

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-ninth Session
February 21, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Moises Denis at 3:34 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 2017, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Vice Chair
Senator Tick Segerblom
Senator Pat Spearman
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Becky Harris

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Patricia Farley, Senatorial District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Stewart, Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Counsel
Shelley Kyle, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Leleu, Insomniac
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Brad Keating, Clark County School District
Krystal Riccio, Director, Research Center on Substance Abuse and Depression,
College of Pharmacy, Roseman University of Health Sciences
Carol J. Boyd, School of Nursing, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Senate Committee on Education
February 21, 2017
Page 2

David Marlon, CEO, Solutions Recovery
Jeffrey Talbot, Director, Research Center on Substance Abuse and Depression,
College of Pharmacy, Roseman University of Health Sciences
Joseph P. Iser, MD, Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District
Riana Durrett, Executive Director, Nevada Dispensary Association
David Goldwater, Nevada Dispensary Association
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District
Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government
Relations, Clark County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents; Nevada
Association of School Administrators
Jessica Ferrato, Nevada Association of School Boards
Julia Peek, Deputy Administrator, Community Services, Division of Public and
Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services,
Michael Hackett, Nevada Public Health Association
John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association
Linda Lang, Director, Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership
Glenn Christenson, Chairman, Spending and Government Efficiency Commission
for the System of K-12 Public Education in Nevada
Susie Lee, Chair, Communities in Schools of Nevada
Tiffany Tyler, CEO, Communities in Schools of Nevada
Bill Hanlon

CHAIR DENIS:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 164.

SENATE BILL 164: Authorizes a school district to lease school buses or vehicles
belonging to the school district in certain circumstances. (BDR 34-668)

SENATOR PATRICIA FARLEY (Senatorial District No. 8):

I am presenting S.B. 164 for your consideration. Organizers for some of the
larger conventions and other events held in Las Vegas are being forced to go
out of state to find a sufficient number of buses and other options for
transportation needs.

Senate Bill 164 would allow school districts to lease out school vehicles for
events like these. This bill would keep money in Nevada that is now going out
of state and also allow school districts to potentially generate revenue.

The language in the bill is enabling, not mandatory. School districts would be able to decide whether they would like to participate.

I will go through the main provisions of the bill. Section 1, subsection 1 allows a school district's board of trustees to enter into an agreement to lease school buses or other district vehicles for special events. The agreement must not interfere with providing transportation for students.

Further, pursuant to section 1, subsection 5, the district must determine a commercial bus is not reasonably available for the event.

Section 1, subsection 2 lays out the specifications for a lease agreement. These include a security deposit, fee requirements, indemnity provisions, responsibility for damage, and proof of insurance and driver licensure.

Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (h) requires that district employees be given preference in hiring for operation of the vehicles.

Section 1, subsection 3 requires that any identifying lettering must be covered when a school vehicle is leased, and no signs or wording may be attached. Flashing red lights and mechanical devices at the front of a school bus must not be used unless there is an emergency.

Finally, pursuant to section 1, subsection 4, any money collected from a lease agreement that exceeds district costs must be used to replace school buses and other district vehicles.

To summarize, S.B. 164 allows school districts to use their assets to generate additional revenue, and it addresses the problem of insufficient transportation options for some of those larger events held in Las Vegas.

JONATHAN LELEU (Insomniac):
I am here today representing Insomniac.

There is a shortage of commercial buses in Nevada, especially in southern Nevada. When Las Vegas has large conventions, the commercial rolling stock in southern Nevada is insufficient to cover the transportation demand. Particularly, the shortage is seen with the Electric Daisy Carnival (EDC) and also the Las Vegas Market trade show at World Market Center Las Vegas.

Because of this shortage, conventions outsource to out-of-state bus companies. The out-of-state buses are brought to Nevada, inspected by the Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA) and given a certificate of passage to travel on our roads.

Again, this bill is enabling, it is not mandatory. School districts can decide if they wish to lease their vehicles, and the districts decide the contract terms of the lease for the vehicles.

First, S.B. 164 protects our State's transportation industry and has a provision that all commercial rolling stock within the local jurisdiction must be exhausted before leasing out-of-state buses.

Secondly, it alleviates the burden on the NTA from constantly inspecting out-of-state buses. The local school buses to be used are already inspected by the school district and are certified and roadworthy.

Thirdly, there is a tremendous amount of money, particularly with respect to transportation, that is going out of state. With S.B. 164, this money is kept in our State and allows the funds to be funneled into our schools where it is needed.

Senator Harris previously asked me if we would be amendable to cap the number of buses that would be available for lease. The answer is yes. For example, no more than 10 percent or 15 percent of a district's fleet could be leased at any one given time. We are speaking to the Clark County School District (CCSD) to reach an appropriate percentage to present in an amendment.

School buses exist to provide transportation for our students and must be available for this primary use. We understand this important fact. The intent of this bill is to allow a school district to use its transportation assets when not in use for their primary purpose.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I understand the legislation will be enabling and an event requiring commercial buses could be any event. You are enabling a school district to enter into a contract.

The Electric Daisy Carnival seem to always be short on buses and I realize it would not necessarily be the EDC wanting to lease buses. The reason there were some questions of liability when this bill was presented last Session was because the EDC comes with a reputation.

If a district was to contract with the EDC and had concerns about some activities surrounding some of the participants, the school district could draft the contract addressing those concerns. The contract could include having inspections before and after boarding and perhaps having dogs to check inside the bus.

We will not be drafting the contract; will the school districts be drafting their own contracts for events if they choose to participate?

MR. LELEU:

Yes. The school district is free to design the contract. That could include cleaning the buses and types of items allowed on the bus. We had a conversation today with the CCSD which involved guns and other weapons.

If school districts decide to lease their buses, they are free to design their own contracts. That is not what we are discussing today.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

If a school district requires metal detectors be used before passengers board the buses, then the organization or event wanting to lease the buses would need to comply with the request?

MR. LELEU:

Yes. They would need to comply with the request and pay for it.

SENATOR HARRIS:

In section 1, subsection 3, it states anybody operating a school bus for a private event must cover or conceal signs or wording and cannot use the red lights or the mechanical device attached to the front of the school bus or vehicle. Have you contemplated a penalty provision so if there is a violation, there is some form of consequence?

MR. LELEU:

We have not contemplated a penalty provision. It is important for liability purposes, and we would be happy to design one.

CHAIR DENIS:

We will hear from those in support of S.B. 164.

CHRIS DALY (Nevada State Education Association):

We are in support S.B. 164. We are grateful for the provision that gives the hiring preference to existing school bus drivers in school districts. We support authorizing school districts to lease school buses to the broader community in certain situations.

CHAIR DENIS:

Is there further testimony in support of S.B. 164? Is there anyone wanting to give neutral testimony on S.B. 164 in Carson City or Las Vegas?

BRAD KEATING (Clark County School District):

I am representing the CCSD. At this time, the CCSD is neutral on S.B. 164. We appreciate that this bill gives our school board the choice to enter into any contract for the leasing of school buses for special events.

There are a number of factors that must be reviewed prior to the law being enacted and the CCSD going under contract. Those factors are scheduling, maintenance, student activities and driver availability. We do have concerns with S.B. 164 that have been outlined to both the sponsor and the stakeholders of this bill.

While we appreciate our buses will be cleaned after their use, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) releases facts each year for certain events showing the use of illegal substances.

Who is to say that nothing will be left in between the seat cushions or dropped on the floor? Our main concern is our students. We do not want to do anything to put them in harm's way. We would be looking very closely at the cleaning.

Guns, knives or any type of weapon is strictly prohibited on school buses, and we would expect this to stay true. How can we ensure that this would occur moving forward if our school bus drivers are not contracted? If we contract out

and use a different bus driver, how can we ensure those guns, knives or other types of weapons are not on the school bus?

We want to ensure the outsourced drivers have clean driving records at all times. With our school district drivers, we know that is true 110 percent of the time.

Per *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), if a crime occurs on a school bus, the CCSD Police Department has jurisdiction. We are not sure if this would be the case with S.B. 164.

If something occurs while the bus is marked and covered, who has jurisdiction? Would it still be the CCSD Police Department because it is our bus, or is it the LVMPD? Who would report as the authority in this case?

Finally, the CCSD serves as a member of Clark County and Nevada Division of Emergency Management groups and has the largest fleet of buses in Nevada. If a major catastrophe were to occur here in the State, and our buses were being used by outside companies at the time, we might not be able to fully assist or mobilize our buses in a timely fashion.

We are neutral on S.B. 164, and it is our hope these concerns are addressed before we move forward.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I appreciate your position, and you have many concerns. Most of those concerns include the scheduling, availability, illegal substances and so forth, which are items that can be drafted into a contract. If you feel uncomfortable about any of this, the legislation does not force you to enter into an agreement.

Your concern regarding whether it would be the CCSD Police or the LVMPD to respond to an incident is a legitimate concern. I would want to know that ahead of time before going into a contract.

The number of other concerns you have can be addressed by the party drafting the contract. I would think you either oppose S.B. 164 or you support it.

We spend time on the EDC because that seems to be the group that wants to use the buses. There could be other groups or organizations who might want to

lease school district buses for transportation purposes in other areas of the State.

This bill opens it up to any school district that has a fleet of buses as a way to supplement its income. I do not want to oppose the bill for that reason. Why do you think these are concerns?

MR. KEATING:

The reason we testified neutral is because we are not 100 percent opposed to S.B. 164. We want to make certain our concerns are met.

We want to make sure NRS laws are met. Those laws are NRS 386, areas in NRS 202 and NRS 391 that need to be addressed in order to move forward. These laws deal with the CCSD Police Department having jurisdiction and the guns and knives area.

We would like our concerns addressed and to ensure there is clarification within the bill before moving forward and supporting the bill.

CHAIR DENIS:

Your points are valid. While it all can be put into a contract, it is important for us to understand there are some issues. I did not see that as a hindrance, but something that can be worked out.

Any other questions? Is there further neutral testimony? We will close the hearing on S.B. 164 and open the hearing on S.B. 166.

SENATE BILL 166: Establishes a program to survey pupils enrolled in public schools concerning the use and abuse of alcohol and drugs.
(BDR 34-795)

SENATOR PATRICIA FARLEY (Senatorial District No. 8):

I am here to present S.B. 166. Nevada has an opioid epidemic, and we do not know, yet, the size and scope or how to combat it effectively. Despite these statistics, many people are doing important work to change these indicators in our community.

Senate Bill 166 supports the creation of a study, the first of its kind. It will become the model for other states to follow as they turn to their communities

to better understand the issues plaguing their unique populations. The rigor of this study will put our State on the national stage.

The bill supports a groundbreaking survey of the youth that will be catalytic in driving change in our State. Precise and targeted research that uncovers regional, demographic and attitudinal differences will allow us to hyper-target our prevention messaging by schools, neighborhoods and communities.

This kind of instrument sensitivity is essential in combatting the drug problem and its persuasive ability to creep into pockets of our population. In addition to the rigor of the proposed study, the insights uncovered will put us on the national stage as well as the outcomes of this study.

With this data and ensuing data-driven targeted prevention messaging, along with community support and participation, we will make strides in combatting the problem that exists.

It is not a silver bullet. Understanding and quantifying the issue, putting targeted prevention messaging in place and working with our community partners is the action we need to begin to chip away at this issue.

We all know that preventing drug abuse is much easier than treating an addict. We spend millions of dollars trying to break the cycle of addiction for addicts. We tear families apart, we lose jobs, we lose progress and we lose faith.

Preventing a 13-year-old who is on the fence thinking of trying drugs or just starting to experiment is the only way to ensure fewer kids become addicted. We have to stop the cycle before we create future generations of addicts.

This study is the tipping point in allowing us to start to make real quantifiable progress in our State. It will help us to understand a complex problem that is plaguing our children, families, neighborhoods and economy.

We owe this to our children. We must do all we can to protect them. Our children are our future.

KRYSTAL RICCIO (Director, Research Center on Substance Abuse and Depression, College of Pharmacy, Roseman University of Health Sciences):

It is because of the effort of our legislators, community partners, schools and our academic institution—all active citizens in this great State of Nevada—that I am able to be here to address you today. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

The National Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) we have used since 1991 has only one question, and it asks about all prescription drugs combined. I have spent years learning about the different drug classes and am acutely aware that we need to know which prescription drugs are being abused today. The survey program in S.B. 166 will help us identify and address the issues.

I will walk you through the presentation you have been given ([Exhibit D](#)). This is an overview of a pilot survey designed to determine what drugs are being used, how they are being used and why. This was completely funded by citizens who are critically alarmed by the crisis we are faced with today.

Page 2 shows our survey demographics which includes 900 students from one high school in the CCSD, 213 students in a rural high school and 162 students in a rural junior high school. The anonymous online survey takes, on average, less than 30 minutes to complete.

On page 3 is a comparison of the survey data. The YRBS was reported in 2015. In the next two years, the 2017 report will be published.

When we look at the national data for marijuana use, Nevada is where we expect it to be. There is about the same amount of usage Statewide as reflected in region 3 and the CCSD. Region 3 includes Pershing, Churchill, Humboldt and Lander counties.

When we pull out pilot data from one specific school, we see there is a potential difference. In one urban school, we have nearly 1,000 respondents. We can see there is a difference with this school.

The question is: Is their prevention programming effective or is there another reason the data is driving down? I know the school to be proactive, but they have been unable to see the differences they have been making. Perhaps this is

an indicator that what they are doing works and we should adopt it in other schools.

Another important aspect within S.B. 166 is the evaluation of the risk perceptions of the students. Whether it is their personal perceptions, their parents' perceptions or their friends' perceptions, it correlates with their continued usage patterns.

The risk perception is shown on page 4; electronic cigarettes called e-cigarettes versus smoking traditional cigarettes. Students report inhaling the aerosol or vapor from e-cigarettes is less harmful or about the same as inhaling smoke from tobacco cigarettes. We know there is significant harm with e-cigarettes. The usage pattern shows vaping is up. We know there is a significant harm with e-cigarettes and what may be put into the cartridges.

Marijuana is one we want to highlight in this State as we enter recreational use. We have done a tremendous job educating our youth about the risks of tobacco smoking. Page 5 shows the perception of risk for youth totaling all urban and rural students combined. We see the majority of students consider tobacco smoking to be a great risk. Usage patterns are close to national average.

When we look at students' perceived risk of marijuana, however, a third of students say there is no harm at all. This is compelling. We have done a poor job of educating about the potential risks for marijuana, and we see usage increasing.

When we total all prescription drug abuse combined, in the YRBS for the State last reported in 2015, we see about a 16.9 percent usage rate of prescription drugs in a lifetime. This data is shown on page 6.

Looking at our pilot data, when the data is broken out by specific drugs, there are differences among these drug classes. Rural and urban are similar for their usage patterns.

We know opioids are a crisis. We also see there are other prescription drugs that are a problem in our schools. Yet, we focus on one.

If we break that out in a different way and ask students if they were prescribed drugs, how many of those students misuse their own prescription drugs? Do

you see the difference between rural and urban? Rural students tend to utilize their own drugs inappropriately more than the urban students.

On page 7, students were asked how often they used prescriptions that were not prescribed to them. Urban student use jumps up. There is a difference there and we do not know the reason for the difference. We are starting to see the difference and S.B. 166 would allow us to explore the reasons.

At this time, we are deficient in gathering intelligence on our youth. Nevada does not have a study of this kind. In conducting this survey, our State would lead the way, nationally, in how other states look at their unique populations and create effective programming to address the issues they see. There are states that are watching Nevada and S.B. 166. I have a list of them.

Roseman University of Health Sciences supports S.B. 166 because we know this kind of intelligence is critical for the State to begin to move aggressively to tackle the drug problem. What has been achieved in the development of the pilot study suggests what is possible.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

Is the average time for the rural high school of 176.2 minutes correct?

Ms. RICCIO:

The rural high school survey was conducted within a 34-minute class period.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Are you only factoring time when they began and ended the survey itself? What are the total minutes for students leaving the classroom, settling in and taking the survey, waiting for everyone to complete the survey, returning to their classroom and returning to their regular schedule?

Ms. RICCIO:

The complete time it took for students to come into the classroom, sit down with their tablets, have a script read to them and complete the survey was 34 minutes in the rural school.

SENATOR TICK SEGERBLOM (Senatorial District No. 3):

Senator Farley and I have travelled to a number of states where recreational marijuana and/or medical marijuana is legal for adults. We have found there is a

need for reliable data. Whether it is Washington state or Colorado, states are raising their voices and demanding more targeted, precise and sensitive data relating to specific drug trends impacting their youth.

While YRBS is broad-based and provides information about a number of risks to our children, it does not offer the specificity or the rigor needed to combat this problem. In order to produce more robust, detailed and specific data on trends among our youth, we must consider S.B. 166.

We need an instrument so precise it guides the development of targeted prevention programming by school, so that we can effectively target schools with the right messaging.

CAROL J. BOYD (School of Nursing, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor):
More than 20 million people in the United States have a substance abuse disorder involving sedatives, tranquilizers, non-heroin opioids, stimulants, hallucinogens, cannabis, cocaine, heroin, inhalants, or other drugs. Today's youth—Nevada's youth—are part of that 20 million. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

DAVID MARLON (CEO, Solutions Recovery):
I am the CEO of Solutions Recovery, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit drug and alcohol treatment center in Las Vegas, and have been active in drug abuse prevention and treatment in the CCSD and our communities for just over eight years. I have been in health care in southern Nevada for over 30 years.

I want to support this study. Solutions Recovery is a Substance Abuse Awareness Program provider for CCSD. We have kids who get in trouble for using drugs on campus. They come to our facility each month.

We separate the kids and the parents and ask each group a question. We ask the kids, "Have you stolen some pills from your parents or your relatives?" More than half the kids raise their hands. We ask the parents, "Does your kid steal drugs from you?" None of the parents raise their hands.

When the two groups are together, we again ask the kids, "Have you stolen some pills from your parents or your relatives?" Again, more than half the kids raise their hands. It is amazing to me that every month, we still get a room of surprised parents. Our families and parents are not getting the message.

We know heroin usage has increased over the last five or six years. I am startled by the fact that methamphetamine use is increasing again in our community and it is astounding to me. It shows that something needs to be done.

I have seen this problem close up. We cannot create strategies without benchmarking where we are. We need information. We need an instrument that is sensitively calibrated, hopefully, electronic.

Never before has there been a study of this rigor, scale and specificity. If this survey is allowed to be conducted in our State, it will allow us to move beyond the simple survey to be able to focus more efficiently on prevention.

The pilot study has gained community support, raised money from our community and has already surveyed 1,200 youth in Nevada.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

The survey is asking the students whether they are taking drugs. Does it also include whether their parents or other family members are taking drugs?

MR. MARLON:

We will ask a kid about vaping and the kid may say, "No, I have not vaped." We like the skip logic, so we do not ask the kid six or eight questions about vaping if he or she has not vaped.

Since this is an electronic tool, it is clearly superior to the traditional pencil and paper which can prompt some unhealthy behaviors, which is one of the fears about a survey.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Is this an opt-out not an opt-in piece of legislation? Would parents have to sign something if they did want their child to participate? Would a student have to take the survey if a parent did not sign something? I am getting a nod from several people. Yes, a student would have to take the survey if a parent did not sign something. Okay.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Each of you on the Committee have just been given a proposed amendment to S.B. 166 ([Exhibit F](#)). We want you to be aware of the cost associated with the bill. We are looking into a number of areas to fund this.

JEFFREY TALBOT (Director, Research Center on Substance Abuse and Depression, College of Pharmacy, Roseman University of Health Sciences):

I am proud to say I am a University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) alumnus, raised in rural Nevada and am a native son. I trained at the University of Nebraska Medical Center and the University of Michigan in substance abuse. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

JOSEPH P. ISER, MD (Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District):

I am in support of S.B. 166 and want to commend the work that has been done by Senator Farley. When we look broader than just substance abuse, in particular opioid use, we see an increase in sexually transmitted diseases and often, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

Southern Indiana had a huge increase in HIV cases. By understanding the causes and effects in trying to develop interventions to prevent people from using opioids and other substances, I think we speak well to our population and try to prevent this from happening.

We need to know this information. I would like to ask the Department of Education (NDE) working with the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, who you have charged with substance abuse prevention and substance abuse treatment, to look at how this study is administered, analyzed and utilized.

In earlier testimony, it was mentioned this would alleviate this concern, and it does not. This is not a survey that helps us to deal with this problem. The survey gives us the evidence there is a problem, where the problem is and what kind of problem it is.

It will take more than that on behalf of the Governor and the Legislature to come up with additional funding for substance abuse prevention and in particular for substance abuse treatment. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

RIANA DURRETT (Executive Director, Nevada Dispensary Association):

The Nevada Dispensary Association (NDA) was formed in 2014 in order to develop and promote best practices in the legal marijuana industry. We now represent over 80 percent of dispensaries Statewide. In June 2016, the NDA organized a two-day conference in Colorado which was attended by several of Nevada's legislators, regulators, representatives of law enforcement, patients and other constituencies.

We were fortunate to have drug addiction specialist David Marlon join us on the trip. We met with Colorado legislators, regulators, law enforcement, local government representatives and educators to discuss with them some of the failures they encountered with legalized marijuana and what recommendations they might have for Nevada going forward with legalized marijuana.

A major focus of the trip was how Colorado addressed its public health issues since marijuana became legal. The resounding message was to collect data as early as possible and be proactive on education and wellness programs. Colorado State Representative Jonathan Singer, District 11 and former Colorado State Senator Patrick Steadman were very adamant in telling us that in a few years, Nevada would regret it if we were not proactive on collecting data.

Nevada does not have extensive data on drug use and we do not have formalized programming on drug prevention. I am extremely relieved there are others in our State who are being proactive about youth drug use. This bill will allow schools to collect the data in almost real time in order to keep up with the changes in what kids are getting access to and what is influencing them.

I learned from my trip to Colorado, marijuana use has not increased among youth. However, it has been an opportunity to fund education, prevention and treatment programs.

The Nevada Dispensary Association supports S.B. 166 as a major step toward collecting the data necessary to make informed choices and strategies in youth substance abuse prevention.

DAVID GOLDWATER (Nevada Dispensary Association):

As a Board member of the Nevada Dispensary Association, I come to you today in support of the goals articulated in S.B. 166. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).

Ms. RICCIO:

To the question asked earlier by Senator Gustavson about the survey asking if there is other drug use in a student's home, the survey does ask students about their feelings surrounding their parents' current use.

The unique opportunity with this type of a survey, being in the format that it is and being tailored just for Nevada, is if we in Nevada feel this is a question that needs to be answered, we can do that. We do not have to wait for all the different agencies to allow us to do that.

One of the brilliances of having a Nevada survey is we do not have to wait. If someone wants to change a question on one of our national surveys, it will take at least two years to have this change made.

In response to Senator Hammond's question, there is a provision to opt out. It does not require any student to take the survey. The survey asks for child assent within the first pages.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

A letter is sent home to the parents asking for consent for the child to take the survey. If the school does not receive the signed consent from the parent, then is it assumed the parent is giving permission and the child is given the survey?

Ms. RICCIO:

In the survey we piloted, the parents were notified by electronic and print copy, depending on what the school requested. We have offered to do this multiple times. Thus far, it is up to each school that has participated to determine how they wish to handle it.

It is an opt-out letter that does inform the parent of the intended use of the survey as well as the contents of the survey outlined. If the parents do not return the letter to the school, the child is allowed to sit for the survey. The first page of the survey describes the survey and asks the student if he or she would like to proceed or choose to learn about water.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I ask because as parents we get a lot of information from the school. So much so, it can fall through the cracks and sometimes does not reach us because it is

paper. If it is electronic, it does reach us. We may think it is a notice our child was missing for an hour, which we already knew, and we keep receiving those electronic messages. There is a lot of information coming.

There may be parents who do not want their child to take the survey, and a younger child may take the test not knowing better, and now you have an upset parent. I prefer the opt-in method where you know the parent is granting permission.

A lot of surveys are done at the school, and I am not sure at times the parents know exactly what they are signing or not signing.

Ms. RICCIO:

I am a mother of four and get bombarded with mail every day. I respect your comment in that regard. Passing this as legislation, we are raising awareness to the content of the survey and the intentions behind the survey. I would hope through public announcement, this would be more apparent to the parents.

I understand we can be bombarded with paper. At the same time, being that it is S.B. 166, it is going to gain attention. Ideally, it will raise parents' understanding, and if nothing more, raise parents' awareness so they can have these conversations with their kids.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I totally respect your comments. In the future, everybody who will come to us will have the same statement about their survey that demands attention, as well. Schools are asked to do a lot.

This is another example where schools are sending more information to parents and asking them to respond, sometimes in an immediate fashion or within a certain time period. As parents of several students, we receive three or four different requests and we have permission slips required to go to different schools. I feel more comfortable with an opt-in survey.

CHAIR DENIS:

Is the survey anonymous?

Ms. RICCIO:

It is an anonymous survey that uses skip logic as well as display logic to protect those who have not been introduced to certain concepts. It will not influence them with things they would not normally know based on their experiences. It is tailored to the individual.

CHAIR DENIS:

Is there further testimony in support of S.B. 166? Seeing none, we will ask for testimony against S.B. 166.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Families for Freedom):

The objectives of this bill are good. We all want to help our children to avoid drug and alcohol abuse. I advocate for doing that.

I am concerned about the data collection. Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b) states, "Tailor the questions posed to each pupil based upon his or her previous answers." Does this mean previous questions in the survey they are taking at the moment, or does it mean the student will be surveyed in the future? If the information is saved, how can the survey be anonymous?

I am concerned it is an opt-out instead of an opt-in survey. If we want parents to be involved, we need to honestly ask them to be involved and have them opt in. This is critical with something as sensitive as this survey.

We heard testimony that there will be questions asked about the family. This is sensitive information that should be made clear to parents. I cannot judge this project without seeing the questions.

I pulled a particular youth survey question blank off the Internet today and went through it. It happens to be about alcohol problems. It has 30 pages of questions.

In reading it, I was alarmed because as I went through it, it seems it was promoting or assuming that all children are involved in these kind of abuses. In addition, there were a lot of questions asked specifically about what the family does. This is of great concern.

Some of these things are illegal, and we know although this is supposed to be anonymous, there is a data bank somewhere with the information. I have

serious concerns about that. Who is collecting the data; who has access to the data; who has the contract that will provide for this; where will the information be used; and how will the identity of the participants be protected? In many cases, this is an invasion of privacy. I do not know what the survey says, so I do not know how invasive it truly is. This is a serious concern to me.

Please make it an opt-in survey to involve parents if we care about that. Be sure there are more safeguards for protecting against invasions of privacy and for the anonymous nature of the survey. I need to have my questions answered regarding section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b). Do they save the survey or do the students take the survey again?

It makes a huge difference whether or not we can consider this in any way to be anonymous.

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) is in opposition to S.B. 166. This is an important issue facing our State. I do not minimize this in any way.

Senator Farley suggested the WCSD team meet with the Roseman University of Health Sciences team. My team and I met with them yesterday and it became clear during our conversation, this survey would be in addition to the YRBS survey we currently do and are vested in. We also conduct a safety survey within the WCSD that has been done for many years which is part of our climate survey.

While the safety survey is very narrow around substance abuse, there are many issues around student safety that are important to us to have a better understanding how students feel at school.

It sounds as if the S.B. 166 survey would be in addition to our other surveys. In that instance, it became clear that we could not support it under the unfunded mandate part of our legislative platform and with the loss of instructional time.

There are concerns over the use of outside technology and how that would work versus our own labs, which are overworked already, and how to make the survey available to parents given that the questions would be different

depending what the answers of the students were. There is some confusion about that.

We understand there may be some amendments. We understand there is a fiscal note attached. We are willing to continue to work with Senator Farley to address some of our concerns.

As it is originally presented, we are in opposition to S.B. 166.

NICOLE ROURKE (Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District):

These issues are important to the CCSD and we have worked with several of the partners who have presented S.B. 166. We have three issues with the survey itself.

First, is the opt-out provision versus the opt-in provision. Currently, the CCSD requires all surveys to be opt in, so the parent permission is very clear. We would like that to be a change to the bill.

Secondly, we are giving the YRBS every other year and also giving the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) tobacco survey. The two surveys are addressing similar issues. We understand the survey in S.B. 166 takes a deeper dive into substance abuse issues.

Lastly, it is about classroom instructional time when teachers need the time to address every instructional topic. For those reasons, we are in opposition to S.B. 166. We would like to work with the sponsor of the bill and see what can be done to make some adjustments.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents; Nevada Association of School Administrators):

I am representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents and Nevada Association of School Administrators. Our concerns are the same as those expressed by the WCSD and the CCSD.

We are very concerned about the opt-out option as was mentioned in Senator Hammond's concern. If a parent does not receive the letter and the student takes the survey, the parent can become upset about it. The people the parents get angry with are the schoolteacher and the school administrator. Their

anger is not directed at the company or organization that has put together the survey. This is an issue for our administrators.

In the bill there is no input from the schools or the districts whether they want to participate or not. Section 1, subsection 6 states, "The Department shall select at random the school districts or schools in which each survey will be administered." A district may not want to engage in another survey if it is already giving body mass index surveys, tobacco surveys, YRBS and school climate surveys.

If the survey is given annually, every other year the students will be doing the YRBS and this survey. Two surveys are addressing basically the same concerns.

We are concerned about kids being involved in drugs and alcohol. That is why we have so much education about drugs and alcohol abuse in our school and health curriculums. As S.B. 166 is written, we cannot support the bill.

JESSICA FERRATO (Nevada Association of School Boards):

I am speaking for the Nevada Association of School Boards. We are in opposition of S.B. 166 for the similar reasons previously given. We consider this an unfunded mandate and have concerns about the cost to our districts.

What has not been discussed yet is that every one of our districts is different. Every student population is different. As has been highlighted by the presenters, the drug and alcohol problems in each community are slightly different.

It would be more of our preference to have something such as this under local control. We feel there is a lot of duplication and crossover.

We are concerned about the impact to classroom time. Some of our rural districts have different schedules than our urban districts, and we are already very tight in instructional time and the time we have with our students.

Lastly, we have concerns about the opt-out versus opt-in provisions. Teachers, principals and superintendents are the people dealing with parents who may be upset about their child being surveyed on something the parents are not aware of.

We look forward to working with the sponsor and with Roseman University of Health Sciences to work out some of the details.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

When we first started this conversation, we learned the survey was designed to identify some factors related to what substances might be abused and how we drill down. It is not just an overarching thing.

I respect everyone's opinion, both those who are in support and in opposition. After looking at the results of the surveys that were presented by Dr. Riccio, my question is, "What do we do?"

When Nevada Question 2 was on the ballot, I heard a lot of people saying, this is going to make marijuana more accessible for students and one might ask 12- or 13-year olds where to go buy weed and they can tell you whether they are using it or not.

My concern is if we know we do not have data and have to develop a program that will collect the data so that we can target those individuals who would be susceptible.

Dr. Iser mentioned other behaviors that may be prominent. If we are talking about HIV, we may be talking about sexual abuse. Are we looking at what substance abuse adolescents are involved in? What is the propensity for suicide?

For me, yes, it is about collecting the data and I recognize this may not be the perfect instrument, but I am concerned we come up with a solution. If this is not it, then what is? Clearly, we have a problem. Again, my question is what do we do?

CHAIR DENIS:

That is an overall question.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I know it is a rhetorical question. I want to put it on the record because it is easy for us to say, "No, we do not want to do this." I respect that and those who are in opposition and their opinions. If not this bill, then what?

MS. FERRATO:

We look forward to working with the sponsor and Roseman University of Health Sciences to see if there is a solution we can come together on. It is definitely a concern on behalf of the school boards. I cannot speak for the WCSD, the CCSD or the superintendents, but this is a big concern for all of us. We know there is an epidemic in some areas in the State.

SENATOR FARLEY:

We are talking about an issue that kills kids. If they are not killed in their youth years, they become addicts which destroys lives, families or kills them as adults.

Teachers do have a lot going on during the school day. Maybe we can look at consolidating and looking at using the best tool instead of the tool we have always used.

We have to have good data in order to have good prevention programs. We need to know what we are preventing in order to say we have the best prevention program ever.

In Dr. Riccio's presentation, it shows the difference between the urban and rural areas, kids have different perceptions based on their regions. We need to have preventions that address what is happening in specific regions.

We must get to the point and come up with prevention programs that actually slow the rapid increase in the numbers of kids and adults who become addicts and the cost it has on society.

CHAIR DENIS:

Is there neutral testimony?

JULIA PEEK (Deputy Administrator, Community Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services):

We are neutral on S.B. 166. We want to express our support for the passive parental consent. It greatly decreases the teachers' time trying to get the signed consent forms returned.

We do have some concerns on S.B. 166. We are concerned about the school time. If the survey takes 22 to 34 minutes to complete would there be time to do a school session.

We have talked with Senator Farley about a couple possible amendments and we look forward to discussing them with her. Potentially, we oversee the YRBS and have been doing so since 1993 in Nevada. We have talked about doing the YRBS in the odd years and doing an additional survey in the even years. The school districts would not have three surveys in one year.

The YRBS is a voluntary survey. If there are several mandated surveys, the likelihood of students being able to do a voluntary survey in addition to all the normal school work the student would have, would be less.

I heard several times we do not have data in the State. We have prepared legislative health reports at the district level; substance use is one of those indicators. It is available on our Website. We also have prepared coalition-level reports. A lot of the substance use prevention efforts that occur in the State occur at the coalition level. We have prepared that data and provided it to the coalitions. Opioid use is one that is highlighted.

We have prepared an infographic that is easier to follow than some of our reports. It quickly highlights the data related to the opioid epidemic. We do have two larger reports highlighting the opioid data we have, and we have several data sets related to opioids for the last five years.

I want to acknowledge Dr. Iser and his staff. Through a CDC grant that I have talked about to the Interim Finance Committee, we are going to be able to be doing opioid dashboards. What that is doing is Dr. Iser's team will be pulling data in real time from our hospitals, our mortality data, the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program soon and poison control. That will be populated in real time for people to look at and drill down into.

We have a lot of really good data. I look forward to getting this new data from Roseman University of Health Sciences, as well. If we cannot do this in schools, perhaps there is an opportunity to do this at the coalition level and do some community research.

I have not seen the questions myself. We do have a substance use Statewide epidemiology work group that has the coroners, the schools, and the coalitions' treatment providers. All we do is look at data for several hours a quarter. I would love to see the survey and see what other mechanisms we can use to get it out.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

The data you talk about that you have and is available, is it metadata?

MS. PEEK:

We do have larger metadata, but we also drill down into some lower level data. I will pick one example: hospital discharge data. We have an individual's name, address and all that information. We can drill down, looking at hospitalizations compared to mortality, and if, for example, a person died of an overdose, was he or she hospitalized in a prior year.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Are we talking about adults or adolescents?

MS. PEEK:

We can look across the board.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Do you have any data that will give us a snapshot of the student population we are concerned with now?

MS. PEEK:

The youth data we have, specifically, is the YRBS, which is anonymous. We have hospital discharge billing data which is identifiable for youth as well; we have some Medicaid billing data that is identifiable, and mortality data is identifiable. We are also looking at ways we can potentially use the health information exchange.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

What would be the difference between information you collect from the YRBS and the surveys we are looking at here? What information do they collect that you collect, and what information do they collect that you cannot collect?

Ms. PEEK:

I have not seen the survey addressed in S.B. 166. We have requested the survey, and we would like to look at it at the next YRBS work group meeting and then we just crosswalk.

We also have an additional work group with the schools and the NDE. We are looking at the questions we ask the coalitions across the board. In the climate survey and YRBS, we are trying to minimize the number of times we ask that question so it should be asked once.

The survey Roseman University of Health Sciences has presented will be outstanding as it is drilling down in much more depth, looking at specifically why someone is using the drug and how they got the drug. This is not asked on the YRBS or our other surveys. There is value. We need to look at the mechanism to get that survey out. Is it community-based?

Once we see the survey, we could see how much duplication, if any, there is with the YRBS to see if there is benefit doing it every other year. We are happy to walk through those scenarios with the stakeholders. I cannot speak to it because I have not seen the survey.

MICHAEL HACKETT (Nevada Public Health Association):

The Nevada Public Health Association is neutral on S.B. 166. We appreciate the intent behind this legislation, and we understand the severity of this problem of substance abuse among this population group. However, we do share many of the concerns that have been put on the record so far, particularly regarding the opt-out provision.

As Dr. Iser stated, how the data is collected and ultimately utilized and how this survey complements the YRBS and other existing surveys currently in place interest us. These are valuable resources for us in determining public and population health and how to address some of those needs.

At the association level, if there is a role to make this a better bill, we certainly want to make ourselves available to the bill's sponsor and the Committee, understanding that some members within the Public Health Association are directly involved in this piece of legislation. If they choose to bring us into this, we look forward to being a part of it.

JOHN VELLARDITA (Executive Director, Clark County Education Association):

I am here for the Clark County Education Association, representing teachers. The intent behind S.B. 166 is phenomenal. The first step to good policy is to create good data collection, and that is the intent of the bill.

We are going to be neutral on the bill for one reason and one reason alone. There are 371 minutes of instruction time in a school day. Educators are charged with utilizing those days to the maximum effectiveness. Every time we look at bills that impact the classroom, one of the first things looked at is instruction time.

I heard the survey took 34 minutes from start to finish. It did not take into account any additional minutes to prepare for that. Assuming the 322,000 students in the CCSD took the survey, that would be more than 10.9 million instructional minutes in a year. The bill says annual evaluations.

The survey only occurs one time, but any minute that is taken away from instruction is a minute you never get back. There are a lot of programs.

Yesterday, we heard testimony around the program Breakfast After the Bell. If you are a teacher, you are bleeding into instructional time just to carry out that program.

If this was a bill that could be amended to minimize or not take into account the loss of any kind of instructional time, it is a bill worth reconsidering from our perspective. I am here representing those classroom teachers who would ultimately have to be part of this process.

LINDA LANG (Director, Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership):

The Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership is comprised of the members of all the community coalitions across the State. These coalitions cover Nevada's 17 counties and support and provide prevention programming in the State of Nevada. We are neutral on S.B. 166.

We have an organized system for providing prevention services across the State. The reason we are neutral on this bill is because we wish we could do every one of these surveys. We need the data. We know the reality is our school districts cannot conduct multiple surveys.

The boards of directors of our community coalitions are made up of the school superintendents, principals and all the key stakeholders from the community. We know just getting the YRBS every two years is a challenge. We would like the data that the Roseman survey is going to provide because it digs much deeper into our substance abuse problem. We have heard the YRBS has minimal questions.

I agree with Senator Spearman when she asked what we can do. How do we get this information? In reading the bill I have one area of concern. In section 1, subsection 6 it indicates the school districts will be selected at random across the State where the survey will be administered. In section 1, subsection 7, those that are not selected to participate may request the survey if the money is available for that purpose.

This concerns me because depending on which schools are selected, we may not have consistent data across all of our school districts. We use this data to develop our comprehensive community prevention plans that drive the prevention programming and the strategies that we implement in our communities. I am concerned this would not be across the board in all 17 counties as the YRBS survey.

The YRBS has provided us over the last 17 years with a survey we get every 2 years. It is not perfect. It has provided us with trend data that is important. Starting a new survey in replacement of the YRBS concerns me. We have years and years of trend data that we make decisions on.

This survey would be very valuable if it could be community-based so we could still continue the YRBS. On behalf of the coalitions across the State, we are neutral.

DR. ISER:

I want to thank Senator Spearman for her comments. I must tell you, Senator Spearman, I cannot be happier because you understood exactly what I was saying.

There are all of these other outcomes related to drug use that are killing our kids. People here have talked about family members who have or had drug abuse issues. There have not been effective programs in the Kansas City area

that can help to address my nephews' issues. Those lives are lost. My nephews are now in their forties.

As a physician, I look at my patients from both an artistic side—there is an art to medicine—and from the scientific side. We are talking about enhancing the science of medicine in behavioral health.

I am absolutely in support of the goals of S.B. 166, and I would like to work out the logistics with Senator Farley, Ms. Peek and others to make sure going forward this will be an effective tool for us.

If we do not have good baseline information and we end up doing some kind of intervention, there is no way to tell what the cause was of any behavioral change. We need to have a baseline and follow it through the years. This survey must be an opt-out. Otherwise, we will not get effective statistically significant data for us to follow.

CHAIR DENIS:

This is an important issue and without the data, a solution cannot be found. I appreciate Senator Farley bringing this bill forward.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I am prone to go to academic studies to find what is going on. Information such as this is emotional. What we are looking for is a cognitive solution and not emotional branding.

A study, "Application of environmental sensitivity theories in personalized prevention for youth substance abuse: a transdisciplinary translational perspective," by E. L. Thibodeau, et al., was published in December 2015 in *Translational Behavioral Medicine*. Basically, the study found:

Preventive interventions that target high-risk youth, via one-size-fits-all approaches, have demonstrated modest effects in reducing rates of substance use. Recently, substance use researchers have recommended personalized intervention strategies. Central to these approaches is matching preventatives to characteristics of an individual that have shown to predict outcomes.

I think that is what we are trying to do. Again, I respect everyone's opinion.

I am tying this to information we have talked about in the Health and Human Services Committee. Anytime our children are sent out of state to 22 different facilities in 9 different states, I am concerned. They are sent away for various reasons. Some are returning to substance abuse; some are returning to issues of self-esteem. This is certainly an issue that crosses a lot of different disciplines. For me, it brings about a hair-on-fire moment. That is where I am.

SENATOR FARLEY:

We did drop the ball and are reaching out to both supporters and those who are in opposition of the bill. I want to encourage those who have testified in both positions to continue to contact me or contact Roseman University of Health Sciences and get some amendments made so we can move this important bill forward and do something good for kids of Nevada.

CHAIR DENIS:

I will close the hearing on S.B.166. We will hear a report from Glenn Christenson, Chair of the Spending and Government Efficiency Commission for the System of K-12 Public Education in Nevada. This report is for K-12 education that was authorized in the last Legislative Session.

GLENN CHRISTENSON (Chairman, Spending and Government Efficiency Commission for the System of K-12 Public Education in Nevada):

I am here today in my capacity as Chair of the Spending and Government Efficiency Commission for the System of K-12 Public Education in Nevada (SAGE Commission), for K-12 education that was authorized in the 2015 Legislation Session. I have submitted our report ([Exhibit J](#)) for you to review. I will present additional information ([Exhibit K](#)).

I am encouraged by the enthusiasm I see with the efforts to improve K-12 education. This enthusiasm is not just happening in the CCSD. It is happening in the business community, in the not-for-profit community and is happening with the parents. The work of the SAGE Commission complements the work that is being done around A.B. No. 394 of the 78th Session.

There is one area I think we are missing. In my mind, perhaps the most important challenge we have is ensuring there is a high quality teacher in every

classroom in every school in the State of Nevada. In order to do that, we have to address the challenges around the teacher pipeline.

There are a number of reasons why we have difficulties bringing teachers from around the Country here to Nevada—not the least of which is the shortage of teachers all around the Country. The best way to address this issue is to be more strategic in how we are thinking about it.

We need to make a significant investment in a teacher preparation program and I recognize we have limited resources in the State. We need to be more targeted in where we make these kinds of investment.

The situation we have today is UNR aspires to be a Tier 1 research institution, as does the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). The Nevada State College (NSC) is an access and baccalaureate institution.

Investing in a high quality teacher program at NSC makes a lot of sense because it is less expensive to gain a high quality education at NSC. Because NCS does not have a research arm, it is much less expensive to gain a high quality education than at UNR and UNLV.

In addition, NSC could serve as a theater for the masters and Ph.D. programs at both UNR and UNLV. There needs to be a building dedicated to a teacher education program, and I think the logical place is at NSC.

In full disclosure, I am the longest serving chairman of the Nevada State College Foundation and recently chaired a \$17 million capital campaign. I think I can step back and look at this from a logical and objective way. That is the right way to address the problem.

I would like to thank the Commission members for serving on the SAGE Commission, all the witnesses from the various districts from around the State, and Manny Lamarre, primary liaison with the State. Nancy Brune's research for the SAGE Commission was invaluable.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I have a comment on the report's conclusion on the retention of teachers on page 14 of [Exhibit J](#). Obviously, we want to retain all of our teachers. The report shows three specialties in particular. Can you recall some of the

discussions you had surrounding math and science teachers. With the emphasis on science, technology, engineering and mathematics, these teachers are hard to hire. Is there anything else, other than that?

MR. CHRISTENSON:

No. That was the primary testimony that we heard. The one area I am particularly interested in, personally, is special education. In our district, we define special education as anywhere from students who are profoundly physically and mentally disabled all the way to our gifted and talented education students. We need to do a better job defining what those rules are. I know there are significant needs for special education teachers all around the State.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I agree with your statement. There are a lot of requirements of special education teachers and a lot of litigation surrounding special education. Districts want to hire good teachers and retain those who understand and know the ins and outs of the special education programs.

MR. CHRISTENSON:

This is the reason we need to be more strategic about the way we are addressing these subjects. There is a lot of effort. We need to be laser-focused on how we address improving quality of K-12 education in the State.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

In our Committee meeting last Thursday, we heard a report about the importance of counselors. Did you look at the effect that might have even with respect to retention of teachers? What would be the value of making sure we had full-time counselors on each campus?

MR. CHRISTENSON:

I mentioned earlier, this is not a complete list of things that could be done. This is a great observation. Unfortunately, it is not one we considered during our five meetings. I wish now we had considered that.

CHAIR DENIS:

Recommendation No. 33 is to retain funding for Teach Nevada by March 31, 2017. I do not see that happening. We will look at these and see what can be done.

MR. CHRISTENSON:

There are 35 recommendations. There is a lot of work to be done. There are a few things in here like the one you just mentioned.

As we are out recruiting teachers, it is important to know we have these incentives available for them. To find those incentives in June is about three months late from the prime time period.

If I could narrow the 35 recommendations down, I would ask you to look at recommendation Nos. 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 29, 31, 33 and 34.

CHAIR DENIS:

We will now have a presentation from Communities in Schools.

SUSIE LEE (Chair, Communities in Schools of Nevada):

As we release the new Nevada plan with a goal of our State being one of the fastest improving states in the Nation in terms of education, we can all agree we have a lot of work ahead of us. Communities in Schools of Nevada (CIS) is here to ask that we continue to work together to support a weighted funding formula to address the issues students living in poverty bring to the classroom.

At this time, Dr. Tiffany Tyler and I will go through our presentation ([Exhibit L](#)).

We fully support continued expansion of the categorical funding you have supported in the past, and we support any and all attempts to provide additional resources and to work together collectively with all agencies that are involved in education delivery so we can be strategic and collaborative in making sure we are addressing all the needs in our classrooms.

TIFFANY TYLER (CEO, Communities in Schools of Nevada):

I want to speak to Senator Spearman's question asked earlier: What are we going to do about it? What CIS is doing is integrated student supports (ISS). The ISS recognizes the weight of educating should not rest solely on the shoulders of teachers.

Now, with the recognition of our State commitment around the work that should happen for the children in poverty, you will note that not only is it a commitment to engage all of the stakeholders that contribute to help children

move forward, but it is a recognition that children in poverty need additional resources and support to make the journey effectively.

You will also note, in keeping with a number of the aims that were identified during the last Legislative Session, it also includes a focus on college and career preparation. We have talked about what workforce development is and what should be happening in terms of a pipeline for our youth. We want you to know it is the core of our work.

Not only are we formally a partner with all of the stakeholders who move the needle for children, we are also recognizing the end gain is not just a diploma. It is also how we prepare them to successfully lead their households and lead in our communities.

As a part of that work, I want to draw your attention to our national model on page 9, [Exhibit L](#).

We want to underscore that we are thankful for this partnership with the Legislature, we believe in your vision and the work you are doing and we support anything you could do to ensure there is a safety net for all children across our State.

As a part of that process, if you will invest or commit to it, CIS will ensure there is a return not only for our children but our community.

CHAIR DENIS:

We can see your passion. We appreciate all the work you do for our children and schools. I will now take public comment.

MR. DALY:

I want to comment on the SAGE Commission report for K-12 education. One of the recommendations we did engage on at the SAGE Commission was recommendation No. 31, the issue of outsourcing centralized district services.

While all the effort to find savings and efficiencies in public education in Nevada is certainly helpful, it is not a substitute for the severe and chronic underfunding of public education in our State. More needs to be done.

Specifically with recommendation No. 31 and the outsourcing recommendation, I would caution that we believe strongly that any benefit in terms of money saved from outsourcing usually is derived by paying workers less in terms of their salaries and/or their benefits.

Ultimately, the risk of outsourcing when you are a government like the State of Nevada and the school districts is that the costs end up coming back to the State in other ways.

We represent members who do the work, many on the support staff side, and many more of them who work directly with students. These are members who care about their school sites and care about the kids.

We caution against contracting those jobs out to people who do not have the same commitment level at stake and may be paid less or not have the same benefits as people working for school districts.

In the discussion at the SAGE Commission, there was much contemplation of the Houston model. The initial recommendation was amended after hiring a consultant to study contracting out services such as transportation, food service, facilities and maintenance and information technology. We then contemplated contracting out the management of those services.

For us that is less of a scary recommendation, although we would still have some concerns about moving forward.

BILL HANLON:

Programs are only as good as the teachers implementing them. Today Nevada ranks fifty-first in many of the surveys in the Nation. I would say a lot of the problems emanate from Carson City.

Nevada has had, and continues to have, a teacher shortage. Not only do we have a teacher shortage, we also have too many first and second year inexperienced teachers who do not have the professional knowledge to optimize student education.

These new teachers do not know the standards, do not know how to link them to previous knowledge and outside experiences, they do not have instructional strategies or resources to support those standards. They do not know how to

assess those standards, nor do they have the professional development that would help them and their students to be more successful.

Part of the fault is with you. The Governor, in his proposed budgets, has not set aside funding to attract and retain teachers, and the Legislature has done nothing to address this or to ensure teachers have access to needed training on the standards.

Until we adequately fund education, all these so-called new reforms should be repealed. They are nothing more than resumé builders and fodder for future obituary notices. To be quite frank, they are distractions from the real issue.

Without qualified experienced teachers who know the content, have the instructional strategies and assessment strategies, and have resources to support those strategies, these programs make students suffer because it takes away from classroom instruction.

Simply stated, if Nevada cannot afford the basics in education, then programs such as Zoom and Victory schools, Education Savings Accounts (ESA), and Achievement School Districts (ASD) are nothing but lipstick on a pig.

If you do not understand the importance of teachers, I will tell you parents do. When students get promoted from grade to grade, parents' first question is: who is my kid's teacher?

Before the Sandoval administration began diverting funding from classroom education, the CCSD was nationally recognized as the fastest improving district in the Nation. That means Nevada was, too. Look at what you have allowed to happen because of misguided priorities. We are last.

Since it is clear the Governor's priorities are not about improving classroom education by ensuring students have access to the best qualified teachers, then this Legislature must establish priorities that place students' experiences in the classroom, learning to read and write, learning about math, science and social studies, above all else.

I urge you to redistribute the funds in the Governor's budget for Zoom and Victory schools, ASD and ESA, and invest those funds in teachers so Nevada is competitive with other states. So we do not keep hiring teachers for just two

years and can attract and retain teachers, I urge you to invest in professional development resources for those professionals that actually support and improve classroom experiences.

On a separate note, at some future date, I would ask that you look into the testing fiasco with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, and percent above cut intervals in the end of course exams, and that would take over an hour.

In the past, we had legislators who took time out to find out about professional development. They knew, first-hand, what we are expecting of teachers. I am hoping the legislators today can take the same interest, so when voting on bills, they would know what the expectations are.

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

Senate Committee on Education
February 21, 2017
Page 39

CHAIR DENIS:

Are there further comments? If there is no further business for the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Shelley Kyle,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
S.B. 166	C	2	Krystal Riccio / Roseman University of Health Sciences	Written Testimony
S.B. 166	D	7	Krystal Riccio / Roseman University of Health Sciences	Pilot Survey Results Presentation
S.B. 166	E	1	Carol J. Boyd / University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Health Behavior and Biological Sciences	Written Testimony
S.B. 166	F	3	Senator Patricia Farley	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 166	G	1	Jeffrey Talbot / Roseman University of Health Sciences	Written Testimony
S.B. 166	H	1	Joseph P. Iser / Southern Nevada Health District	Written Testimony
S.B. 166	I	1	David Goldwater / Nevada Dispensary Association	Written Testimony
	J	15	Glenn Christenson / SAGE Commission	SAGE Commission Report
	K	16	Glenn Christenson / SAGE Commission	Presentation
	L	21	Susie Lee / Communities in Schools of Nevada	Presentation