

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-ninth Session
April 27, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Moises Denis at 3:42 p.m. on Thursday, April 27, 2017, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [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:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Counsel
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Craig M. Stevens, Clark County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Jessica Ferrato, Nevada Association of School Boards

Senate Committee on Education
April 27, 2017
Page 2

Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents; Nevada Association of School Administrators
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Steven Silberkraus
Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Wade Poulsen, Trustee, Lincoln County School Board; President, Nevada Association of School Boards
Bridget Peterson, President, Lyon County School Board; Nevada Association of School Boards
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Ed Gonzalez, Clark County Education Association
Brad Keating, Clark County School District
Ray Bacon, Nevada Manufacturers Association
Juanita Clark
Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education
Kristine Nelson, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options, Department of Education
David W. Carter, District 2, State Board of Education
Anne Hansen, Western Nevada College
Frank Woodbeck, Vice Chancellor, Workforce Development; Interim Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, Nevada System of Higher Education
Michael Flores, College of Southern Nevada
Heather Dye, Nevada FFA
Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement Division, Department of Education
Victor Wakefield

CHAIR DENIS:

I will open the meeting of the Senate Committee on Education with a work session on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 1.

ASSEMBLY BILL 1 (1st Reprint): Requires the payment of certain undergraduate fees and expenses of the dependent child of a public employee who is killed in the performance of his or her duties. (BDR 34-69)

TODD BUTTERWORTH (Policy Analyst):

This bill was heard in this Committee on April 20. It provides that the dependents of a public employee who is killed in the line of duty will receive certain expenses and fees paid when they attend a postsecondary institution in the State of Nevada. There are no proposed amendments or fiscal notes attached to the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

One of the questions that came up with this bill in Committee was the definition of "killed."

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MAGGIE CARLTON (Assembly District No. 14):

It means you died on the job. As far as police workers and fire workers go, it is killed in the line of duty. When it is another public employee, it is killed in the performance of their duty, meaning they suffered the injury or death while doing their jobs.

An example would be, if you are at the Department of Motor Vehicles as an employee, and an enforcement officer is there too, if someone comes in and starts shooting people and you are both killed, under this bill, both you and the officer would be treated the same. If you died of your injuries later, you would still be covered. This bill mirrors everything for public employees that we do for police and fire employees right now.

CHAIR DENIS:

What about the scenario where you are performing your duty, but it is an accidental death, like slipping on a puddle and hitting your head.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

That is not killed. We use the word killed on purpose to mean a violent action. If you were with the Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP) standing on the side of the road and your vehicle was hit and you were killed, or if you were a Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) worker on Mt. Rose clearing snow and you were hit and killed, those situations fit the definition because you were doing your job and you got killed.

CHAIR DENIS:

My understanding is that if there is a question of the definition, the Board of Regents could define it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

That has already been done for police and fire, so we expect this to mirror their law. Whatever is done for police and fire officers would apply to these individuals. That determination would be made at the county or city level in the death of the employee, which is how it works with police and fire.

ASHER KILLIAN (Counsel):

That is clear enough. This would be subject to the rule of the Board of Regents, just like the existing provision for police and fire. We have it pretty clear on the record that the Legislature's expectation is that the rules would be extended in the same fashion currently applied to police and fire officers.

CHAIR DENIS:

Since we are missing one Committee member, we will go on to the next work session bill, A.B. 85.

ASSEMBLY BILL 85: Requires instruction in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and the use of an automated external defibrillator in certain schools. (BDR 34-569)

MR. BUTTERWORTH:

This bill was heard in this Committee on April 20. It requires instruction on cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) in certain schools. There are no amendments included in the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

Seeing no one wanting to discuss this bill, I will close the work session and open A.B. 221.

ASSEMBLY BILL 221 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the model plan developed for the management of a crisis or an emergency that involves a public school to include a procedure for the evacuation of a charter school. (BDR 34-594)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHANNON BILBRAY-AXELROD (Assembly District No. 34):

My daughter Molly attends Doral Academy's Fire Mesa campus in Las Vegas, and this bill is the result of a situation that arose at her school. Like all other public schools, including charters, my daughter's school is required to have an

emergency plan. In the past, that plan for Fire Mesa has included procedures to evacuate to Cimarron-Memorial High School, located across the street.

Recently, when my daughter's principal was reviewing and updating the school's emergency plan, Cimarron-Memorial indicated it would no longer accommodate Fire Mesa students in the event of an evacuation. This led to a scramble to find another location willing to accommodate Fire Mesa students. In the end, we were able to find a library down the street that agreed to do so. Unfortunately, the location is farther away, and the facilities are not as conducive to student safety and comfort.

Assembly Bill 221 attempts to avoid similar situations in the future by requiring certain non-charter public schools to accommodate charter school students in the event of an emergency or crisis. Schools are often the safest and best-equipped facilities for evacuation and should be available for evacuated students from other schools whenever possible.

Section 1 of the bill discusses the model plan for emergency management that is required to be developed by the Nevada Department of Education (NDE). In subsection 1, paragraph (k) of that section, it states that the model plan would have to include a procedure for evacuating charter school students and employees to certain schools in a school district. As originally drafted, the bill did not specify which schools would be subject to this requirement. However, after talking with the Clark County School District (CCSD), we made additional specifications. Now the bill specifies that evacuations would be to a designated space in an identified middle, junior high, or high school that is separate from the general population of the school and sufficiently large, like a gym or multipurpose room, to accommodate the evacuated students.

Section 1, subsection 3 of the bill requires school districts to ensure that each school in the district that is identified pursuant to section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (k), be prepared to allow a charter school to evacuate there when necessary. Another amendment we made on the Assembly side was to add indemnification language to this subsection to protect the school district.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Will each school district have a list of the charter school and public school pairings for evacuation so there is never a confusion in an emergency?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD:

Superintendent Steve Canavero is here from NDE, and he can answer that since that Department is responsible for the State emergency plan. I see he is nodding his head in the affirmative in the audience, so yes, there will be a list.

CRAIG M. STEVENS (Clark County School District):

We at CCSD support A.B. 221 and appreciate the amendment language that was included.

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Washoe County School District):

The way we envision this in the Washoe County School District (WCSD) is like a two-way agreement between a public school and a charter school. In case of an emergency, the public school may also be in a crisis setting or evacuation. We would then have that two-way agreement with the charter school. The space that would accommodate the number of students was very important to us, so we appreciate the sponsor being willing to work with us on that.

SENATOR HARRIS:

My concern is on behalf of the parents because it is never good to hear that your child's school is having an issue or an evacuation. When those calls come in, someone needs to have a master list of where the children will be transferred, because worse than being in an emergency situation is having a plan and still not knowing what you are going to do with a large number of children. There will be panicked parents, staff and children. I would also like to see some thought given to a back-up plan because it may be that the closest school is not the best option for evacuation pairing.

MS. ANDERSON:

In the WCSD, there are several contingencies and plans for that exact thing. We did clarify with the sponsor that the school district would not be responsible for the reunification of the charter school, because we do not know who the parents are of those students. That would be the charter school's responsibility. All of that would, hopefully, be worked out well in advance of any emergency situation.

CHAIR DENIS:

I appreciate you mentioning the two-way system, because that was my thought too, and if the public school needs to evacuate, that could be an option. Many schools already have back-up plans. Is that what you were saying?

MS. ANDERSON:

That was not my intent. I meant two-way in that both school administrators agree that this is the plan for the charter school. I guess it is possible it could go the other way, too, but our schools have emergency plans already. Maybe there could be a symbiotic relationship, but that was not my intent.

JESSICA FERRATO (Nevada Association of School Boards):

The Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) supports A.B. 221. Ms. Anderson highlighted the pieces we needed to talk about. We like the mutual agreement part of the bill.

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

We support the bill as amended.

STEPHEN AUGSPURGER (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):

We support A.B. 221.

STEVEN SILBERKRAUS:

I have interacted with many charter schools and their parents over the years, and the prospect of making sure that public charter school children have a place to go in the event of an emergency is important. I support this bill.

STEVE CANAVERO, PH.D. (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

The NDE supports A.B. 221.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD:

One of the issues in my daughter's school situation was that we had to evacuate to the library, and those are bad places to reunite kids and parents. We all hope there will never be an emergency situation at our schools, but if there is, this bill will help.

I have two letters of support to submit; one from Jennifer Schember from the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District ([Exhibit E](#)), and one from Beckie Dehner, an assistant principal at Doral Academy in Clark County ([Exhibit F](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 221 and open A.B. 451.

ASSEMBLY BILL 451 (1st Reprint): Requires a member of the board of trustees of a school district to complete certain training for professional development. (BDR 34-1032)

ASSEMBLYMAN JASON FRIERSON (Assembly District No. 8):

We have people elected as school board trustees to take care of the system that educates our children, yet there is no requirement that they be trained to do that job. This is not to suggest that current trustees are not prepared, but because of the issues we have in our growing State and the size of some of our school districts, it is worth looking at what other states are doing to ensure that there is a certain level of training and preparation for their trustees to make the best decisions. Other states have legislation that mandates a certain level of training for school trustees who make important and complicated decisions that affect large student populations.

Assembly Bill 451 proposes that each person serving on a board of trustees in a school district should receive a certain amount of training during the first and third year of their terms. That training should include subjects such as public records, the open meeting law (OML), employee management relations and the kindergarten through grade 12 system. We also want to ensure that our trustees receive continual training as our Legislature makes adjustments to State policies and laws. One of the things that brought this issue to my attention was the need to have periodic ethics training, especially when dealing with both staff and kids. Other issues that need to be in the training are identifying and preventing violence in schools, including sexual violence; financial management or fiscal training; fiduciary duties; and employment law.

That is what A.B. 451 is attempting to do. With the help of the NASB, we were able to put together this legislation that helps our system and our children in the long term.

MS. FERRATO:

We support this bill requiring mandatory training for school board trustees in Nevada. Due to the responsibility of these individuals, combined with their varying backgrounds, we think it is prudent to require training applicable to their roles. Currently, 24 states require some training for their trustees. The NASB

provides voluntary training for members. I have submitted a list of the courses that NASB offered from 2014 to 2017 ([Exhibit G](#)).

Our trustees currently receive three trainings per year. We do a national conference where we provide ongoing training throughout that event. The Nevada Association of School Boards is more than willing to increase or specialize training to coordinate with this bill. In the Assembly hearing, A.B. 451 was amended in section 1, subsection 1, to require not less than 6 hours of instructional coverage instead of not less than 4 hours. We wanted to ensure we have enough time to cover each category sufficiently.

SENATOR HARRIS:

I like the bill, but I am wondering about the reference to training being in the first and third year of the term. Are we talking about the elected term? If someone runs for reelection and wins, will they then go through training the first and third years of each term?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

Yes, that is the intention.

CHAIR DENIS:

What if the person is appointed?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

It would be the same.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

I appreciate what you are doing here and what the trustees do, but it has been a pet peeve of mine that they hardly get any money to do this—they make \$500 per month in Clark County School District (CCSD), and it is a full-time job. I would like to see us raise their salary at the same time.

CHAIR DENIS:

I have made a similar comment. They put in so many hours, and we want them to do so much.

WADE POULSEN (Trustee, Lincoln County School Board; President, Nevada Association of School Boards):

On behalf of NASB, I support A.B. 451. The training in the topics identified in this bill helped me a lot. When I first became a school board trustee after being a county commissioner, I came in with an opinion of how things should work in a school district. I was informed right off the bat that my preconceptions were not going to work in a school district. It was good to receive the training. I am now in my sixth year as a trustee, and during that time, the training through NASB has been invaluable. It has taught me how to govern, and it has taught me the financials of the school districts, which are different than any other part of our government. This is the education of our kids; to do it responsibly and keep them safe is the goal.

We have 107 school board members in the State, but not all are taking advantage of being trained as trustees. We currently provide trustee training three times a year during the Legislative Session. In the Interim between sessions, we have four opportunities to receive training. It is invaluable for all Nevada school board trustees to have the opportunity for training in these points of governance.

CHAIR DENIS:

Do you think this will incentivize all the trustees to get training?

MR. POULSEN:

I do. It is imperative that all trustees go through some form of training because we are talking about the education of our kids. We educate kids differently than we do employees. With training, the trustees can do the most effective job they were elected to do.

BRIDGET PETERSON (President, Lyon County School Board; Nevada Association of School Boards):

I support A.B. 451. I am in my third year of being a school board trustee, and I take it very seriously. I took it upon myself to go to many of the trainings, and I have learned a ton. I think training is important for all members of the school board. The classes I learned the most from were on the OML, board and superintendent relations, school finances, and leadership and communication skills. I like the part of this bill that holds us accountable to each other. I feel everyone needs to partake of the training and have continuing training.

CHAIR DENIS:

Did you have preconceived ideas like the previous speaker about what the job entailed before you became a trustee?

MS. PETERSON:

I think so. I felt inspired to be a trustee, so I came in without an agenda and wanting to be helpful. I knew some things, but this definitely helped me see so much more.

MS. ANDERSON:

The WCSD supports this bill, and our school board takes this seriously. We use the NASB programs on top of other programs they bring in for additional trustee training.

CHRIS DALY (Nevada State Education Association):

We support this bill because we see it as good government to give trustees the knowledge and tools necessary to effectively govern a school district. I have submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit H](#)).

MS. PIERCZYNSKI:

We support this bill and appreciate that NASB was willing to add two more hours to the training.

MR. CANAVERO;

We also support A.B. 451.

ED GONZALEZ (Clark County Education Association):

We support this bill. We did suggest an amendment to section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (i), which is about laws relating to employment and contracts. The CCSD is the largest public employer in the State and the second largest employer in Nevada with 40,000 employees, 320,000 students and a \$2.2 billion budget. Obviously, financial management training is extremely important, and it should be done by outside organizations, which could be the NASB.

BRAD KEATING (Clark County School District):

Our CCSD school board trustees are in the middle of a meeting today, otherwise we would have representation from them. They do support this bill, because it benefits not only the 7 CCSD trustees, but the 107 school board members

across the State. They would also suggest requiring written certification of the completion of the trainings every first and third years of a trustee's elected term.

MR. SILBERKRAUS:

I support this bill also. I spent the last several years working with the school district and the trustees, and I understand the immense responsibility those individuals have, as well as the impacts their decisions make on more than 300,000 students in Clark County alone. Any additional tools and skill sets that we can give to the trustees are greatly valued.

MR. AUGSPURGER:

We support A.B. 451.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Regarding the cost of the training, is there an organization already in place that could do that as part of orientation, similar to what they do with newly-elected Legislators?

MS. FERRATO:

Yes, we provide this training already. We will be adding courses to what we already do, which you can see listed in [Exhibit G](#).

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

How much training do you provide already? Since they are already getting this training, why make it mandatory?

MS. FERRATO:

Depending on the year, we do three to four trainings per year. We think it needs to be mandatory because not all of our school board members opt to take the training. This would level the knowledge of every trustee in the State, which is especially important since they all come from different backgrounds.

RAY BACON (Nevada Manufacturers Association):

I want to compliment this body and the people who brought this bill forward. This was part of the original version of S.B. No. 482 of the 69th Session in 1997, which was part of the Nevada Education Reform Act. It did not make it to the end.

CHAIR DENIS:

We do things slow, sometimes.

JUANITA CLARK:

I am speaking on behalf of Charleston Neighborhood Preservation in opposition to A.B. 451. As we elect our school trustees, people feel closer to the person they have elected from their county than they would from the school district itself, especially in a district the size of CCSD. I am concerned about indoctrination. Is there is some allowance to be a unique individual? After someone has taken this NASB training, does that person feel as free to have a different point of view? I would like that answered by a school board member who has taken the training.

CHAIR DENIS:

I think we got a partial answer from the trustees that spoke earlier.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

I want to make it clear that the requirements of training are intended to be objective topics, not subjective topics. If a person is going to handle budgets, they should learn the ins and outs of handling budgets.

CHAIR DENIS:

I agree. When people run for any office, they have a preconception of what they think they are going to do, but when they get in there, they realize it is not always what they thought it would be. That training is important. I think this bill is offering a good way, an innovative way, to do it. If a trustee does not do the training, his or her name will be put on the Website.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 451.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

My only comment is, could we put a raise in the bill? However, if you want to pass it out now, we will pass it out now.

CHAIR DENIS:

Not unless you want to get it stuck in the Senate Committee on Finance.

Senate Committee on Education
April 27, 2017
Page 14

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

Are you saying the Assembly Speaker cannot get it out of Finance?

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 451 and reopen the work session with A.B. 1.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

The one concern I had was with the definition of "killed." We need to make sure that definition is solid, so it does not include too many people. As long as the intent is on the record, I am okay with the bill.

CHAIR DENIS:

When we had Assemblywoman Carleton here earlier, we asked her to reiterate the definition and our legal counsel, Mr. Killian, said it was clear enough to meet the intent of what she was telling us.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 1.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

I will reopen A.B. 85 in the work session.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 85.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

I will now open A.B. 482.

ASSEMBLY BILL 482: Revises provisions relating to programs of career and technical education. (BDR 34-1093)

BRETT BARLEY (Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education):

This bill is another in this process of aligning workforce readiness, K-12 education and the demands of the new Nevada economy. There have been several similar bills before you this Session, including A.B. 7, our Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) implementation bill, that includes graduation requirements in alignment with workforce demands.

ASSEMBLY BILL 7 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to education. (BDR 34-126)

There is a work-based learning bill and a bill to implement the Office of Workforce Innovations to kind of quarterback all of these issues. This bill, A.B. 482, is part of a larger, comprehensive package to align all of our career and technical education, workforce readiness and postsecondary work across the State.

KRISTINE NELSON (Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options, Department of Education):

This is mostly a clean-up bill for State Career Technical Education (CTE) grant money and authorization. I have submitted a document that explains the changes we are making in this bill ([Exhibit I](#)).

MR. BACON:

I support this bill. I have been on the manufacturing sector council, and I have been through this review process three times. It is interesting to see employers from the various sectors going through the review process with an amazing amount of commonality that we run across as to which programs are effective and which are not. As defined in this bill, and as it has been practiced for the last four years, it works very well most of the time. People come prepared, and it is a positive process. We have made the CTE programs across the State better in the process.

DAVID W. CARTER (State Board of Education, District 2):

I support anything that increases our CTE programs as well as the programs that help our students pursuing further postsecondary education.

ANNE HANSEN (Western Nevada College):

For community colleges, this is a wonderful opportunity that will enable us to give the students a great tableau of things they can do. It is making it a lot richer with more options. Our whole State will benefit. I support A.B. 482.

FRANK WOODBECK (Vice Chancellor, Workforce Development; Interim Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, Nevada System of Higher Education):

We strongly support this bill as it provides for a continual alignment of CTE programs with the target industry sectors and with higher education. Our recently won New Skills for Youth grant and the underlying plan will provide a road map for the implementation of the features contained in the legislation and place Nevada in the forefront of CTE in our Nation.

MICHAEL FLORES (College of Southern Nevada):

We support A.B. 482 because it is another way we can align with what we need to provide a trained and ready workforce for all the industries coming into Nevada.

HEATHER DYE (Nevada FFA):

I am with Nevada FFA, formerly Future Farmers of America, one of the student organizations mentioned in section 1 of the bill. I am 90 percent in support of this bill, except for three words that cause some concern. In section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b), it says, "Distribute not more than 5 percent of the state money to pupil organizations for career and technical education" The issue with the words "not more than" is that it could mean zero dollars, which would hurt all organizations and, frankly, hurt CTE effectiveness.

Right now, we have a wonderful working relationship with NDE, and it is in their budget to provide \$40,000 per student organization per year for support. My concern is, what if we do not have those relationships in the future? I think I can speak for all student organizations in that we would all appreciate the full 5 percent of that CTE money. We provide a lot of employability and leadership skills to the students that CTE is known for and that a lot of employers want.

My other concern is in sections 2 and 3 of A.B. 482, regarding the long lists of quality criteria that represent well-rounded programs providing opportunities for students. The amendment removing those criteria is not a bad thing, but I think having them in statute provides more strength and adds diversity to what a program should be offering on the local level.

MS. NELSON:

To Ms. Dye's concern about the words "not more than," in section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b), of the bill, as it is currently written, 5 percent of the Governor's *Executive Budget* of a State CTE grant that equates to \$12.5 million per year would be exorbitant. The "not more than 5 percent" allows for the current funding that we proposed in the *Executive Budget*, which is \$40,000 per year per CTE organization, which has been adequate from year to year. This is an important State-funded cocurricular activity in CTE, which we value. If State funding were to go away, we would then work on the possibility of obtaining federal funding through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 for those activities.

Regarding Ms. Dye's concerns about the criteria outlined in sections 2 and 3, the reason for the proposed striking of those criteria is to give the authority back to the State Board of Education (SBE), and for the Board to be flexible enough to determine the criteria for CTE programs funded by the State CTE dollars so they align with the Governor's vision of the new Nevada economy and with in-demand sector councils and in-demand occupations.

I have a letter of support to submit from Kyle Dalpe from Truckee Meadows Community College ([Exhibit J](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 482 and invite our presenters to come forward with the report and presentation on the Advisory Task Force on Educator Professional Development.

DENA DURISH (Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement Division, Department of Education):

We are presenting the results of a study conducted as a result of S. B. No. 474 of the 78th Session ([Exhibit K](#)), which created the Advisory Task Force on Educator Professional Development. The Task Force met 8 times since last Session and made 19 recommendations outlined by the bill as you can see on

page 2 of our presentation ([Exhibit L](#)). The bill did three things that are described on page 3, [Exhibit L](#), including the creation of the Task Force with the members listed on page 4. There were seven areas of study outlined in the bill which are shown on page 5 of [Exhibit L](#), with the meeting dates listed on page 6. The meeting minutes are available on the NDE Website through the Task Force link.

The recommendations for professional development standards are listed on page 7, [Exhibit L](#). The bill directed the Task Force to make recommendations that were either statutory, regulatory or policy. Some of the recommendations made have already occurred internally, and some may require some action and could possibly be amended into this Session's bills, such as [A.B. 7](#) or [A.B. 77](#).

[ASSEMBLY BILL 77 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions related to teachers and other educational personnel. (BDR 34-253)

The Task Force felt it should be statutorily required to have professional development standards since we are one of the few states without them. There is specific information about what those standards are in other states, [Exhibit K](#). There are 12 recommendations for statutory, regulatory and policy listed on pages 8, 9 and 10 of [Exhibit L](#). One of the things that consistently came up in the meetings was the fact that we do not have fully aligned statewide regional professional development programs (RPDP). There is a lot of fragmentation. At the very least, the districts and RPDPs should align all professional development with the NDE's strategic plan priorities.

When it comes to funding, it was extremely difficult to drill down into how much funding was allocated out of a specific categorical program. We were able to discern how much each school district spent on their categoricals, but when it came to doing the expenditure reports, it was difficult to examine those specific categories. We then made the recommendation that school districts disaggregate that data.

There are two sections of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) requiring reporting that is similar, so we recommended the merging of NRS 391A.190 and NRS 391A.205 into one annual district RPDP report, page 8, [Exhibit L](#), as well as the creation of a standardized format for annual reports.

In regulation, as adopted by the Commission on Professional Standards (COPS), teachers and administrators have to take up to six credits of classes to renew their licenses annually. We discussed what courses should be included in the renewal requirements and how NDE approved the providers of those courses. We concluded that administrator licensure renewal should include revisiting the original administrator licensure requirements, page 9, [Exhibit L](#). We had robust conversations around the new roles for precinct leaders in CCSD, including the question of whether a different type of endorsement is needed. Some states have a specific endorsement for school principals, deans and assistant principals, and then require a different endorsement for those who supervise principals and superintendents. There is a bill this Session pertaining to a leadership taskforce, [S.B. 497](#), that we have a proposed amendment for, based on recommendations from Nevada Succeeds that we heard during our Interim Task Force meetings.

[SENATE BILL 497 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Creates the Advisory Task Force on School Leader Management. (BDR S-332)

We have recommended the Legislature require that the COPS review and update the administrator licensure and renewal processes, and that they and SBE should only approve teacher and administrator preparation programs which have been aligned with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). We do feel NEPF should drive professional development, page 10, [Exhibit L](#).

Last year was our first implementation of the NEPF, and by the results of the effectiveness ratings, we determined there is still training that needs to occur. We are addressing the bottom two bulleted recommendations on page 10, [Exhibit L](#), and one of our big pushes is to focus on school leaders.

The last recommendations are on budget issues. There was a \$30,000 allocated budget for eight of the 2015 programs, one of which was the Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF). The recommendation was to continue funding GTLF, but there were some caveats listed on page 11, [Exhibit L](#). One thing that came up in our meetings had to do with the timing of teaching professional development. Some thought it was automatically implemented whenever there was a new program in a district. That is not always the case. To amend that, the Task Force felt there should be strategic determinations around things like adopting new standards. When we were adopting the NEPF, there were legislative allocations including \$1.3 million the first year and \$978,000 the

second year. We did recommend ongoing funding so that programs do not lose funding shortly after they have started.

Lastly, we realize there is not a system in place for disaggregating professional development categories. We recommend that the NDE should be working with district fiscal staffs so by fiscal year 2019, there should be definite disaggregated data on how professional development funds are utilized.

VICTOR WAKEFIELD:

I represented the SBE on the S.B. No. 474 of the 78th Session Task Force. I fully endorse the recommendation that we adopt statewide professional development standards. As a body, the Task Force took seriously the bill's direction to study and make recommendations regarding budgets spent on educator professional development. We tried to get financial information, asking how much we are spending on educator professional development and asking if that amount is enough.

The only conclusion we could come to as a Task Force was that we really did not know. We got hard data on State categorical funds, the RPDP systems and some State grants, but according to the legislative reports, that was \$19 million in grants and RPDPs. Otherwise, the data was opaque, nonexistent and we could not figure out how to disaggregate it for the traditional public schools.

Professionals who facilitate professional development for multiple schools are not linked to a school's budget, and every school district seems to approach expense coding differently, if at all. We need business rules to clean the data and adequate data systems that link the spending to the school.

My experience on this Task Force suggests to me that dollars are not tracked to schools today, nor do they follow students. This is the principal reason I am supportive of the CCSD reorganization, and I suggest that we put a laser focus on getting systems in place immediately. Until they are in place, we need to ensure there is a third party review or clear policy prescription for any State dollars invested.

Senate Committee on Education
April 27, 2017
Page 21

CHAIR DENIS:

I will now open public comment. Seeing no one wishing to make public comment, I will adjourn the meeting of the Senate Committee on Education at 5:12 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.B. 1	C	1	Todd Butterworth / Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 85	D	1	Todd Butterworth / Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 221	E	2	Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod	Letter of Support from Jennifer Schember
A.B. 221	F	1	Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod	Written Testimony from Beckie Dehner
A.B. 451	G	2	Jessica Ferrato / NASB	NASB Professional Development Historical Review
A.B. 451	H	1	Chris Daly / NSEA	Letter of Support
A.B. 482	I	2	Kristine Nelson / NDE	Bill Change Explanations
A.B. 482	J	1	Kyle Dalpe	Letter of Support
S.B. 474 of the 78th Session	K	12	Dena Durish / NDE	Final Report S.B. 474 of the 78th Session Task Force on Educator Professional Development
S.B. 474 of the 78th Session	L	11	Dena Durish / NDE	S.B. 474 of the 78th Session Advisory Task Force on Professional Development Recommendation form Final Report