the country that lacked a big art museum. Individuals in Southern Nevada formed a new committee to work with the Nevada Museum of Art. David Walker had been present this morning but was unable to remain. The project affected portions of Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz's Assembly District No. 11 and Assemblyman Nelson Araujo's Assembly District No. 3, and the project was located in Senator Segerblom's Senate District No. 3. The project would fill a void that existed in Las Vegas. The museum would ultimately cost several hundred million dollars, but the money in the bill was just seed money. The bill would show the individuals of Nevada that the state was serious in its commitment to help. He asked for any assistance from the Committee. He reminded the Committee that his mother's photo was on the wall downstairs in the Assembly Hall of Fame and asked the Committee to cry for her.

Chair Carlton said the \$1 million would be provided to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC), and the museum would request the funds as the project progressed.

Senator Segerblom said it was a matching grant. If the \$1 million was not raised within the two years of the 2017-2019 biennium, then all the money would revert to the State General Fund.

Chair Carlton asked for any testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Brian McAnallen, Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative Services, city of Las Vegas, testified in support of S.B. 187 (R2). Mr. McAnallen appreciated Senator Segerblom bringing the bill forward. He looked forward to embracing the museum in the community. The city of Las Vegas was donating the land for the Southern Nevada museum project. He was excited the museum would be located in what he considered the prime Symphony Park area adjacent to The Smith Center. He asked for the Committee's support for the bill, and Las Vegas would continue to bring anything it could to support the effort.

Michael Hillerby, former member and Chair of the Board of Museums and History, testified in support of S.B. 187 (R2). The art museum was a phenomenal institution of which the state could be proud. It had been around for 86 years and was the only accredited art museum in Nevada. The American Association of Museums was an important designation with strict qualifications. One of the advantages of creating this partnership north and south was it would automatically create an instant accreditation for the southern campus of the museum. Some might be familiar with the work of the museum on the Seven Magic Mountains art

installation south near Jean. He would answer any questions about the institution or the history.

[Chair Carlton left the meeting briefly, and Assemblyman Frierson assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Frierson asked whether the Committee had any questions about S.B. 187 (R2). He asked for any further testimony in support of the bill.

Miles Dickson, J.A. Barrett Company, testified in support of S.B. 187 (R2). He represented The Art Museum at Symphony Park. He entered into the record [Exhibit F](#), written testimony authored by Katie O'Neill, Chair of the Board of Directors of The Art Museum at Symphony Park. She had been present earlier this morning, but was unable to remain this evening. He said the bill would expand the arts and art education in Nevada.

Nick Vander Poel, representing Capitol Partners on behalf of the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA), testified in support of S.B. 187 (R2). The goal of the RSCVA was to attract overnight visitors to the Reno-Tahoe lodging properties through tourism marketing, convention sales, and facility operations featuring local amenities. He entered into the record [Exhibit G](#), his written testimony in support of S.B. 187 (R2).

Vice Chair Frierson asked for testimony in opposition to or neutral on the bill.

Cadence Matijevich, Deputy Secretary for Operations, Office of the Secretary of State, testified that the fiscal note on the original bill no longer applied to S.B. 187 (R2).

Vice Chair Frierson asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none.

Senator Segerblom asked the Committee to approve the bill for his mother.

Vice Chair Frierson closed the hearing on S.B. 187 (R2). He said he was waiting for several legislators to arrive to present their bills.

[Assemblywoman Carlton returned to the hearing and reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Carlton said Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, was ready to present his bill, and she opened the hearing on Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the funding formula for K-12 public education. (BDR 34-792)

Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, testified that Senate Bill (S.B.) 178 (1st Reprint) modified provisions related to the funding formula for K-12 education. One of the significant and crosscutting efforts undertaken in recent years and, particularly during the 78th Session (2015), had been modernizing the state's funding

formula for K-12 education. The goal was to allocate more money for students with greater needs, including those who were from low-income families, English learners (EL), students with disabilities, or students who were gifted or talented. The historical funding formula, referred to as the Nevada Plan, was created by the 54th Session (1967). He offered some background to provide some needed context. In 1967, it was understood that a new funding formula was desperately needed, but the formula would be unsuccessful if it simply set out to rearrange the allocation. The Legislature supplemented the proposed funding formula with a new source of revenue, the Local School Support Tax (LSST). The Nevada Plan was designed to yield equity among Nevada's increasingly diverse school districts. Washoe County and Clark County were quickly becoming urban counties and very different from other rural school districts in the state. There was no real consideration given to the diversity of the Nevada student population because it was not diverse. In 1967, Senator Denis was a first grader at Robert E. Lake Elementary School in Las Vegas.

Senator Denis said 50 years later Nevada was an entirely different place. Clark County now had twice as many K-12 students as it had individuals in 1967. Then, only 1 percent of the state's residents were Hispanic, and now 28 percent of the population of Nevada was Hispanic. Looking to the future, Hispanics made up 50 percent of the Clark County students in grades K-3. Nevada was also a very middle-class state a half-century ago. Now, nearly half the students qualified for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL). Nevada needed a school funding formula that provided equity not only among its diverse school districts but also among its diverse student body. The Legislature needed to ensure that the funding it provided was adequate. Discussions were held about the recent efforts to revise the Nevada Plan.

Senator Denis commented that because of interim studies and discussions held during previous legislative sessions, a plan was established to provide additional services to four groups of students through either a multiplier or additional weighted funding expressed as a flat dollar amount. Stakeholders were in general agreement that weighted funding might be preferable to a multiplier. Senate Bill 178 (R1) used weighted funding.

As decided during the 78th Session (2015), students with disabilities were the first group of students moving to the new weighted funding formula. Beginning in the current fiscal year, students with disabilities were funded at 150 percent of the standard per-pupil rate. Weighted funding for gifted and talented students was approximately \$500 per student beyond the basic support guarantee. The effects of the funding for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) students were being studied. The other two subgroups of students requiring weighted funding included low-income students and EL. The 78th Session (2015) appropriated a substantial down payment to serve them through new and expanded categorical programs. The cost of educating those students had been monitored. The appropriation for the successful Zoom school programs, which provided literacy and other supports for EL students, had doubled in size to \$100 million over the current biennium. An additional \$50 million was appropriated for new Victory school programs supporting extra literacy and instruction and other supports for 35 of Nevada's poorest and underperforming schools. The funds invested in those programs were not only improving academic progress

but also making it possible over the long term for EL and FRL students to be more equitably funded in the Nevada Plan.

Senator Denis expressed that after many hours of discussion with stakeholders, legislators, and educators, the working group developed an amendment to S.B. 178 (R1). He said the working group held many hours of meetings, some starting at 6 a.m. and others lasting until 10 p.m. An average of 18 individuals attended the meetings representing school districts, rural counties, administrators, teachers, and a great group of individuals and stakeholders. The group developed an amendment that was adopted by the Senate and represented a significant step forward in the collective long-term goal of adequacy to equitably serve the special population of students in the state who required additional resources to meet their needs.

Senator Denis described S.B. 178 (R1), which continued funding for existing Victory and Zoom schools. The students in those schools were thriving, and thus the work had to continue. The bill built a policy bridge to the future by establishing a strategy for increasing the efforts for the EL and FRL students who did not currently benefit from the weighted funding.

Senator Denis submitted Exhibit H, a 6-page document of visual details in support of S.B. 178 (R1), which were graphic designs of a set of scales that illustrated what he would present. Page 2 of Exhibit H showed the performance of Nevada's higher-risk students several years ago. For too long, too many of those students found themselves on the left side of the unbalanced scale. The scale he referred to showed more EL and FRL students than students at or above proficiency. Those EL and FRL students were below proficiency. That was where the state had been historically. The EL students were represented by the red blocks on the scale. The FRL students were represented by the green blocks on the scale. On page 3 of Exhibit H, he showed that over the past three years, Nevada had made big investments in Zoom and Victory programs to serve EL and FRL students, and the investments had paid dividends. Many of the targeted students had already moved to proficiency, and more were getting close. However, some of the EL and FRL students were not receiving the additional help they needed because they did not attend a Zoom or Victory school. Thus, it would be difficult for them to move to the other side of the scale. The scale now started to move toward balance when an investment was added for those students.

Senator Denis relayed that page 4 of Exhibit H showed the premise of the stakeholders about the funding formula that would have the greatest effect on student achievement. The new money authorized by the 79th Session (2017) would be prioritized for the lowest-performing students first because there were insufficient funds available to serve all the students in those categories and because some of those students were already performing well. The scales started to balance as the state continued to put investments into education. Students below proficiency were starting to catch up.

Senator Denis verified that S.B. 178 (R1) required identifying and providing weighted funding for the EL and FRL students who scored in the bottom quartile on the statewide

assessments but who did not attend Zoom or Victory schools. This process ensured that the new funding appropriated went to those students who needed it the most. The weighted funding was \$1,200 per student, and it was funded only once if a student was in both the EL and FRL categories. Funding for those students would be further prioritized according to the schools that they attended. The funds would go first to those students at one-star and two-star schools, then to the students at the three-star schools, and finally to students at four-star schools. If there was insufficient money to serve an entire tier of schools, then the state would fund those schools with the greatest number of EL and FRL students performing at the bottom 25 percent or quartile. The funding would build capacity in schools that were struggling to meet the needs of underperforming students. It was hoped the funds would also help those schools attract more effective teachers.

Senator Denis added that the services provided with the additional money would largely be based on the successful Zoom and Victory models. The statutes would broadly outline the service options with further details provided in regulations. Section 9 of the bill offered some limited flexibility to schools in choosing their service mix. The statewide evaluation process would measure and monitor the effectiveness of each approach. The state would also ensure alignment between the services provided and any school or district achievement plan such as the EL master plans. In those instances where schools might not have enough qualifying students to reach the necessary economies of scale, as might often be the case in rural areas, the bill encouraged coordinating services between multiple schools to maximize the benefits to students. Several schools in close proximity might share a reading center and split the costs.

Senator Denis reported that the programs would measure the effect and effectiveness through performance targets and annual measurable objectives aligned with the Nevada School Performance Framework. An external evaluator would be contracted to analyze the outcomes and report to the Legislature. Page 5 of [Exhibit H](#) showed the benefits of [S.B. 178 \(R1\)](#). The scale showed a greater number of students who were at or above proficiency because of the effects of the bill. It might take a few years for the number of students below proficiency to shrink. The new funds committed by the 79th Session (2017) would serve students and schools that had not received additional support thus far. Some students might be served through a few new Victory or Zoom schools, but most students served would be in lower-performing schools with lower concentrations of EL and FRL.

Senator Denis remarked that the bill provided a vital structural bridge between the progress made over the past three years and the long-term objectives of higher achievement for those special groups of students. Page 6 of [Exhibit H](#) showed what he hoped the future would look like, so students who were living in challenging circumstances and performing below proficiency were the exception and not the rule. Continued policy work was needed to ensure success. The definitions of the students to be served should be refined, and the cost of providing appropriate services should be clarified.

Senator Denis declared that [S.B. 178 \(R1\)](#) called for an important interim study to proceed with those tasks. Section 14 of the bill provided for the study to update the information

contained in a 2012 study of a new method of funding for public schools in Nevada. The study would establish an appropriate definition of at-risk pupils and recommend funding to serve those students. The working group used FRL numbers as a proxy for identifying students who were at risk, but the group wanted to see whether there was a better measure to use. The interim study would review the weighted funding needed for students with disabilities and establish an appropriate definition of GATE students. The study would provide the Legislature with information needed to ensure that ongoing resources were used for the most effective interventions and target future new resources to students with the greatest need.

Senator Denis stressed that administratively, S.B. 178 (R1) also required a few important measures. First, it required the State Board of Education to adopt regulations requiring districts and charter schools to report the number of students enrolled who were identified as EL and FRL. Second, it required the Department of Education to prescribe annual measurable objectives and performance targets to track school performance in supporting those students. Finally, districts and charter schools had to submit an annual report to the Department of Education, which detailed their results against the prescribed annual objectives and performance targets and a plan for meeting the objectives and targets in the ensuing year.

Senator Denis continued that he was grateful to all the staff and stakeholders who gave so generously of their time and expertise to formulate a shared vision for the bill and the conceptual amendment. There were many early mornings and late night hours involved with S.B. 178 (R1), which was both thoughtful and practical. He urged the Committee to support the bill, but also asked that the members speak to their colleagues about the benefits of S.B. 178 (R1) to reverse the student achievement imbalance in the state.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee had any questions. She asked for details of the evaluation process.

Senator Denis responded that the evaluation would start where it left off three years ago. That evaluation studied various weights and developed some recommendations. That evaluation needed to be updated, and a study of gifted and talented students needed to be added. Much of the work was already done, and there would be time to complete the studies and add a better definition of at-risk or low-achieving students.

Chair Carlton thanked Senator Denis for all his hard work. She knew he managed conference calls with 20 or 30 individuals participating at one time. The work had been a labor of love, and she appreciated his efforts and dedication to the subject.

Senator Denis added that he also included community members in the working group. There were teleconferences with individuals in the community that started out with 6 individuals and ended up with 30 individuals. It was great to get input from everyone.

Chair Carlton asked for any testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, testified that he appreciated Senator Denis and the long hours he devoted to this project. The Department considered an expansion of the Zoom school project when the first ideas were developed and presented for the budget for the 79th Session (2017). He appreciated Senator Denis's diligence in expanding those ideas and bringing together the stakeholders to build upon that. The funding study by an independent consultant would be a welcome addition during the interim to help the Department of Education continue on its path to a funding formula that included the per-pupil rates. He cited some preliminary calculations using the data inside of the parameters in the bill from the various school districts. He projected that all of the EL and FRL students in one-star and two-star schools would receive the additional funds, possibly including some students in three-star schools. The EL and FRL students who scored in the lowest quartile in one-star and two-star schools would all receive additional resources for support. This was a source of pride for the state.

Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1). He thanked Senator Denis for his leadership in moving this important legislation and the good policy ideas forward. He also thanked Senator Woodhouse, Assemblywoman Diaz, and Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17. He thanked the superintendents of the school districts for assembling student data and the list of prescriptive interventions that could be used as a part of the legislation. The Legislature established Zoom and Victory schools, but those programs were school-centric and not student-centric. [The term student-centric or student-centered learning referred to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies that were intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students.] That meant that the money followed the school and benefited students attending that school rather than following students as provided in S.B. 178 (R1). This bill ensured that the money went to the students who needed it the most and acknowledged that not all students cost the same to educate. The costs differed depending on the needs of the students.

Mr. Augspurger added that this money was in addition to the Distributive School Account (DSA) funding and had no effect on the existing Zoom and Victory school programs. Those programs were preserved and would be expanded. The student-centric money was targeted and prescriptive. Targeted money to individual students with a prescriptive approach meant they selected from a predetermined menu of learning options. An additional layer of accountability for teachers and principals who worked with those students was added as a byproduct to ensure the outcomes were effective.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of the bill. Senate Bill 178 (R1) was a significant step to the responsible application of the weighted funding formula to serve EL and FRL low-income students. The Association had been pleased to support Senate Bill 508 of the 78th Session (2015) that set forth the plan to adopt a weighted funding formula in the Nevada Plan. The Association strongly supported providing the additional resources necessary to educate

EL and at-risk students. The education equity and social justice concern affected all Nevada students. Despite the significant efforts to expand school funding during the 78th Session (2015), Nevada continued to rank near the bottom of all states in per-pupil education spending. The Executive Budget included increases in total per-pupil funding proposed by the Governor and adopted by the Senate and the Assembly for the 2017-2019 biennium, but those increases barely kept up with the increasing cost of doing business.

Mr. Daly commented that the Association believed the full application of the weighted funding formula contemplated in the original version of the bill reflected the true cost of providing a high-quality education that every Nevada student deserved. The Association was committed to working on that vision and supported S.B. 178 (R1) as an important step to the responsible application of the weighted funding formula. While Zoom and Victory schools were strong models and worthy of the widespread support that they had received from the Legislature, not every EL or FRL student could be reached through the school site model. Educators knew that quality education for students who were at risk or EL required enhanced educational programs or services. Senate Bill 178 (R1) would give schools across the state the opportunity to apply those enhanced programs or services that had already been found effective in the Zoom and Victory school models. The Association supported the move to the weighted funding formula and was committed to continuing its work to find additional resources to adequately fund public education for all Nevada students including those who were EL and at risk.

Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1). The Clark County School District (CCSD) worked with the sponsors and stakeholders of the bill on a transition plan that would ultimately be the foundation of the weighted funding formula. The bill represented the collective work on the weighted funding formula that had been conducted over the past six years. The CCSD requested Senate Bill 11 of the 76th Session (2011) to begin the work necessary to update the Nevada Plan developed in 1967. That bill and all the bills after it recognized that Nevada had a very different student population today. A weighted funding formula was required to support the students learning English, living in poverty, living with disabilities, or needing accelerated learning through gifted and talented education. Senate Bill 178 (R1) represented the best approach to serving EL and at-risk students with limited funds as the state transitioned to a weighted funding formula. The categorical funding would serve thousands of students in CCSD who were not currently in Zoom or Victory schools.

Ms. Rourke stated that CCSD had identified nonproficient students, according to state standardized tests, who required additional services to improve their academic achievement. By focusing on performance for the EL and at-risk students, CCSD could use additional funds within the framework of the EL master plan and the individual school performance plans to provide meaningful services that would raise student achievement across the district. Staff had modeled the potential effect of those funds to provide quality services in schools with small and large populations in those categories. The numbers showed the approach would work. She contended that the weights had to be fully funded, and CCSD committed to

working with legislators and stakeholders in the coming years to see the weighted funding formula fully applied. She thanked Senator Denis, Senator Woodhouse, Assemblywoman Diaz, and Assemblyman Thompson for their efforts and early-morning meetings to work through the problems to ensure S.B. 178 (R1) was the foundation on which to build the new funding formula.

Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now, powered by the Rogers Foundation, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1). She submitted [Exhibit I](#), a letter dated June 3, 2017, in support of S.B. 178 (R1) to Assemblywoman Carlton, authored by Amanda Morgan, Legal Director, and Sylvia Lazos. An equitable approach to full funding of schools was an important goal. Educate Nevada Now supported the amended version of S.B. 178 (R1). She thanked Senator Denis and Mr. Canavero for their leadership and tenacity in retaining some key principles that made S.B. 178 (R1) a good bill.

Ms. Lazos pointed to the first essential principle regarding the allocation of \$1,200 per pupil, and she agreed with the study by the Guinn Center for Policy Priorities that a return on investment (ROI) had to be the beginning of any price- or cost-point analysis. She said students could not be shortchanged by giving them \$500 because that was what the state could afford. The Legislature should begin with a quality allocation, and S.B. 178 (R1) did that. Second, the bill shifted to an equitable approach. The neediest schools were prioritized first, and that made the whole scheme go from one that would have exacerbated the inequality to a plan that addressed the inequality of teacher talent and resources that existed in urban districts. Any move should focus on the ROI. It was essential that the Department of Education measure the results to ensure the ROI outcomes equaled the results of the Victory and Zoom schools.

Ms. Lazos did not want to advocate for more dollars, but she wanted to advocate for more dollars with results. She looked forward to working with Senator Denis and the task force on an analysis of sufficient funds for a system of common schools as dictated by the *Nevada Constitution*. There was still a lot of work to be done because the new funds probably represented only 5 percent of the needed funds. She urged the continued work involving the community, the Legislature, and the stakeholders to ensure that in the future every child, not just the bottom quartile, and all schools would receive the funding to support the teachers and the quality education that would afford every child in Nevada the opportunity to succeed.

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1) and thanked Senator Denis for his efforts. Senator Denis worked to gather all the necessary stakeholders together. A joint hearing of the Senate Committee on Education and the Assembly Committee on Education was held to work on the bill. Senate Bill 178 (R1) provided a great ROI. The funding provided a menu of services that was evidence-based, and the promising practices would improve student achievement.

Mary Pierczynski, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and the Nevada Association of School Administrators, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1). She said

the previous testifiers had presented all the reasons this bill was important to the students. She thanked Senator Denis, Senator Woodhouse, Assemblyman Thompson, and Assemblywoman Diaz for their work. The rural school districts were represented by Jeff Zander, Superintendent, Elko County School District, and the other superintendents of the school districts were present. They appreciated being involved in the discussion and supported the bill.

John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association, represented 18,000 educators. He agreed with the earlier comments presented. The Association had worked on weighted funding for some time. The Clark County School District (CCSD) held an extensive discussion about how to reorganize the fifth-largest school district in the United States. The goal was to create a better delivery system of quality education. The CCSD would decentralize and put more resources and control at the point of education to empower every stakeholder led by good leaders to do their best. The discussion resulted in two major concepts. The first concept was that the money should follow the student. The Legislature had approved the categorical models for Zoom and Victory schools, which included prescribed interventions to improve education results in the school systems. Those were school-centric, and the dollars went to the schools, but not necessarily to every student who needed assistance. That prescriptive approach yielded good results but had diminishing returns. The approach required high critical mass and high EL student populations. Not every school qualified. Of the 357 schools in CCSD, over 200 schools would be affected by S.B. 178 (R1). Every student in one-star and two-star schools in the bottom quartile of proficiency would receive funds that would provide the type of intervention and resources needed.

Mr. Vellardita said the second concept related to the meaning of money following the student. The 79th Session (2017) held a good policy discussion to lay the groundwork for weighted funding and the type of intervention needed. The next two years would show the results of the targeted prescriptive intervention. The state could use multipliers, but would still need to consider what more than the baseline per-pupil funding would buy, how the funding would be used, what kind of accountability systems were needed, and what kind of outcomes would result. This was a good model to gain enough experience to see whether it worked. He thanked Senator Denis, Senator Woodhouse, Assemblywoman Diaz, Assemblyman Thompson, and the other legislators who participated in this effort. Clark County teachers would be pleased to see additional resources and good intervention strategies directed to students who needed assistance.

Jessica Ferrato, Principal, Crowley and Ferrato, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1). She thanked all the stakeholders who put in time and effort to work on the weighted funding formula. The bill modernized the school funding formulas.

Lindsay Anderson, Government Affairs Director, Washoe County School District, testified in support of S.B. 178 (R1).

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Senator Denis added that the cost was \$36 million in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium. An additional State General Fund appropriation of \$250,000 would pay a consultant to perform work for the Department of Education. He thanked Assemblyman Thompson, Senator Woodhouse, and Assemblywoman Diaz for all their hard work.

Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 178 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint): Requires instruction in financial literacy and economics in public schools. (BDR 34-62)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 249 (2nd Reprint), which required instruction in financial literacy and economics in public schools. Many might remember a similar piece of legislation about financial literacy in the 78th Session (2015). Evan Gong was a high school student and a Nevada Youth Legislator representing Senate District No. 5 in 2015. He was now a college student. He brought the financial literacy concern to Senator Woodhouse because he thought it was an important topic for students graduating from high school. They needed a better basis in financial literacy in their coursework. She presented his written testimony as [Exhibit J](#), because he was very committed to this. He had been present this morning but was unable to remain this evening.

Senator Woodhouse explained that since 2015 she had talked and worked with the stakeholders to bring this bill to the Legislature. Under current law, financial literacy was taught in Nevada's high schools and covered most of the basic concepts. However, the depth of the instruction was inadequate given the ever-increasing financial complexity that students faced as they moved into adult life. The principles of personal finance and the global economy in which they functioned were mysteries to an alarming number of Americans, much less young individuals. Recent changes in the financial landscape had further complicated the decisions made by workers, consumers, savers, borrowers, and investors. What is more, the pace of change was quickening at a time when individuals of all ages were being called upon to assume more responsibility for their financial lives. In short, consumers today were faced with a dizzying array of financial options, requirements, and decisions. Nevada owed it to the students to better prepare them for those challenges. Senate Bill 249 (R2) addressed the problem by extending the existing financial literacy course of study from high school into lower grades and expanding the topics covered to include the most relevant information for today's world.

Senator Woodhouse revealed that some components of S.B. 249 (R2) included establishing the Account for Instruction in Financial Literacy in the State General Fund. Those funds could be used only to provide instruction in financial literacy. The bill also required financial literacy instruction for students enrolled in grades 3 through 12. The Council to Establish

Academic Standards for Public Schools would develop the standards, content, and performance of instruction in financial literacy. The instruction in financial literacy had to be age appropriate, include certain topics, and be provided with an established course of study such as economics, math, or social studies. She relied on the curriculum expert at the Clark County School District (CCSD), who was a social studies and economics guru on all topics and who suggested the standards in economics, math, and social studies, but the highest number of those standards was in economics.

Senator Woodhouse mentioned that school districts and charter schools were encouraged to seek out private sector partnerships to support the overall program. The bill required schools to provide professional development to those who would teach the financial literacy topics. All of the necessary work related to the bill could begin on July 1, 2017. However, the requirement that high school students enroll in an economics course was not effective until July 1, 2022. The purpose of that date was to allow the incoming freshmen for the fall semester of 2017 and their parents to be aware of the change in the coursework.

Senator Woodhouse clarified that the fiscal note was related to the need to provide the necessary professional development for teachers of financial literacy. Originally, the cost was estimated at \$1.5 million in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium. Before the bill was released, the cost was reduced to \$1 million in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and \$1.5 million in FY 2019 because some startup time was required for the professional development. The State General Fund appropriation included in S.B. 249 (R2) was made up of the following amounts:

| Entity | FY 2018 | FY 2019 |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| Clark County School District | \$700,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Washoe County School District | \$200,000 | \$300,000 |
| Department of Education (For rural school districts and charter schools) | \$100,000 | \$200,000 |
| Total | \$1,000,000 | \$1,500,000 |

Senator Woodhouse added that the funds for the charter schools and the rural school districts were noncompetitive grants through the Department of Education. Professional development could be provided by school districts, regional professional development organizations, or third parties that were approved by the Department of Education. There were many free programs and volunteers to provide professional development. Senate Bill 249 (R2) was an important step in making education more relevant for the students and preparing them for life after high school.

Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2). During the interim, the Clark County School District (CCSD) curriculum staff worked with Senator Woodhouse to ensure that they moved forward in a thoughtful way with the appropriate standards to fit the curriculums of grades 3 through 12. The CCSD also heard from students during the interim. A student advisory group stressed the importance of a financial literacy education in their

curriculums. They emphasized that the matter should be presented as a priority. The Las Vegas Sun Youth Forum shared that conclusion. This bill was a good idea supported by adults and students. The CCSD would use the appropriation for curriculum development. The CCSD would develop lesson plans for grades 3 through 12 to use and share with the rural school districts. Currently, the CCSD worked with many partners including banks, financial institutions, and nonprofit organizations to provide both in-school and out-of-school opportunities for students in the area. The CCSD looked forward to more comprehensive programs that built on one grade after another.

Chair Carlton said she explained many financial literacy concepts to her children, including the caution that just because you had checks in your checkbook did not mean that you could keep writing checks.

Connor Cain, Vice President, The McMullen Strategic Group, representing the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2). He said there was a broad coalition of support for the bill, and he submitted [Exhibit K](#), a letter dated June 3, 2017, to Nevada legislators. The Henderson Chamber of Commerce, Jump Start, The Public Education Foundation, Nevada Bankers Association, Clark County Education Association, the Mesquite Chamber of Commerce, the Latin Chamber of Commerce, and many others supported this bill. He submitted [Exhibit L](#), a letter dated June 3, 2017, in support of S.B. 249 (R2) from the Nevada Bankers Association to the members of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. The letter showed the commitment from the Nevada Bankers Association to contribute to a private fund to help offset the cost of providing financial literacy training in classrooms. Banks that had committed to contributing to the fund included Toyota Financial Savings Bank, Bank of Nevada, Nevada State Bank, US Bank, Schwab Bank, Wells Fargo, and Heritage Bank of Nevada. He hoped to encourage many other banks to contribute as well. This bill had broad support, and he urged the Committee to support it too.

Sara Cholahagian, Manager, Legislative and Government Affairs, The McMullen Strategic Group, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2). She represented the Nevada Bankers Association. She said the members had made meaningful contributions to the fund. The Association believed that this was an important piece of legislation not only for Nevada students, but for all Nevadans who would benefit from financial literacy. Many of the financial literacy courses would be made available at no charge to parents, grandparents, and other Nevadans. She encouraged the Committee to support the legislation.

Lindsay Anderson, Government Affairs Director, Washoe County School District, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2). She said the standards for social studies were also being revised to include many financial literacy standards. The time needed to put this program into effect would be short. She appreciated the appropriation that would ensure that the teachers were ready to teach the subject matter. Many private sector partners were ready to help expand this program.

Mary Pierczynski, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and the Nevada Association of School Administrators, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2). She appreciated the noncompetitive grants. The Department of Education was capable and would handle those grants well to help the rural school districts, which lacked grant writers. The long lead-time would allow school districts to prepare properly for the curriculum.

Paul Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2). The Chamber supported the policy and the appropriation, and thanked Senator Woodhouse for her support.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of the bill. Senate Bill 249 (R2) was a good bill and was supported for all the reasons stated by others. He particularly appreciated the inclusion of professional development and its funding in the legislation.

Jessica Ferrato, Principal, Crowley and Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards, testified in support of S.B. 249 (R2).

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. Hearing none, she closed the hearing on S.B. 249 (R2) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint): Requires an audit of certain performance assessments conducted in public schools. (BDR S-306)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 303 (1st Reprint). She testified that S.B. 303 (R1) required an audit of the statewide system of certain performance assessments conducted in public schools. Much testing was conducted in the schools. In Nevada, a typical student was required to take a kindergarten entry assessment, a few early reading assessments, a half-dozen criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in English, a half-dozen tests in math, three science CRTs, four end-of-course exams, and a college and career readiness test. That totaled 20 standardized tests in all. A student who struggled with language proficiency could take as many as nine more tests. That total was just the tests that were required by the state and the federal government, but the school districts also administered their own tests, and teachers had their formative tests that they used to identify the needs of their students.

Senator Woodhouse commented that when Congress passed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, it acknowledged the potential problem of overtesting in the nation. The law encouraged the states to streamline the assessment tools and the examinations used to monitor the performance of the students and the schools. It also authorized the use of federal funds to assist states with the audit, which Congress hoped would assist with realigning the system of assessment with new, more flexible federal requirements. In response to this opportunity, S.B. 303 (R1) required the Department of Education to audit the K-12 assessment tools and examinations. It also required school districts and charter schools

to collect and provide the information that was required by the Department to carry out the audit.

When the No Child Left Behind Act was approved in 2001, Senator Woodhouse said, it began the era of test-based accountability in the nation. It was easy to look back now and be critical of the increased emphasis on testing, but the truth was we probably needed more testing. However, she said, as sometimes happens with public policy, we take a good idea and take it too far. Every time we wanted to ensure accountability, we required another standardized test. Now those tests had become an impediment to doing the underlying activity they were intended to measure, and that was the education of the children.

Senator Woodhouse commented that ESSA and the federal funding provided the opportunity to step back, reassess the current situation, and decide whether there was a better way to move forward. The original fiscal note was cut in half from \$200,000. The cost was reduced because she learned from the research that the survey and focus groups were already completed, and all that remained were the audit and the plan of corrective action after the audit. The current fiscal note was \$50,000 for the audit and \$50,000 for the development of the plan. She was aware of the shortage of funds but thought that the cost was small enough and would result in significant improvements for the students and the teachers. This bill was an important step in regaining the balance between the need to educate the children and the desire for accountability.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), testified in support of the bill. Senate Bill 303 (R1) was a good bill. In working with the members and the teachers who taught in the classroom, the subject of testing and overtesting was cited as one of the biggest problems in the classroom. The NSEA thanked Senator Woodhouse for decades of championing public education and students in the classroom throughout her career. Mr. Daly believed that the audit was half done. The ESSA began the process to look at the state system of assessments. The state contracted with WestEd and surveyed test directors. It conducted a survey of the test instruments and conducted three rounds of focus groups in the south, north, and the rural areas. The basis for the legislation was important. The Department of Education made a change in student assessment in 1987 with movement of the end-of-course exams from a high-stakes test to a mid-stakes test. The NSEA believed that more needed to be done, and an audit and a plan would give decision makers the tools to further streamline or adjust the student assessments.

Mr. Daly read from one of the focus group's reports:

The most common concern that participants raised with respect to state assessments was the timeliness of results. In every focus group, participants reported that they had not received test results and therefore cannot use the results for any purpose. Many participants said they had not received results for multiple years for some tests. Others noted that even when results were provided, the data came after the school year ends too late to inform

instruction. The lack of results appears to be a particular area of frustration given the amount of time and energy that went into the testing process. Some participants were under the impression that online administration of the tests would lead to more timely results. They were disappointed this was not the case. Participants strongly believe that a key feature of an ideal assessment system would be a timely delivery of results. Participants consistently reported that there were too many state assessments that took too long to administer.

Participants in every focus group believed that redundancies within the state assessment system should be eliminated, which would result in fewer tests. They expressed a desire for shorter administration periods for tests. Participants identified a number of ways that assessments negatively affected the educational system. The most common concern was loss of instructional time. Estimates of the instructional time lost directly to test administration ranged from four days for one set of students to one month for all tests in a school. Participants also noted that instructions negatively affected them because of pressures to "teach to the test" and imposed time constraints on instruction. Participants identified ways that state assessments indirectly affected instructional time through accommodations made to school schedules. For example, participants reported that their schools had altered the schedules in the spring so that computer labs were unavailable for regular use. Some schools instructed students to stay home on days they were not being tested to accommodate test administration. Participants were also concerned about the negative effects on students, noting that the frequency and duration of the state assessment system led to adverse behavioral outcomes. The negative effects included: lack of engagement in the classroom, not trying hard on tests, test fatigue, missing classes, and adverse psychological outcomes such as other test anxiety, stress, malaise, and other conditions.

Mr. Daly said he would stop reading the report there and thanked the Committee for its consideration. Part of a previous presentation that Senator Woodhouse made related to her personal experience administering tests. It was some of the most compelling testimony that he had heard during the 79th Session (2017), and he urged the Committee to review her previous testimony.

Chair Carlton said she had watched the video of that testimony and it was very compelling. As a parent, watching what a teacher and a student went through was very informative. One of her children was very smart but unable to take tests effectively. She understood the problems.

Chair Carlton asked for any testimony in support of the bill.

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, testified in support of S.B. 303 (R1). He appreciated the bill and looked forward to taking the next step after conducting the initial audit. The Department had already taken a number of steps to ensure that it was as efficient as possible in both the administration and reporting of the assessments.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 303 (R1). She was pleased with the provisions of section 1 of the bill. It was important to improve the assessments and streamline the tests. She had looked at the Pine Middle School schedule of testing. Of the last ten weeks of school, seven weeks used human capital for testing. The Legislature had invested in libraries and computer systems that educators were unable to use because of the time devoted to testing. She asked the Committee to support S.B. 303 (R1).

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There being no further testimony on the bill, she closed the hearing on S.B. 303 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 192 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 192 (1st Reprint): Establishes required hours of operation for certain mobile mental health units. (BDR 39-816)

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 192 (1st Reprint). She introduced former Senator and Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, who joined her in developing this piece of legislation to advocate on behalf of mobile mental health units. The effect of this bill was substantial. She had been asked how it was that she came to sponsor such a piece of legislation. There were two reasons. She normally worked as a prosecutor in Clark County. She frequently had cases where an offender came to her through the criminal justice system, but who was not an individual who should be in the criminal justice system. Many were individuals who suffered from mental illness and lacked access to the appropriate services and follow-up care. She often saw situations that could result in a revolving door situation with individuals who were not meant to be in the criminal justice system being arrested repeatedly. Through conversations with individuals about what sort of legislation would better address those types of situations, this legislation was brought to her, and she thought it was a good idea. She had an opportunity to examine the Washoe County Mobile Outreach Safety Team (MOST) unit that connected individuals with services and provided follow-up care to avoid some of those reoccurring situations. Although this bill included a large appropriation, S.B. 192 (R1) would save the state money over time and provide some necessary services to those who needed them.

Senator Cannizzaro explained that S.B. 192 (R1) required that any facility within the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, which provided mobile mental health services in Clark County and Washoe County, had to ensure that the mobile unit was available to provide services from 8 a.m. to midnight, seven days a week, including holidays. This requirement would apply to MOST, a program that paired

a behavioral health professional with a law enforcement officer to respond to calls and provide interventions to those in a mental health crisis. In fiscal year (FY) 2017, MOST served an average of 199 clients each month, including 158 clients in Northern Nevada, 16 clients in Southern Nevada, and 25 clients in Carson City and Lyon County. The MOST program was popular among law enforcement and the behavioral health community as evidenced by its expansion from Washoe County to rural areas of the state and, in 2015, to Southern Nevada. The goal of S.B. 192 (R1) was to expand on an already successful program to increase access to much-needed services. Mental health crises were not limited to 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. By providing mobile mental health services outside of regular business hours, the state would be able to serve many more Nevadans in crisis when they truly needed it most. The fiscal note was \$1,400,528 in FY 2018 and \$1,417,080 in FY 2019. Those funds would go far in allowing the state to expand those successful programs.

Chair Carlton said funds were being appropriated and the hours were being extended. She asked whether a new unit would be needed to do this or whether the same unit would be used but the hours extended and the personnel doubled.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that her understanding was that this bill would require four additional full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions. She was unsure whether that would result in a physical unit that would be dispatched. She believed that those FTE positions were law enforcement officers who were paired with behavioral health specialists who were able to respond to calls. The bill would require an increase in the number of individuals who were working on these calls but not necessarily a new unit or physical place.

Sheila Leslie, former Senator and Assemblywoman, Washoe County Behavioral Health Program Coordinator, representing Washoe County Social Services, testified that she was pleased to support S.B. 192 (R1). She thanked Senator Cannizzaro for bringing forth the bill. The MOST team got its start in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building in the 75th Session (2009). She and Senator William Raggio chaired the Human Services subcommittees. Two officers from the Reno Police Department came forward to testify during a dramatic hearing. Officer Patrick O'Brien and Officer Steve Johns talked about a man named Murray Barr, who had been picked up on the streets of Reno dozens of times and taken to the hospital. Mr. Barr had no health or cognitive problems, but he was an alcoholic. One year, the officers got so tired of repeating the same episode that they started jotting down the cost of the episodes. They came up with a total of \$1 million in less than one year's time in local hospital costs, ambulance costs, booking costs, jail costs, and other costs. A story was written about this by Malcolm Gladwell titled "Million Dollar Murray" and was published in *The New Yorker* magazine [on February 13, 2006]. The punchline of the story was that the government spent \$1 million not to do anything about Murray. The two officers told that story and presented a request to start a mobile outreach team that would pair a law enforcement officer with a mental health professional. Senator Raggio was not keen on the idea, but Ms. Leslie nagged him all during the 75th Session (2009). Near the end, Senator Raggio agreed to approve a pilot program, and that was how the MOST program got

started in Reno. Since then it had worked well, had saved lives, and had been duplicated in different forms in Las Vegas and rural Nevada.

Ms. Leslie mentioned that Washoe County had seen no increase in the mental health staff. Law enforcement officers requested more workers than could be provided. The mental health professionals at MOST had been state employees before they moved to Washoe County, and she was now in a position to supervise those two workers. She received all the daily calls and reviewed those every day. The calls were disturbing because clients were often suicidal, homicidal, or had family members struggling with their younger members who were experiencing a psychotic break. The police department asked for the MOST workers continually, but the agency lacked the resources to fully respond. This bill would allow the agency to create a mental health MOST unit within the Social Services Department. One position would supervise three to four more psychiatric mental health professionals, and a caseworker would provide the follow-up services. Those additional positions would allow the agency to keep the MOST unit operational from 8 a.m. until midnight, seven days a week. The Reno Police Department, Sparks Police Department, and Washoe County Sheriff's Office supported this bill.

Chair Carlton understood the fiscal notes and said the MOST program was a worthy cause. She studied S.B. 192 (R1) and asked whether the costs had been reduced because she knew there might be time required to "ramp up" the program. She asked about the evaluations and whether the full amount was needed to support the program.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that the fiscal costs had not been reduced. Those programs currently operated, and there was no need for ramp-up time to develop a new program. There would be a need to hire some additional personnel. She did not anticipate that it would be a significant hurdle for those programs to be given additional funding. Clark County used a similar program, but it was paired with agencies such as WestCare Nevada to connect individuals to beds, placements, and services. She said because those programs were stable and currently operated, the ability to hire some additional staff would not take long.

Chair Carlton appreciated the response, but she knew that often bills were approved and it might take three to four months to hire staff for the positions. She understood that the State General Fund appropriation would revert if not spent. Some programs required more funding in the first year but less funding in the second year, and often those funds balanced in the end.

Ms. Leslie added that she had just hired two new workers for the MOST program because she knew this bill might be approved. She had four to five staff ready to work, and there would be very little lag time.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions. Hearing none, she asked for any testimony in support of the bill.

Dan Musgrove, Dan Musgrove Advocacy, Inc., testified in support of S.B. 192 (R1). He represented WestCare Nevada and Valley Health System. In the 72nd Session (2003) and the 73rd Session (2005), then Assemblywoman Leslie and then Senator Maggie Carlton helped get legislation and money approved to develop a revolutionary concept called community triage center that gave first responders a place to take mentally ill individuals. It was nice to see new legislators including Assemblyman Araujo and Senator Cannizzaro taking on those problems and supporting them through the session. It had always been difficult to find funding for those projects that he supported. Generally, Clark County sent out law enforcement officers without case managers. This bill might afford Clark County the opportunity to model its programs after the MOST programs. It was helpful to have case managers on site to help individuals while they were in crisis. It was a great program.

Chuck Callaway, Policy Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, testified in support of S.B. 192 (R1).

Kathy Clewett, Senior Analyst/Grant Manager, City of Sparks, testified in support of S.B. 192 (R1). The cities of Sparks and Reno in Washoe County had made great strides over the last year and a half. She attended working group meetings that started a year and a half ago. The MOST care team member who went on calls with the police departments was able to get a bicycle so she could be on the bike team in Reno. She previously used an old bike that was not reliable. She always attended the group meetings and had asked for a bike. Washoe County found funds to provide her with a new bike. The group needed to work collaboratively to develop more data to support the requests for more federal funds. The working group developed a special code used by all the officers from the three jurisdictions. Monthly data was gathered from the three jurisdictions about all calls that were determined to be mental health cases. It was amazing the number of calls that were now coded as mental health calls. The cities needed the extra help, and the program worked well.

Corey Solferino, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, testified in support of S.B. 192 (R1). The MOST workers in the field with his units were invaluable. Having them at the point of crisis was the defining moment. The program allowed individuals to receive the needed treatment, and resources were used where they were most needed. He worked with Murray Barr years ago, and he wished there was a program similar to MOST back in the day when Mr. Barr needed services.

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Assemblyman Hambrick noted that the local theaters broadcast messages on the screen before the movies started that individuals who needed help could contact MOST. It was good to see those programs in the neighborhoods.

Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 192 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 306 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 306 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to offenders. (BDR 16-298)

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 306 (2nd Reprint). The bill revised provisions related to offender training and education. He presented the bill in the policy committee, and the fiscal cost was \$300,000 to the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to help operate a pilot program between the College of Southern Nevada and the Department of Corrections. The program would have 50 male and 50 female soon-to-be-released offenders who would participate in the program to receive vocational training and educational training.

Chair Carlton asked whether the \$300,000 would pay for the educational costs associated with the program, and Senator Ford confirmed that was correct.

Chair Carlton asked for any testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Michael Flores, Director, Communications and Government Affairs, College of Southern Nevada, testified in support of S.B. 306 (R2). He thanked Senator Ford for the bill and appreciated the opportunity to work with Senator Ford during the last year and a half. All the funds would go directly to the instruction of the inmates to prepare them to enter the community upon release.

Chair Carlton asked whether there would be evaluations to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the offenders and determine the areas of interest for future employment. She wanted to ensure the inmates were trained properly for potential jobs. The challenges of placing an inmate were different than placing a college student.

Mr. Flores responded that he had worked with the Department of Corrections, which would create the criteria to identify which inmates were eligible for the program. After the inmates were selected, they would be enrolled in a two-track approach, either the apprenticeship approach or the academic approach. When the offenders were released, they would finish their associate degree or continue on the apprenticeship path with some of the labor partners. The Department of Corrections had commitments from labor groups and several other trades to assist with the program. The College of Southern Nevada provided most of the training for the inmates. Data and research showed that inmates who pursued a trade made higher wages and were more likely to be successful when they were released.

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. Hearing no response, she closed the hearing on S.B. 306 (R2) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 543.

Senate Bill 543: Makes an appropriation to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health. (BDR S-1235)

Bobby Ernaut, R&R Partners, representing the Cleveland Clinic Nevada, Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 543. In July 2009, the Cleveland Clinic

opened a new facility in Las Vegas that specialized in the research and advancement of treatment of various brain diseases. The Cleveland Clinic represented advancements in healthcare and had positively affected Nevada's economy since it opened. The Clinic focused on three main areas:

1. The Clinic conducted clinical trials to advance new treatments and diagnostic approaches for patients with Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, and frontal temporal dementia.
2. The Clinic partnered with pharmaceutical and biotechnical companies and the National Institutes of Health to bring the best treatment to patients and caregivers.
3. In conjunction with its own research, the Clinic collaborated with other leading academic institutions on a global scale to advance the understanding of brain diseases.

Mr. Ernaut said the facility was also widely recognized for its "patients-first" approach, which provided patients with swift but extensive consultation encompassing diagnostic procedures, traditional and nontraditional care, and direct family services to allow patients' families to feel more at ease during their family member's journey to be healed. The facility was ranked No. 2 in the 2016 *US News and World Report* listing of the top hospitals. It ranked No. 6 in neurology and neurosurgery and No. 1 in cardiovascular care. Over the past three years, the Center had conducted nearly 64,000 patient visits, almost 8,000 of whom were Nevada patients. Many had experienced the nightmare of having a family member start to succumb to a disease such as Alzheimer's. That type of disease ran in his family. The appropriation would assist the Center, which was at the vanguard of looking for a cure for brain diseases.

Morgan Baumgartner, Executive Vice President and General Counsel, R&R Partners, testified in support of S.B. 543. She represented the Cleveland Clinic Nevada, Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health. She added that the Center filled a tremendous need in the state. Unfortunately, that need was growing as the population aged. As of three months ago, the Center had 140 individuals on the waiting list to get into the Center. The average wait-time for the first visit was approximately 90 days, and the wait-time for a follow-up visit was between 90 to 120 days. The Center served a great need in Nevada. Many services were provided at the Center that were not provided elsewhere in the state. Sometimes, the Center was the only place a person could get a specific type of treatment. The services were cutting edge, and the Center was a crown jewel for the state. Nevada struggled in so many areas, and the Center was one of its best assets and an asset that she would like to cultivate, grow, and make stronger. That was why she asked for the appropriation.

Ms. Baumgartner shared news that she believed would allow the Center to continue its mission and continue to grow. She entered [Exhibit M](#) into the record. [Exhibit M](#) was a copy of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas

(UNLV) School of Medicine and the Cleveland Clinic Nevada. The MOU committed the two entities to partner in a number of areas. Some of those areas would focus on student training in neurology, health, and behavioral sciences after the UNLV School of Medicine was operational. Medical student training, residencies, and clinical opportunities for students and residents would allow them to explore the behavioral health sciences and provide research opportunities, medical clinics, training, and joint research projects. The Center had been working on a National Institutes of Health grant to perform research for a few years and hoped to pursue more of those projects. She believed the collaboration between the new medical school and the Center would allow many more research dollars to be obtained to move the Center forward in finding treatments and cures for diseases.

Ms. Baumgartner continued that telemedicine was important for the Center, which would partner with a number of rural and remote areas. The Center's telemedicine program had seen patients and would continue to see patients in Reno, Elko, and some outlying areas. The Center hoped the program could grow through the collaboration with UNLV to prevent patients from traveling to Las Vegas for services. She urged support for S.B. 543.

Brian McAnallen, Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative Services, city of Las Vegas, testified in support of S.B. 543. He was excited about the opportunity to support this bill. The Center was located in the shadow of City Hall. He considered it a jewel in the city, an asset to healthcare, and an opportunity to bring a focus of healthcare nationally and globally into the city. The MOU was exactly the type of synergy sought by the city. This was an opportunity to bolster the Center and the UNLV School of Medicine. The opportunity to focus on clinical trials and behavioral health would address some of the mental health challenges in the city. He believed this bill would present many types of opportunities for the city and the state.

Chair Carlton asked for any further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. Hearing none, she closed the hearing on S.B. 543. She said the Committee lacked the number of members needed to take action on bills now. She would reconvene a meeting behind the bar before the floor session to process more bills. None of those bills had any amendments proposed. She recessed the meeting at 6:02 p.m. until the call of the chair.

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting behind the bar at 9:45 p.m. Assemblywoman Titus was not present. Chair Carlton explained the Committee would take action on the following bills:

Senate Bill 146 (2nd Reprint)

Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint)

Senate Bill 187 (2nd Reprint)

Senate Bill 192 (1st Reprint)

Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint)

Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint)

Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint)

Senate Bill 543

Senate Bill 306 (2nd Reprint)

Senate Bill 146 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing the filing of an integrated resources plan with the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada. (BDR 58-15)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 146 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 146 (R2) revised provisions governing the filing of an integrated resources plan with the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada. Electric utilities would be required to submit a distributed resources plan as part of a plan to increase their supply or decrease the demands on the systems. The cost of the plan requirements listed in the bill would be paid by a mil assessment of 4 cents to 5 cents per month levied by the utilities. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 146 (R2).

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 146 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Oscarson and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the funding formula for K-12 public education. (BDR 34-792)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 178 (1st Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 178 (R1) revised the provisions related to the funding formula for K-12 education. This bill replaced the term "limited English proficiency" with the term "English learner" and provided an additional \$1,200 per pupil for English learners and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch in those schools scoring in the lowest quartile of performance. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 178 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 178 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Oscarson and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 187 (2nd Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the establishment of a fine arts museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, and the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in Reno, Nevada. (BDR S-267)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 187 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 187 (R2) made an appropriation for the establishment of a fine arts museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, and the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in Reno, Nevada. A State General Fund appropriation of \$1 million would provide \$500,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and \$500,000 in FY 2019 as seed money for a statewide museum in Las Vegas. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 187 (R2).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 187 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Oscarson and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 192 (1st Reprint): Establishes required hours of operation for certain mobile mental health units. (BDR 39-816)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 192 (1st Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 192 (R1) established the required hours of operation for mobile units operated by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, to provide mental health services in Clark and Washoe Counties. The units would provide services from 8 a.m. until midnight, 7 days a week including holidays. The State General Fund appropriation would be \$1,400,528 in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and \$1,417,080 in FY 2019. Any unexpended funds would revert to the General Fund at the end of the fiscal year. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 192 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 192 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Oscarson and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to instruction in computer education and technology. (BDR 34-266)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 200 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 200 (R2) revised provisions related to instruction in computer education and technology. The bill authorized a student to apply for credit received for certain courses in computer science to fulfill requirements for graduation from high school, admission to college, and eligibility for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship. The bill included a State General Fund appropriation of \$700,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2018 for the Clark County School District, \$100,000 for the Washoe County School District, and \$200,000 for rural school districts and charter schools. The General Fund appropriation in FY 2019 would be \$800,000 for the Clark County School District, \$200,000 for the Washoe County School District, and \$400,000 for rural school districts and charter schools. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 200 (R2).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 200 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Oscarson and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint): Requires instruction in financial literacy and economics in public schools. (BDR 34-62)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 249 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 249 (R2) required instruction in financial literacy and economics in public schools. Instruction in financial literacy would be provided for pupils enrolled in grades 3 to 12, inclusive. The bill included a State General Fund appropriation in fiscal year (FY) 2018 to Clark County School District of \$700,000 and in FY 2019 \$1 million. The Washoe County School District would receive \$200,000 in FY 2018 and \$300,000 in FY 2019. The Department of Education would receive \$100,000 in FY 2018 and \$200,000 in FY 2019 for rural school districts and charter schools. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 249 (R2).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS MADE A MOTION TO
DO PASS SENATE BILL 249 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint): Requires an audit of certain performance assessments conducted in public schools. (BDR S-306)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 303 (1st Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 303 (R1) required the Department of Education to carry out a plan to audit the assessments conducted to monitor the performance of pupils and public schools. The Department of Education would receive a State General Fund appropriation of \$100,000 during the 2017-2019 biennium to enact those requirements. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 303 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 303 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Senate Bill 543: Makes an appropriation to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health. (BDR S-1235)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 543. Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 543 authorized a \$2 million State General Fund appropriation to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health for research, clinical studies, operations, and educational programs at the Center. Reports of the expenditures of those funds would be presented to the Interim Finance Committee in fiscal year (FY) 2019 and FY 2020. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 543.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 543.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Senate Bill 306 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to offenders. (BDR 16-298)

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to review Senate Bill (S.B.) 306 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Jones explained that S.B. 306 (R2) authorized the Director of the Department of Corrections to

adopt regulations for a pilot program to permit the use of telecommunications devices for purposes related to education and employment for certain offenders during the 2017-2019 biennium. A State General Fund appropriation of \$300,000 would allow the College of Southern Nevada to carry out the pilot program. There being no questions on the bill, Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on S.B. 306 (R2).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 306 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

There being no further business before the Committee, Chair Carlton adjourned the meeting at 10 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janice Wright
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a two-page data sheet submitted by Crystal Abba, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education, in opposition to Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony submitted by Crystal Abba, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education, in opposition to Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit E](#) is a chart titled, "Recommended Schedule for the Four Year Civil Engineering BS Program," submitted by David H. Sanders, Ph.D., UNR Foundation Professor, Center for Civil Engineering, Earthquake Research, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno, in opposition to Senate Bill 200 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony authored by Katie O'Neill, Chair of the Board of Directors of The Art Museum at Symphony Park, submitted by Miles Dickson, J.A. Barrett Company, in support of Senate Bill 187 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit G](#) is written testimony submitted by Nick Vander Poel, representing Capitol Partners, on behalf of the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA), in support of Senate Bill 187 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit H](#) is a 6-page document containing visuals submitted by Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, in support of Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter dated June 3, 2017, in support of Senate Bill 178 (1st Reprint) to Assemblywoman Carlton authored by Amanda Morgan, Legal Director, and Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now, and presented by Sylvia Lazos.

[Exhibit J](#) is written testimony of Evan Gong, a former Nevada Youth Legislator representing Senate District No. 5 in 2014-2015, submitted by Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, in support of Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated June 3, 2017, in support of Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint) from the Coalition for Financial Literacy Education, to Nevada State Legislators, submitted by Connor Cain, Vice President, The McMullen Strategic Group, representing the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance.

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated June 3, 2017, in support of Senate Bill 249 (2nd Reprint) from the Nevada Bankers Association, to the Members of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee submitted by Connor Cain, Vice President, The McMullen Strategic Group, representing the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance.

[Exhibit M](#) is a copy of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, School of Medicine and the Cleveland Clinic Nevada submitted by Morgan Baumgartner, Executive Vice President and General Counsel, R&R Partners, in support of Senate Bill 543 (2nd Reprint).