

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
AND
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
SUBCOMMITTEES ON K-12/HIGHER EDUCATION/CIP**

**Seventy-ninth Session
March 16, 2017**

The joint meeting of the Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:06 a.m. on Thursday, March 16, 2017, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Ben Kieckhefer

ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Paul Anderson (Excused)

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 2

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst
Mary Sullivan, Committee Secretary
Kurt Englehart, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education
Will Jensen, Director, Office of Special Education, Nevada Department of Education
Christina McGill, Director, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment, Nevada Department of Education
René Cantu, Executive Director, Jobs for Nevada's Graduates, Inc.
Kelee Dupuis, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development and Support, Nevada Department of Education
Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Clark County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Government Affairs Director, Washoe County School District
Charles Mann, Vice President, Nevada Agricultural Teacher's Association; Agriculture Science Teacher, FFA Advisor, Capitol FFA Chapter
Betty Giles, Director, National Board Certification Program, Clark County Education Association
Ryan Merritt, Principal, Stanford Elementary School, Clark County School District
Michael Thorsteinson, International Baccalaureate MYP Coordinator, Basic Academy of International Studies
Brenda Pearson, Director of Professional Learning, Clark County Education Association
Jami Miller, Sales and Training Coordinator, Workforce Training and Economic Development, Vegas PBS
Theodore Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association
Brent Husson, President, Nevada Succeeds
Tracy Wilking, Consulting Teacher, Peer Assistance and Review

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 3

Nancy E. Brune, Ph.D., Executive Director, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy
Priorities
Caryne Shea, Director of Communications, Honoring Our Public Education
Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State
Education Association

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will open the meeting. We will begin with Dr. Canavero and the Department of
Education.

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

I provided a slide presentation ([Exhibit C](#)). Our five-year goal is to be the fastest
improving state in the Nation. With the investments and accountability put in
place in 2015, our message is "stay the course." We will begin with budget
account (B/A) 101-2699.

EDUCATION

K-12 EDUCATION

NDE - Other State Education Programs — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-19
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-2699

We will begin with the Read By Grade 3 Program. The Program was passed in
the 78th Legislative Session. We were funded \$5 million in FY 2014-2015 and
\$22.5 million in FY 2015-2016. Going forward the budget reflects base funding
of \$45 million over the biennium due to the "second year of the biennium times
two rule." This is a \$17 million increase to support the Program. The Program
has a number of components. It includes professional development for teachers,
a learning strategist to work with teachers and students on literacy, as well as a
systemic shift to work on literacy across the State. We have a State literacy
plan that has been recognized nationally. In FY 2015-2016, the Program was in

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 4

64 schools with over 21,000 students. In FY 2016-2017, this program was in 312 schools. We have found incredible leadership in our rural superintendents. Some of the rural superintendents have worked together to leverage their capacities and skills. This rural consortium includes Esmeralda, Lander, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye and Pershing school districts. All of the districts have been awarded Program funds with the exception of Eureka County School District. They will be coming online soon.

This program was one that received the external evaluation. The infrastructure includes local literacy plans, designation of local learning strategists to support implementation, training activities for learning strategists, K-3 teachers, and a well-designed and well-executed grant application with monitoring and reporting processes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO:

How many school districts and charter schools applied for this grant in FY 2016-2017?

MR. CANAVERO:

Every school district, except Eureka County School District, and eight charter schools applied and were funded in FY 2016-2017.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

My understanding is that some of the Read by Grade 3 grant funds were used for administrative support costs. I do not believe these were eligible grant expenditures. Please explain.

MR. CANAVERO:

I will need to speak with you offline to understand specifically which administrative costs you are referring to.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Please provide this information to our Staff so that all Subcommittee members can receive this information.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 5

SENATOR DENIS:

What is the Nevada Department of Education (NDOE) doing to help students learn to read in the schools that did not get the Read by Grade 3 funding?

MR. CANAVERO:

The Read by Grade 3 Program is applicable to all our elementary schools. The NDOE has created a State literacy plan to help support them. All the activities under the Program are broadcast to all of our schools. Every elementary school would have some ability to receive the intervention and support from a learning strategist. I would hope with the additional dollars in this biennium we would be able to cover all elementary schools within the grant. One of the requests received by NDOE was to have a learning strategist work at multiple schools rather than just one school.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

The grant funds were to be used for hiring, training, contracts with vendors, professional development and other eligible costs. Some of the grant funds were used for administration and support staff. What is your response?

MR. CANAVERO:

The same response I gave to Assemblywoman Spiegel applies. I understand the question. I do not know the specific costs that you are referring to. I will get back to Fiscal Division staff and the members of the Subcommittees with a clear and detailed response.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

One of the expenditure categories listed is personnel costs for the school district. The grant funding was used to provide 20 percent of the full-time equivalent cost of a grant evaluator and grant coordinator and 75 percent of the cost of the secretary for administrative support.

MR. CANAVERO:

This is a conversation around nondirect services, and I will need to know which district is involved in order to provide a full and complete answer.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 6

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

Third graders could be held back for not being at a certain reading level in the 2019-2020 school year. Is there any idea as to the number of students that might be held back? How do we communicate this to parents?

MR. CANAVERO:

Part of the system to support literacy includes parent communication. When a student is not achieving a certain level of reading, parents are engaged through formal communication channels. This program involves parent participation. The NDOE has provided templates of letters that the districts could use to communicate with parents.

There are multiple avenues to demonstrate proficiency in order to move into the fourth grade. It is not just a test. In the bill itself, we have three categories for students to move beyond third grade. There is the State assessment, an alternative assessment, and students can move up based on the professional judgement of the teachers. The Nevada Board of Education (NBOE) would establish the proficiency level on the third grade Smarter Balance Assessment. Once we understand what that level will be, we could provide you an estimate of the number of third graders that may be held back.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I think this is a great opportunity to engage parents in a meaningful way. This is a shared responsibility and a good way to involve families.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

Do we have the information from each school district regarding the efforts they undertake to engage parents? You mentioned sending home a letter. Sometimes sending home a letter does not necessarily ensure the parents receive it. What are some of the processes the districts are establishing to communicate with parents?

MR. CANAVERO:

Districts provide one-on-one meetings. There is a partnership on literacy for each student. Resources are provided to a parent in order to support the literacy of a child. The feedback I receive from parents is that they have had teacher meetings that actually go into the details about items discussed at the

parent-teacher conference. They tell me they now have more clarity. Possibly the parents did not know their child was not at the right pace or track to be ready to move into fourth grade. Parents are appreciative to know what they can do at home. Do you think this meeting would have ever happened if we did not have a focus on reading by third grade?

The Turnaround Schools Grant Program continues with \$5 million base funding over each year of the biennium. This program was evaluated by the external evaluators. We did struggle with implementing and the rolling out of this program. We had to integrate it with our school improvement strategy.

We do have recommendations for the Turnaround Schools funding. One is to allow these funds to be used for replication, using our best schools and replicating them with those that are struggling. We identified Shining Star schools as well as five-star schools to improve outcomes for students with similarly situated populations. Second, sustainability, our goal is three stars in three years, an initial lift for our Rising Star schools. These are the underperforming schools. The State has specific State dollars to improve goals for the first time. What may happen, if successful in making this transition, the schools will become ineligible for school improvement money. This is the first time the schools in need of improvement have had specific State dollars. We have an opportunity to wean them off of the improved schools and fill a funding gap. The schools are no longer eligible for federal funds, but they are not three stars moving forward. Finally, in eligible schools, the funding was restricted to one- and two-star schools in our State.

What we are asking for is a little more latitude in the schools we serve and additional funding for a five-star school to provide intentional support and resources. If we spend these dollars within our approved new Nevada Plan, that will be submitted in April, it will clarify our school improvement strategy.

We served 47 schools that were not served with federal funds. Seven of those schools were not U.S. Department of Education, Title schools, 24 did not have other school improvement money. Fourteen of these nonfunded schools were rural schools with limited access to funds, and ten of the schools were charters.

The external evaluation is seen on slide page 23 of [Exhibit C](#).

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 8

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

How are the targeted services provided in the Turnaround Schools Grant Program different from that of the Zoom or Victory programs?

MR. CANAVERO:

The Turnaround Schools Program maintains a focus on principal leadership. These dollars support a network of principals under a Principal Learning Community (PLC) like structure for instructional leadership. It was a way for the State to coordinate a number of principals throughout the year and engage them on a PLC level work at the school site. Then we brought in external individuals to help support the professional development of those principals. This may occur at some school sites. Most of the participants, I recall from a meeting I attended, were rural superintendents.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

Do we have any data that shows the efficacy of the Turnaround Schools Program? Is there evidence that this support and funding is having a positive impact on the academic performance of the students?

MR. CANAVERO:

This is not a district-led initiative. This is the State's work under Senate Bill (S. B.) No. 92 of the 78th Session that is consistent with the support for underperforming schools.

The strategies in professional development we offer with these funds and what we conceive going forward are built upon a foundation of research and evidence-based research that this is the right work to occur. Given the implementation timeline in FY 2014-2015 and FY 2015-2016, we do not have the empirical evidence to say if it is working. Qualitatively, we have work to do. This is one of the reasons we have gone through our school improvement strategy as a State. We went through the entire process and redesigned much of its work.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How do the dollars align with the principal leadership and development?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 9

MR. CANAVERO:

There are external providers that do needs-assessment work. An area of emphasis over the last three years was trying to get a clear idea of the problem we are trying to solve at a particular school site. We used to use school teams. Now we use external partners with expertise in this work, and it is more effective. They look at leadership, instructional design, curriculum, assessments and how all of this work affects outcomes of students. They provide feedback to the school site at which point it is incorporated into a plan. That plan is one we would support with professional development. Not all the funds are for principal leadership.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How are the schools chosen?

MR. CANAVERO:

The State worked with the districts to provide the Turnaround grants in a collaborative between the school district and the State. We found schools that were not receiving federal or other State dollars.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are the schools willing participants?

MR. CANAVERO:

I think they are willing participants. It is a grant application.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is there significant turnover or stability in the leadership at the school level?

MR. CANAVERO:

There is always turnover with teachers and instructional leaders.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is there more turnover than before?

MR. CANAVERO:

I cannot give you a definitive yes or no.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 10

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Do you have plans or procedures by which you work with school districts on staffing limitations, especially with turnover?

MR. CANAVERO:

Generally, yes, we look at budget accounts. We can knit together a number of investments that the State has made to invest in the recruitment and retention not just for teachers but also of school leaders. The Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF) would be one of those. We work with our Rising Star schools that need our support.

We have three areas where the NDOE is going to place all of its resources and time. One of those is the school principal. We believe that instructional leadership at the school site is key. Right now, we see work done in the classroom at the teacher level. We continue to invest in the principals; it is critical, specifically for our underperforming schools.

Secondly, investments are being made around data to inform and make instructional decisions. This is a carryover from the Turnaround work.

Thirdly, we will put our emphasis and effort into our Rising Star schools, schools identified as in need of improvement and the one- and two-star downward trending schools.

Within this realm, we have federal and State dollars that are in place to support this work. It is important for the State and our districts to understand what the State's critical investments are and how we are leveraging the federal and State money where we can.

MR. CANAVERO:

The Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) funding increased last biennium. It went from \$175,000 of State funding in each year of the biennium to over \$5 million in each year of the biennium to support students who are gifted and talented. Enhancement unit, E-276, asks for an additional \$4.3 million over the biennium.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 11

In FY 2015-2016 we funded 12,829 GATE students. In FY 2017-2018 and FY 2018-2019 we will fund students if identified and served through State-approved assessments and processes. This is a level of clarification that we felt was necessary to identify and serve students.

I believe no later than 2019 we could actually express the investment as a multiplier or a weight and allocate it on a per-pupil basis according to the statute. In FY 2015-2016 it was about \$416 per pupil in GATE. In FY 2016-2017, it was \$403 per pupil as we increased the number of GATE students. I estimate by FY 2018-2019 the weight could approach \$600 per GATE student identified and served.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Currently, there is not a standardized Statewide assessment for the GATE Program. Is that correct?

WILL JENSEN (Director, Office of Special Education, Nevada Department of Education):

We have a battery of State-approved assessments. There is work on narrowing the number of assessments through some stakeholders, the GATE community and service providers. It is a work in progress to narrow the list.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

So are we moving towards a standardized assessment? Do we know when this will be accomplished?

MR. JENSEN:

We are working towards a set of standardized assessments that will be State approved. Districts have some they are using that are reliable. They have purchased these assessments in bulk to save costs. I would like to have a list of assessments that are reliable and approved. We are looking at one standardized rubric across the State. There is a little bit of discrepancy from district to district. We think that the rubric is going to bring a very standardized way of identifying gifted and talented students.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 12

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

There is a concern about this program underserving in some demographics, Hispanics, Pacific Islanders, and African-Americans. What are we doing to reach all students?

MR. CANAVERO:

That was the same concern we had in 2015. We specifically wanted to address the disproportionalities with these investments, and we would monitor the remediation of the disproportionality.

MR. JENSEN:

There is a concern. When I first looked at the data, I wanted to identify if our concern was unique in comparison with the rest of the Country or State. The result was no. This is a struggle the Country is having. States are taking measures to correct this. Our stakeholder group is looking at this also. We do think there are ways to address this concern. There are some ways of norming the assessment tools and norming the rubric to make sure we are identifying equitably. I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

There is such a huge variation between school districts and the number of students identified for the GATE Program. Carson City is at 10.5 percent, Clark County is at 2.1 percent and Washoe County is at 7.2 percent. Which percentage is closer to what data tells us is the actual percentage of the student population that is gifted and talented?

MR. JENSEN:

Districts have the option to participate in GATE; there is no law requiring mandatory participation. In our districts that are participating, participation ranges from 0.47 percent to 10 percent. When I came to work here in June that was a priority. The research has a lot of variability, but we think as a stakeholder group for gifted and talented education, it should be between 2 percent and 4 percent. There are credible researchers that believe that it should be 10 percent or higher. We are building rubrics around these percentages to capture this population.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 13

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

If this is true, what do we do with conflicting data based on the assessments and the rubric data? I do not want to restrict a school based on the statewide percentages.

MR. JENSEN:

Federally, GATE students are not identified as a special education population. We have them tied into funding. When we had unit funding, we allowed districts to use a portion of that unit funding for gifted and talented education. They were allowed to remove that money from their overall maintenance of fiscal effort.

MR. CANAVERO:

The process we would set here is how the State would fund eligible and served students. If students were eligible, based on the assessment rubric and served then they would receive funding. Schools may have to make an adjustment in their GATE student population based on the assessment and rubric.

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO:

Which school districts do not participate in GATE?

MR. JENSEN:

I do not have that information with me today. We will get that information to you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

How do we appropriate the monies in the GATE Program?

MR. JENSEN:

We take the total identified GATE population in Nevada and divide the money evenly and distribute to each district.

MR. CANAVERO:

The Nevada Ready 21 Program (NR21) is our technology initiative with base funding of \$20 million. In the last biennium, \$5.4 million was allocated in the first year and \$13.3 million in the second year. Fiscal year 2015-2016 was a procurement and planning year, and FY 2016-2017 was an implementation

year. For the 2017-2019 biennium we have \$10 million budgeted in each year. The Cohort I that is presently being served is 23 school sites across 6 districts and 3 charter schools. These programs serve 19,000 students and over 1,000 teachers. This program is keenly focused on technology, but also professional development for teachers.

I have a draft of the process that we have been discussing with districts in response to feedback on this program. As NR21 was conceived and launched, the State issued a request for proposal (RFP) for a full service provider for a device at a low cost, integration services, maintenance of the device, replacement of the device, coordinated professional development and options for networking. It came as a complete seat cost. Therefore, we have the approximate seat costs on the bottom of [Exhibit C](#), page 34.

What we realized when we initiated this grant, was that some districts had their own device already in place. Moving to a new device was not cost effective for them and would have presented challenges in their district. We offered three options. The first option was to go with the State device for the Program and use all the services. There is some value in scale when all this is done at the same time. The NR21 team has found a Windows device. So now, we have two devices that are under State purchasing. The other two options allow districts to utilize their own device and have the opportunity to bring their own technology to the table and participate in the NR21 activities, like the professional development or digital learning coach and the onsite information technology (IT) technician. The third option removes the onsite IT technician.

We are trying to be responsive to some of the nuances with our partners and at the same time leverage what we have. The way that we envision it, we provide the district a coupon for the dollar value that the State was able to obtain in supporting a device that meets the minimum standards.

[Exhibit C](#), page 35, represents what a NR21 classroom would look like versus a typical classroom. About 48 percent of our classrooms are not sufficiently ready with the technology infrastructure to do a significant amount of work leveraging technology for learning.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 15

The external evaluation did result in continued funding. The NR21 looks promising, but I need more time to really understand its impact. We are recommending this program be maintained at \$10 million over the two years of the biennium.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

I am glad we rolled the NR21 out slowly. The whole idea was to evaluate how it was going to work. When I look at the list of schools that received this, it is obvious what areas of town we are operating in. It is not representative of the school district that my district lies in. How were these schools chosen? If we want to really understand how this program is going to work, it has to be distributed widely. We need to understand how it is going to work in all schools, one-star, two-star, Rising Star and Shining Star schools. This list does not represent all schools.

MR. CANAVERO:

We have been discussing this question quite a bit as well. How do we ensure the programs and opportunities we have are equitable across all students and districts. The percentage of students with individual education plans (IEP), the percentage of English language learners (ELL), and the percentage of students with free or reduced price lunch (FRL), in this first round of applicants does not approximate the State's typical distribution of students. This would be worked on in the next iteration when we establish "Cohort II" over the next biennium.

This is a grant opportunity. Districts and schools submit grant applications. In some cases, schools did not submit grant applications due to barriers or challenges the districts had in regard to devices.

We have 13 urban schools and 10 rural schools in the Program. We would like to continue to offer NR21 across all of our schools and ensure we catch all students, ELL students in particular, as well as students available for FRL.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

I was happy to see they reached out to Lund, Nevada. How do we really evaluate the NR21 when we do not have a full picture? I do understand the grant. The problem with grants is schools need the resources, time and staff to be able to apply for the grant. If you are in a school that has issues and the

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 16

focus is on students, are you going to have the resources to focus on a grant? Maybe we need to be proactive and reach out to those schools and districts to make sure they have these resources.

MR. CANAVERO:

We had the external evaluator present in both the Senate and Assembly. It is a challenge to evaluate the Program in a scientific way. We can bring quantitative data to bear across school types that service differently to appreciate the effect that this would have on outcomes for students. What we have been able to collect is qualitative data or nonnumber data. For instance this program has really helped me as a teacher do "x, y or z." This data is reflected in the external evaluation. It is trending positive in terms of support for the teacher in integrating technology in student learning.

As we roll out Cohort II, we will be strategic and thoughtful about ensuring that we capture a representative cross section of our schools. We can create priorities within the grant that would prioritize one type of school over another. We can also encourage our superintendents. We hope that by listening, responding and providing different options for them to engage in, this grant will certainly open up the number of interested districts and schools. We can work with our rural partners in a consortium.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Could we have the list of the schools that applied for the NR21 grant, but did not receive it, as soon as possible? This way, we can determine who applied for and who received the NR21 grant.

SENATOR DENIS:

All the schools in my district have one-to-one devices, but they are not on this list. I do not know why. If you are going to be evaluating the Program, it seems you would want to make sure you are including these schools. They are U.S. Department of Education Title I schools, and I think they were the first ones to get it.

MR. CANAVERO:

We only reported on the schools that received the NR21 grant funding. I recognize that many schools received one-to-one devices.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 17

SENATOR DENIS:

Our schools have the devices, but did not receive them under the NR21 grant.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

In addition to the schools on the NR21 list, would you provide the Subcommittees and Fiscal Division staff a list of the others that are in the Title I Program Senator Denis mentioned.

MR. CANAVERO:

I certainly will. I have three requests: schools that applied for the NR21 grant and did not receive funding, all of the one-to-one schools and the schools that have received the NR21 grant.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

I do realize we want to diversify the infusion of funds and opportunities to our different schools, but I think we should look at the impact of technology on our younger learners. I have had conversations with "academics" who think at times the way to meet certain populations of students is through devices. For example, if an ELL student has a device there is a propensity to accelerate an ELL acquisition because the device helps differentiate instruction in the classroom. Maybe we want to do something that is fair and equitable, but maybe we need to pilot something that is intentional to see if we have gains by tweaking a component or two.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

In Clark County, all of these are middle schools. We talked about as the student goes from the middle school to high school the Program would follow them. I also second Assemblywoman Diaz's comments regarding elementary students. Where is the NDOE on K-12?

MR. CANAVERO:

The reason why middle school was chosen, and the priority for NR 21 under the proposal is to remain in middle school, is because we lose the connection with students and the students lose their connection to learning in middle school. It was one of the areas we canvassed in the investments we made across the Pre-K through 12th grade continuum. We did not have a particular initiative here or available funds to be used for technology. This is why the intention of NR21

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 18

was to remain in middle school and continues to be. We will continue to support the districts sustainability of Cohort I moving through, and then we will pick up 9,000 to 12,000 new students under Cohort II.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Do you have any Program adjustments going forward?

MR. CANAVERO:

I would classify the options I discussed as being the most significant program adjustments in how we recognize and work with our district partners on NR21. If a district choses to use their own device, we would not be paying \$1,000 for their device, because we can meet the minimum requirements for NR21 at \$250 to \$300 for the device itself.

MR. CANAVERO:

Social Workers in Schools was another program initiated in 2015. We maintain the base funding of \$22.4 million over the biennium. We do have a budget bill to request unspent funds in one year of the biennium be brought forward to the next year of the biennium. This is done for a number of our grant programs. Director Christina McGill is working hard to determine what other funds could be utilized for a sustainable path in order to bring more social workers or other mental health professionals into this field, given the success of the Program. We will have some recommendations that do not restrict the type of social worker or other mental health professional. We are looking at various streams of funding from insurance, Medicaid as well as others, that could be used to support additional social workers. Director McGill will speak to this.

[Exhibit C](#), page 39, shows 11 districts and 7 charters in FY 2016-2017 with 165 schools being served by 225 social workers or other mental health professionals. We will utilize school climate data in order to appreciate the effect that our social workers have on improving school climate and culture.

[Exhibit C](#), page 40, shows some baseline data. This Program was evaluated by the external evaluator. The recommendation was to continue the funding. They cite a number of positives with the Social Workers in School Program, [Exhibit C](#), page 41.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 19

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

When we implemented the Program last Session, we discussed the issue of getting social workers and other mental health professionals into the schools. It looks like we have been coming close to our target numbers and projected numbers from the last biennium. Is that correct?

MR. CANAVERO:

Yes, and we continue to have concerns about developing our workforce much like teaching professionals. It is important to continue this focus and not let up on the gas pedal. We have 225 social workers and other licensed health professionals supporting our students.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

It is a grant program. What do grant requests look like for the upcoming biennium?

CHRISTINA MCGILL (Director, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment, Nevada Department of Education):

This year, our grant applications have gone out to the districts. They are a little bit different. One of the aspects we wanted to continue was how important social workers are in the relationships they build with students. We wanted to ensure those relationships were intact. We are putting priority funding first to the schools that already have social workers in place in order to continue. Then, if there is new funding that becomes available, or as we get districts and other partners on board for the match, we will be opening it up to new schools.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

If you open up to new schools, do you have any idea if 100 percent of the dollars will be used for the schools in place now or will there be room to bring in more schools?

Ms. MCGILL:

If all of our social workers return, we will be overspent by \$78,000. It really is about maintenance.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 20

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

Why is Clark County School District (CCSD) experiencing a high turnover rate for their social workers and other licensed mental health workers with the Program only in its second year?

Ms. MCGILL:

Clark County has been very active in working with us to get the turnover rate down. One of the reasons that Mr. Canavero has requested flexibility is the issue of contractor versus employee. Social workers are contract employees. We are losing some because they want health insurance or other benefits. We have created pathways that social workers can come up from the high schools. We want to hire employees that look like our students in our districts. We want pathways that start people off as contract employees and then allow them to transition to employees of the districts.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I heard you mention leveraging of funds. I heard you discuss Medicaid and that these services could be reimbursable. Could you please discuss in a big picture way how these funds would work together.

Ms. MCGILL:

We are working closely with the Medicaid programs and the districts to look at some of our Tier 3 services, that would be groups and individual services. We are looking at billing Medicaid for those services. Because these are State funds, they can act as a Medicaid match. We are looking at cost-based Medicaid or continuing professional education. Our larger districts like Clark County are probably the most interested in this route. We are also looking at our smaller districts to partner with federally qualified health centers or community health centers.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

What modifications are anticipated by the NDOE in this next biennium based upon the evaluation of the Social Workers Program?

Ms. MCGILL:

There are several modifications. We want to be sure we are capturing data to get at what is working and what is not working. We are working with all the

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 21

districts. We have some inequity among our districts about the ability to collect data. We are taking the strengths from Clark and Washoe districts and applying them across the State. We pulled quick impact results from Clark County. They are already showing a reduction of expulsions from 4,695 to 1,968. This is the kind of data we would like all districts to be able to realize. The other change is to build a team effort around social emotional learning in all school districts. We are also looking at tiers of support and ensuring that communities and schools are working together in order to respond to our students at the earliest possible intervention.

MR. CANAVERO:

Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG) was started in 2013 with increased investment in 2015. We are recommending base funding of \$7.2 million. Presently we have 12 districts being served with 2,500 students and 160 employers. The results of JAG, [Exhibit C](#), page 45, speak for themselves in terms of the graduation rate and a connection of our most at-risk students. Statistically, these students may not have graduated or have the benefit of a high school diploma going forward.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON:

It is rewarding to receive texts, emails and cards from these JAG students. This program has really made a difference in these students' lives. I thank you for instituting this program and for the vision you had. I look forward to its growth and the huge impact it will have on students.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

What are the outcomes of the JAG or matrix for the Program?

RENÉ CANTU (Executive Director, Jobs for Nevada's Graduates, Inc.):

We have just over 2,500 students currently enrolled at the high school level and at one middle school. We also have an additional 580 students that are in a 12-month follow-up. Jobs and graduation rates are measured. The graduation rate for the class of 2015 was 83 percent. For the class of 2016, we are on track to meet or exceed the 2015 graduation rate. This is 45 percent of our students coming from the bottom quartile academically, with 14 absences on average and a 2.0 grade point average. We look at a number of factors. I would be glad to provide any additional information. We look at students who are

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 22

employed after graduation. We also measure positive outcomes after a student is employed, such as how many of them are getting a raise, a promotion or moving onto a better position. The fourth factor we look at is full-time employment. This is a very important one. It not only looks at employment, but also emphasizes postsecondary enrollment. Full-time placement could be postsecondary enrollment, full-time employment or entry into an apprenticeship or some other program.

One of the reports we provided the Legislative Counsel Bureau indicates the average hourly rate of our students by school. Probably right out of high school the average is about \$9 to \$10 per hour. We compiled our data from 13 districts including 2 students from Dyer, Nevada. Our employers range from Carniceria Mendoza and Deli to the Tesla Giga Factory.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

My notes indicate 54 percent have obtained civilian employment or have enlisted in the military service. Is that over the entire time of the JAG, or is it just this biennium? In previous hearings, that number was much smaller.

MR. CANTU:

The 54 percent represents the 2016 cohort who have been in follow-up for 9 or 10 months. We still have two months of key follow-up remaining with our graduates from last year. We anticipate the 54 percent will go up. Employment for the class of 2015, which was measured, was 78 percent. We have been expanding the pathways to employment during the last couple of years.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

I want to recognize that JAG is doing amazing work for students coming from low socioeconomic situations, or disadvantaged or single parent homes; this program provides another adult they can confide in. It is a quasisocial work program in these schools. I appreciate the work you are doing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

We have to push the focus on career and technical education programming. How do we see these two programs coming together?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 23

MR. CANAVERO:

They are entirely complementary. Career and Technical Education (CTE) would be an engagement in high school for those students who are disengaged in high school and hit the risk factors; the focus is jobs and a high school diploma. JAG has continued to provide solutions, not just for a particular group of students, but also work-based experiences. We have a bill for a pilot on work-based learning experience opportunities for students in high school. JAG has brought to the table a group of employers we can immediately engage in productive conversations about what this would look like with the partnerships already established with employers.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

If there are no other questions on JAG, we can proceed to CTE.

MR. CANAVERO:

Career and Technical Education has base funding of \$25.1 million over the biennium. The way the Program is funded will result in an increase of over \$2 million in the biennium. The funding quadrupled during the budget closure of the last biennium. We do have a budget bill that will do some clean-ups on how the student leadership organizations are funded. You will see student leadership functions in two parts of the budget. We are bringing it all together and providing clarity around student leadership organizations. We are also clarifying in the budget bill that the NBOE would establish criteria and review and award CTE funding. [Exhibit C](#), page 48, shows the enrollment growth in our CTE programs. The next page shows the graduation rate for CTE students.

We have been working over the biennium around career and technical education. It knits together and aligns career and technical education. It engages employers more intentionally. We ensure we have a career-focused accountability system. We need to bring parity to the conversation about career and college.

There is an initiative in the State with policy changes that is in the education Subcommittees that do in fact bring parity. A student who is prepared to engage in a high-skill and high-demand job will likely need postsecondary education, but less than a bachelor's degree. We need an accountability system by which schools earn star ratings, that have equal value for a student who is

prepared to engage in nonremedial credit-bearing coursework and is on a path for a baccalaureate degree, equal to a student seeking postsecondary education to engage in a high-skill, high-demand job.

The other conversation is around certificates of value. We believe a certificate of value means a certificate that is honored by industry or honored by postsecondary education institutions. If there is no commensurate obligation on the employer to value or provide incentive for a student to earn a certificate in high school or thereafter, the value proposition falls apart. We are also working to align State and federal funding streams and work on cross-institutional alignment. You will see this in a form of a policy when we try to codify what the Governor created by executive order, the Office of Workforce Innovation. I see this Office providing a critical connection that the NDOE otherwise does not have with industry. The industry sector councils will help establish for NDOE that bull's eye. Where do we align these experiences for students that meet employer demand.

We were one state of ten to receive the New Skills for Youth Grant. This is a national grant funded through JP Morgan Chase and run by the Council of Chief State School Officers. We received a Phase I grant to help do some of this planning.

The Phase II grant, that we were awarded, was very competitive. I think it is a recognition that we are headed in the right direction, aligning these programs to the industry demand and ensuring our students have multiple pathways to be successful throughout high school.

Among the other states that were awarded, two states have begun to model some of our graduation pathways. We hope this will come through the policy side in Assembly Bill (A. B.) 7. Assembly Bill 7 was submitted in November. This is a conversation that is coming to fruition and to finality now. The NDOE is talking about establishing graduation pathways that include career, college, and career and college pathways. What we learned from CTE was that students who were engaged in learning and have real time experiences in a pathway are highly more likely to graduate and find employment after high school.

[Assembly Bill 7](#): Revises provisions related to education. (BDR 34-126)

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 25

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Can you talk about the relationship with community colleges in this effort. I know there is a lot of partnership already taking place, but how do we strengthen and expand to make sure those are aligned?

MR. CANAVERO:

The last 16 months our work with Frank Woodbeck, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), and industry representatives around our New Skills for Youth grant application, was to ensure we have that cross-institutional alignment. The Office of Workforce Innovation can coordinate and focus the work on the industry demand for NSHE, community colleges, NDOE, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) and the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED). Two resolutions were passed because of the partnership of NBOE and NSHE regents. One is to continue the expansion of career and technical education, in particular, the Learn and Earn Advanced Career Pathway (LEAP), the learn and earn framework. This framework provides a way for K-12 and postsecondary partners for students to move not only to gain fulltime employment, but also to continue on to an educational system and attain degrees that will advance them on a career ladder. We have the systems in place. Now we are looking to execute on that system and align it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

What are these pathways we are going to actively pursue as a State to ensure that our schools and higher education systems are aligned?

MR. CANAVERO:

Twenty percent of our CTE dollars we award competitively. We would try to bend the curve to initiate or expand the CTE pathways that lead to high-skill and high-demand jobs. We would prioritize particular pathways as a State for our students that are aligned to our industry needs. How do we get that alignment? Before we had engagements with industry sector councils in soft relationships with GOED as they ran their numbers to understand where the jobs are headed. Since that time, our engagement has been more formal and robust. We would be able to receive information from the Office of Workforce Innovation to help us as a State and the NBOE to identify those in-demand pathways. It also means we need to work with our district partners to begin to scale down pathways that do not lead to meaningful careers. The next part of the

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 26

conversation is to understand where investments are being made. We want to keep students in high school and provide a pathway that is aligned to an emerging industry or middle-skill job layer. We know 48 percent of the future jobs will be in this layer.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

When you say things do not align. What are we talking about?

MR. CANAVERO:

I do not know if I am ready to discuss what pathways. However, we would be able to say with the existing CTE programming in the State, we could align those programs to the high priority industries. We could immediately incentivize the growth of those programs. Then, we have a conversation with districts to say we see 4,000 students enrolled in program "X." We need to have a conversation on how that aligns with future industry needs and create a path that will either work or not work, to provide a student an opportunity that does align.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

If there are no further questions on CTE, we will move to the Adult High School Diploma Program.

MR. CANAVERO:

Adult education provides educational opportunities that assist adult learners in development of meaningful and productive lives. This is not the Adult Basic Education. We have one final hearing in which adult basic education is transferred over to DETR. This is our adult education for adults to earn adult standard diplomas. We continue with base funding of the biennium. We have a split, 68 percent goes to public programs, and 32 percent goes to correctional programs.

The five-year enrollment growth based on these two buckets is on [Exhibit C](#), page 54. The next page provides the outcomes of providing these opportunities to students earning a high school diploma. Other students go through the high school equivalency. We now have a few assessments to provide the high school equivalency diploma. A number of programs to complete a vocational certificate are offered as well.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 27

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO:

In terms of the adult high school diploma, have we made progress on an online level? What are the Program retention rates?

MR. CANAVERO:

I am not prepared today to give you those numbers. The programs we did not spend a significant amount of time on are the College and Career Readiness and Advanced Placement (AP) programs. College and Career Readiness was funded in FY 2015-2016 at \$3 million and in FY 2016-2017 at \$5 million. In the *Executive Budget*, funding is \$5 million for each biennium year for the College and Career Readiness Program and \$1 million for each biennium year for AP.

At our last budget meeting, we talked about the change in the way federal funds flow and that in the U.S. Department of Education, Title IV funds, the AP costs are now embedded in a number of others to help defray costs for students in poverty to take the AP examination. This is where the State funding supports the continued expansion of AP, in particular the expansion of AP for two groups of students, our African American and Native American students. These two groups have the most significant gap between participation rates and the national participation rates. This initiative began in 2015. We will continue to use the AP funds to narrow that gap.

We do have a budget bill, and this bill will seek to utilize some of the funding from the College and Career Readiness Grant to pay for the pilot in our work-based learning bill. This is a policy bill that opens up a pilot program to reenvision the authentic engagements of work-based learning. It is our former internship bill that we are modeling. We just had a pilot, and if money is available, we would like to use a small amount between \$500,000 and \$1 million to support districts to help provide better work-based learning opportunities for our students. The budget bill continues to support dual enrollment under the College and Career Readiness, specifically Senate Bill 66. This is the Governor's Office dual enrollment bill.

SENATE BILL 66: Revises provisions relating to internship programs.
(BDR 34-254)

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 28

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Do you have any information how the College and Career Readiness grants were utilized by schools and school districts to support and increase Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) courses?

MR. CANAVERO:

Yes, in 2017 about \$2.4 million was awarded for STEM. There was a priority in the College and Career Readiness grant for STEM dual enrollment and we have merged it all with AP. Douglas County added new computer science courses for middle and high school students. Elko County added Project Lead The Way for all students and added a STEM teacher to their staff.

In Clark County, 45 to 60 middle school teachers completed the middle school coding training in January of 2016. Eighty-one hundred middle school students participated in the middle school coding course. Students at five high schools participated in the Microsoft Office Specialist or the Microsoft Technology Associates Certification. In Washoe County, additional computer science coding occurred in two middle school classes.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

One of the things I liked about AP is the ability for students to gain college credits and have those credits accepted. I am hearing mixed things about whether colleges are actually accepting AP credits. Have you noticed changes in these trends?

MR. CANAVERO:

I have not seen a significant shift. Yes, in some cases they apply to a more diffused general education credit than offsetting a particular credit hour for a particular course. It may look aligned with the AP class the student entered into. There is tremendous ancillary value to the AP programming in addition to offsetting credit in college. It provides exposure for our teachers to teach AP-level coursework. If it was just a credit-to-credit conversation then our dual enrollment would likely be a better way to ensure that students who enroll in a particular program have the commensurate offsetting credits to that specific course in college.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 29

We have estimated that the 1,620 students were served in FY 2015-2016 in our dual enrollment under the College and Career Readiness grant. That would be an estimated savings of \$786,000 to students who earned 8,641 college credits.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

Why are the districts not spending AP grant monies for test fees for African-American students?

MR. CANAVERO:

I would need to look into that. I hope it is wrong. I will circle back on this concern.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Mr. Canavero we do have on our agenda the AP grant program. Do you have it later on in your presentations? If not, let us cover some other questions on AP.

MR. CANAVERO:

I do not have any other detail on the AP programming.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We want you to provide us a response to Assemblywoman Diaz's question. Please give us a quick overview of the AP grant program.

MR. CANAVERO:

The AP programs funded an offset for testing fees for students. The other is to provide teacher training and professional development across the State. The other is a very specific carve out of a test fee coverage for the two populations of students we have been talking about, African American and American Indian students, and funds to participate in AP courses across the State. We have almost \$1 million in AP funds that we were able to utilize not including the federal dollars we had in FY 2015-2016 or FY 2016-2017. We understood the federal dollars for AP fee reimbursement to the State would be folded into Title IV. We had a conversation with our district superintendents about utilizing Title I, Direct Student Services, as an opportunity that the State would have to reserve up to 3 percent of the total Title I dollars to provide across State servicing.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 30

Clark County School District has an incredible AP engine or way to distribute AP courses across the State at an incredibly low cost. There were some challenges in terms of the funding. As we move forward, we will retain our commitment to narrowing the gap between where we are in our national averages for certain student populations. We would also like to continue to explore the opportunity to provide AP programming to include the teacher by the generous offer of Clark County to other districts across the State. Especially, those districts who do not offer or have never offered AP programming primarily because of not having teachers or enough staff.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Would you confirm for us that the NDOE no longer permits indirect costs to be an allowable expenditure on the State-funded grants?

MR. CANAVERO:

That is presently where we are. We have received clarity that indirect costs cannot be charged against State grants. They can be charged against federal grants. If the Legislature made clear that an indirect could be charged against a State-funded grant, then the NDOE would follow your direction.

We have transfer enhancements transferring Zoom, Victory, and New Teacher Incentives to the Other State Education Programs, B/A 101-2699, from the Remediation Trust Account, B/A 101-2615. We are transferring our Wide Area Network funding to the Office of Science Innovation and Technology; that is consistent in coordinating all the work through that office. The Enhancement Summary and Gifted and Talented Education is provided on [Exhibit C](#), page 60.

NDE — Contingency Account for Special Ed Services — Budget Page K-12
EDUCATION-28 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2615

E-905 Transfers to Distributive School Account — Page K-12 EDUCATION-30

We will move to B/A 101-2618, Professional Development Programs Account. The task force on professional development finalized its report in January. They have requested or recommended to adopt standards. I think they used the seven learning forward standards but added two more, one centered around

equity and the other around cultural competency. The Statewide standards would drive professional development. If we are doing something or making investments in a program to provide professional development there should be a base of evidence that would suggest it is the right thing to do.

NDE - Professional Development Programs — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-26
(Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2618

On the policy side, there are a number of recommendations aligning professional development with State priorities. A way to drive the needs to improve instructional practices in our classrooms for individual teachers can be made with a number of recommendations around reporting, licensure and the Commission on Professional Standards, and linking professional development to online renewal or initial licensure, and using the Nevada Educational Performance Framework (NEPF). There are recommendations related to the budget. The recommendation is if the Legislature is going to adopt a new program, make sure you include professional development.

The GTLF supports our professional development of educational personnel as well as recruiting and retaining and selecting teachers and leaders. It originated last Session with \$9.8 million over the biennium. We will continue with the base funding. We have 14 entities awarded in FY 2015-2016 and 20 entities in FY 2016-2017. We had 175 preservice candidates and 25,708 teachers or leaders served by this investment. There is a provision with this fund that allows the NBOE to identify some priorities. I listed a couple on [Exhibit C](#), page 12, to give you an idea where the NBOE is with their day-to-day interactions with the challenges we face as a State and how they are responding to the challenges. The FY 2015-2016 priorities include science, implementation of the NEPF, and the recruitment of effective teachers and leaders, as well as an emphasis on leadership. In FY 2016-2017, it was a little bit more specific in regard to science, looking at integrating real world applications, effective use of instructional technology, leadership development and the role that the leader would play in the retention of effective leaders at a particular school site in addition to teacher preparation and recruitment.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 32

[Exhibit C](#), page 13, discusses generally the provisions of the bill, S. B. No. 474 of the 78th Session. I provided the recipients of the GTLF in FY 2015-2016 which included nonprofits, employee organizations and NSHE.

The external evaluation does suggest to continue funding. They also see that emerging practice holds some promise for the State, in full recognition of the problems that we face as a State and nationally. There are recommendations within the task force report that we should consider moving forward. The GTLF recommendations are centered around alignment with the proposed professional development standards and the use of evidence-based practices to measure outcomes for students as a way to measure outputs rather than inputs.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

When we look at the amounts recommended for each priority on the initial grants, science standards was 24 percent, NEPF was 27.6 percent, recruitment selection and retention was 29 percent and leadership training and development was 19.4 percent. How did you get to those percentages in your prioritizing?

MR. CANAVERO:

The bill does provide for some guidance with regards to the categories and how much a particular organization would be funded.

KELEE DUPUIS (Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development & Support, Nevada Department of Education):

There is a cap. Each entity is not allowed to be awarded any more than approximately \$973,000. However, there is no specific amount that the review team was directed to award in each category. The totals Chair Woodhouse just read were the outcomes of the review team's recommendations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

I do see the much-needed efforts on recruitment, selection and retention. Are we keeping track of return on investment of these monies? Are we collecting the data to see if the awards are actually paying off? In my experience having taught more than 15 years, I have seen many of these programs bring in teachers where they work a few years and then move on to other opportunities.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 33

MR. CANAVERO:

There is a return on investment for the Teach Nevada Scholarship. The Victory and Zoom teaching opportunities provide recruitment and retention. The problem you outline is the problem we are trying to solve by growing and keeping effective educators in the classroom. I think this is why you see the focus on leadership to ensure there is a clear role for the leader to play in the retention of educators at their school site.

The first year of the biennium was a rush to figure out how to be fiscally responsible in terms of allocating these dollars and reviewing the grant applications and working with districts to stand this up. We have at the same time started to build the infrastructure to appreciate and answer some of the questions you are asking.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Based upon your experience of less than two years with the GTLF, are you considering any modifications to the Program around awarding the grants, as there were some concerns by some of the organizations that applied and did not get an award and they wanted to know why they did not?

MR. CANAVERO:

Yes, we have an obligation to the State to review the GTLF. Working with the NBOE, we refined the composition of the review team, the rubric and the application that is somewhat responsive to the questions we heard in the first iteration of the GTLF. It is a continuous process that we work through. Other than the standard federal pass-through dollars, all of our programs that are awarded go through continuous review. We want to make sure we are selecting the right partners to invest in to serve our students and teachers.

On [Exhibit C](#), page 65, is B/A 101-2718, Teach Nevada Scholarship Program. This program provides scholarships to students who are entering into our colleges and universities and other providers of alternative licensure programs. It originated last Session. The key aspect of this program is a student can receive up to \$24,000, \$3,000 per semester; of which 75 percent is paid to the institution not the student, 25 percent is reserved for the student and only distributed after 5 years of teaching in Nevada public schools. This is an incentive to recruit teachers and provide an incentive to keep teachers in

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 34

Nevada for five years. The NBOE does have the ability to identify and place teachers in a high vacancy school for three of the five years. We publish each year of the scholarship award a list of schools that have high vacancy rates. There is a priority for individual scholarship applicants who are economically disadvantaged, race or ethnic minority, veterans, or spouses of veterans, and also in high-need subjects or grades. There is a \$1,000 bonus to incentivize our providers to stick with it and continue to have that student pursue the degree. There is a \$1,000 penalty to the provider if the student does not complete.

NDE - Teach Nevada Scholarship Program — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-34
(Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2718

In FY 2015-2016, the NBOE prioritized the alternative route for licensure recipients. This was to address the immediate shortage. The NBOE had multiple discussions and spent time understanding the gravity of the vacancy issue in our State. In this case, they chose to make a decision to bring forward as many teachers as possible. They awarded 142 scholarships to 6 providers. As of August 2016, 100 or more teachers were hired and are serving in our high-vacancy schools. Fifteen were eligible for hire upon completing coursework or the competency exams.

In FY 2016-2017, they recognized that the Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) is a quick solution but also wanted to build a pipeline for traditional candidates. They balanced this with ARL and traditional scholarships. There is a second phase of applications that are pending. We continue with the base funding of \$5 million in each year of the biennium. We have an enhancement unit, E-285, for \$1 million.

E-285 Educated and Healthy Citizenry — Page K-12 EDUCATION-34

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

Why have we gone fully to the ARL piece? I thought this was unfair to those who select to be teachers as their career, when they could be Nevada born and raised students. It is important that we do have a balance and help all the pools of students as much as we can. I also want to know why there is such a

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 35

difference in the cost. Clark County is \$24,000 per recipient, Lincoln County is \$12,000 per recipient.

MR. CANAVERO:

Some of the district providers for ARL come in at a lower cost. It is really driven by the institutions' tuitions and costs. Students can apply directly to the institution, or they can apply to multiple institutions to find their best value.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I thought I heard you say \$5 million per year, but it is \$2.5 million for each year of the biennium with an additional \$1 million, totaling \$6 million for the biennium, correct?

MR. CANAVERO:

Yes, that is correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

I have a concern about the five-year commitment. We had another program in the past where we gave the retirement credits, and it created an issue. With this program we are asking students to make a commitment, yet we have school districts talking about layoffs. I want to make sure students are not left in a "catch-22" where they did the right thing and, through no fault of their own, it may not work out for them. Has there been any discussions around this issue? Is there something we need to do in the language to protect those teachers?

MR. CANAVERO:

That is a very good point, and we need to have discussions. Perhaps we can bring some suggestions.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

The money goes to the different institutions. How does the money get turned back when it has not been utilized the correct way?

MR. CANAVERO:

Is your question, "if we provide a scholarship to an institution and they do not expend those dollars how do they return them?"

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 36

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:
Yes.

MR. CANAVERO:
We have had a challenge as a State communicating clearly with our grantees and have those funds returned in time. What we see is that the balance carried forward changes when a grantee returns funds late. If something nefarious is happening, that is a different path we would take. The vast majority of our work is on a reimbursement basis. We only fund when they have already spent the dollars and can demonstrate those expenditures. A few of the grants in FY 2015-2016 went out on a front end and we corrected that in FY 2016-2017. It was part of our growing process as we launched a huge number of programs in FY 2015-2016.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:
We do not have to be concerned about the front loaded dollars because it is being done on a reimbursement basis for students who do not complete the program. How do we track these awards?

MR. CANAVERO:
I will provide this information to the Subcommittees and Staff.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:
Is the full amount we appropriate enough to cover the full run of the scholarship in the year they are awarded? Do we hold the 25 percent in reserve or trust? We are funding the full cost of the scholarship for that student. If we did not fund the money we appropriated last Session, is it enough to cover the scholarships for the full five-year run for the students awarded in year one?

MR. CANAVERO:
That is my understanding.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:
What happens to the funds when a student drops out of the program?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 37

MR. CANAVERO:

These funds are awarded on a per-scholarship basis. The NBOE reallocates those remaining scholarships to another institution with a bench. Alternatively, we had a case where we awarded 10 scholarships, but they were able to serve 12 students with the 10 scholarship monies. Then we had to go back and do policy gymnastics to ensure they are able to serve all 12 with the 10 scholarship monies. The NBOE keeps track and reports and may readjust the awards to meet the demand.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

Let us say that there is a student with a scholarship who participates the first year and then decides they do not want to teach. What happens when they start and then do not complete?

MR. CANAVERO:

Ultimately, there is a \$1,000 penalty for the student that does not complete. The institution providing the support for that student pays the \$1,000 penalty.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I am not sure we are clear on this concern. We will pursue it further with you.

MR. CANAVERO:

It is actually not intuitive on how the whole process works. The NBOE hears this every third meeting in order to get updates and allocations correctly. The \$1,000 penalty is complicated to figure out and budget for, but it is in the statute.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I understand that the NBOE and the NDOE are working on regulations on this Teach Nevada Scholarship Program. What is the status of those regulations?

MR. CANAVERO:

I will circle back with you on the exact status of the regulations. It has not been heard in the last four to six months. We have not had the adoption of these particular regulations.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 38

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Those regulations might help solve some of the questions of the Subcommittees.

MR. CANAVERO:

We will move on to B/A 101-2717. This account provides for reimbursement of certain out-of-pocket school supplies for teachers. It originated last Session. It has a base funding of \$5 million over the biennium. We have reimbursed teachers from all 17 school districts and 36 of the charter schools in FY 2015-2016. About 73 percent of all teachers benefited from this program.

NDE - Teachers' School Supplies Reimbursement — Budget Page K-12
EDUCATION-38 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2717

In FY 2015-2016, funding was "upfront" based on self-reported counts of teachers as of August 2015. At that time, we had 24,334 teachers reported and \$2.5 million available. Each teacher received \$102.73. This was the amount used to determine each entity's allocation, not to exceed \$250 per teacher according to the statute. The reimbursements were locally managed. At year-end, the entities submit a financial report and return any unused funds. In FY 2015-2016, we had a little over \$500,000 returned in unused funds. The total number of teachers reimbursed was 17,832. The average teacher reimbursement was \$108.00.

In FY 2016-2017, the self-reported counts in August 2016 was 24,961 teachers and a little over \$3 million was available. This amount includes the unused amount of \$574,316 from FY 2015-2016. The reimbursement amount was calculated at \$123.16 per teacher. I captured data as of February 1, 2017. We had \$10,000 requested for reimbursement. Per Roger Rahming as of March 15, 2017, it was \$13,364 requested for reimbursement.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

My understanding is that substitute teachers are not eligible for this program. Are long-term substitute teachers exempt from participating in the reimbursements?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 39

MR. CANAVERO:

I believe it is only licensed and contracted teachers.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

I was surprised to see money was returned in FY 2015-2016. Are there any plans to improve the participation rate? If so, what are those plans?

MR. CANAVERO:

We will continue to work with the districts to understand what barriers are in place. I know there has been some concern about the receipt requirement. I am certainly hopeful that all of the \$3 million will be expended in this biennium.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Librarians are also excluded from participation in this program because they are not licensed teachers, correct?

MR. CANAVERO:

They are not included.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

That is a concern I have because I feel that the libraries are the heart of the school in a number of ways. Previously, Clark County had a program where they used a bankcard and the cards were tracked. It was an automatic receipt system, which eliminated the need to keep receipts. Are there any discussions of going to this method for the reimbursement of school supplies for teachers? We know how many teachers there are in each school. We send the cards to the school and each teacher signs for the card. Would this be easier?

MR. CANAVERO:

We will have the conversation with Clark County and evaluate the costs involved.

NICOLE ROURKE (Associate Superintendent, Clark County School District):

It was our intention to use the bankcard system for this program over the last biennium. Unfortunately, the bank that offered the program previously did not make it available again. The cost to do this was prohibitive to provide all the cards.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 40

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

If we had someone willing to do this, would the district be happy to work with them?

Ms. ROURKE:

Absolutely, it was far easier. I have provided my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

I will do my homework to get my gold star on this one. Madam Chair, I feel very strongly about pursuing this and believe the librarians should be included in this program.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I have three items that we had in our notes for a quick overview. Please give us a quick overview on the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDP)?

MR. CANAVERO:

The base funding of \$15.1 million over the biennium is maintained for the three regional programs: the southern region, the northwest and the northeast region. We will continue to engage with our RPDPs and with the Statewide coordinating council. We will be working with them in the various programs and the task force report to establish and adopt professional development standards across the State.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The RPDPs are a critical part of our professional development Statewide. Secondly, can you provide an overview of the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Program? My understanding is that the Governor's recommendation is not to fund this program.

MR. CANAVERO:

When we went through our budget bill process, we concluded that PAR was a one-time expenditure in the last Session and it would then expire. As far as I know, PAR in Clark County is going well. I have not received a formal report on this, but the information that Deputy Dena Durish shares, suggests that it is going as intended. I cannot speak to the details of this program but the districts could.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 41

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I understand there will be a bill draft request coming. Could you please discuss the Harbor Master Program? We had a long discussion on this at a recent Interim Finance Committee meeting on this program.

MR. CANAVERO:

The Harbor Master Program is another one-time or one-shot funding program. It is rolled out on a one-to-one match basis. For every dollar of private money or philanthropy that is raised by the Harbor Master, they are eligible to receive \$1 of the Harbor Master funds not-to-exceed \$10 million over the biennium. Thus far, we are at a little over \$5.5 million in State funds. I receive quarterly updates. I have not looked at the most recent quarter. They have a number of activities that are scoped and approved in response to the RFP process. We selected Opportunity 180 as the Harbor Master. Within the RFP, there is a contract with the State that states all the services they are to provide. It includes providing information research to the State regarding education. They provide coordinated services with charter schools and charter school organizations, both local and across the Nation. Most recently, you may be aware of the Achievement School District and the partnership with Democracy Prep and Andre Agassi and with a school called Futuro. This is a new charter school, which will be in place shortly in the CCSD. Both of these schools were part of the Opportunity 180 outreach program. The Opportunity Program assisted in developing the school leader at Futuro and helped with coordinating and working with Democracy Prep. The Program also helps schools grow local leaders and recruit out-of-state and national talent.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I am looking at the personnel costs for this program. Are these costs for the management of these funds, and are these personnel costs passed through?

MR. CANAVERO:

Whose personnel costs are you referring to?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I am referring to the Charter School Harbor Master Expenditure Report, category Personnel Costs, listed as \$349,333.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 42

MR. CANAVERO:

Part of the obligation of Opportunity 180 is to report back to the State. Personnel costs are supported with philanthropic dollars non-State match. State match goes towards direct costs in accordance with the contract.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

Where did the State dollars get expended?

MR. CANAVERO:

We can provide more information with regard to the services that are funded with local raised dollars versus State dollars. Community engagement efforts, for example, are where they have open houses or community engagement efforts which are not specific to a particular charter school. They are specific to education and choice, magnets, etc., in Clark County. It does not go to specific charter organizations. They have done quite a bit of work trying to appreciate the significant challenge to the expansion of charter schools with regard to adequate facilities. They have been working with Clark County, other commissions and other national groups to find a pathway for school facilities. The example we are learning from is Futuro, our local school and leader, to understand what the process looks like to inform the State. Other examples would be leadership development. I believe this program is working on this development.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

What I am looking for is how the dollars were appropriated and the categories of expenditures. I can talk to you more offline. I am interested in how the \$10 million dollars was spent.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

When you have the report ready, can you please forward it to our Staff?

SENATOR DENIS:

What is the current situation with the Harbor Master? I believe I read that the executive director is moving out of state.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 43

MR. CANAVERO:

My understanding is that they are launching a recruitment for a new leader. I do not know where they are at in the process. I have spoken with their board president, Steve McCracken.

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

I want to address questions discussed previously. Assemblywoman Diaz asked about our Read By Grade Three Program regarding parent notification. I sent a link to Ms. Diaz and you, Chair Woodhouse, to some of the paper work we use. I can assure you it is not just a single letter that goes home. We have online videos, parent classes and lesson plans that go home. We have done quite a bit with social media.

Senator Kieckhefer asked about Turnaround Schools. Yes, we at the district select who will apply to the State for those funds. There are restrictions about Zoom schools; they cannot be Victory schools or Read By Three schools. The Turnaround schools are another layer. We pick schools that we are not layering on top of them but maybe are not being served by other programs or funding sources.

Regarding the GATE Program, in Washoe County, we are doing universal screening for all of our first and fifth graders. It is not based on a teacher's recommendation. Every one of our first and fifth graders is tested. We really are acknowledging and addressing the disproportionality issue this way. There are varying levels of gifted services. We have some students receiving services once a week and some with a fully intensive program, all the way through elementary school to high school. We have a great GATE Program at Hug High School right now.

The NR21 was discussed with Clark County. Washoe County School District opted not to apply for NR21, and some of those concerns are being addressed now. Originally, it was specific to either opt in or opt out. You either signed up for the whole program or not at all. Initially, it was device specific. You had to get their computer and make it work with your system. At the time, we said that computer does not work with our system, and we will explore other ways to bring devices into the hands of our students. We worked really hard to

express our concerns with NDOE and wanted to engage in NR21. Local devices and the flexibility that Mr. Canavero discussed was good news.

The teacher reimbursements will get better over time as more teachers know about the Program. The feedback we heard about was that teachers would purchase school supplies along with personal items and the receipts were mixed with school items and personal items. They would have to highlight the items on the receipts that were the school supplies prior to turning them in for reimbursement.

The Washoe County School District also has PAR and is in its fourth year, if you count the pilot year. It has been a great tool to improve the practice of our teachers.

You ask great questions about indirect costs, accountability, and how many schools. There is a lot of administration that goes into making sure we are holding those programs accountable. Asking us to pay for the administrative costs with our per-pupil funding related to accountability around grant programs can be a challenge.

CHARLES MANN (Vice President, Nevada Agricultural Teacher's Association; Agriculture Science Teacher, FFA Advisor, Capitol FFA Chapter):

I represent the Nevada Agricultural Teachers Association. I am currently the Vice President. I am supporting proposed B/A 101-2699 for current technical education funding. I am a fourth generation Nevadan. I am greatly impacted by agriculture education and current technical education. I am a member of the FFA and represent Nevada FFA as the State Vice President and National FFA delegate. As a current agricultural science teacher, I have been able to see the impact of current technical student organizations and the scope of many people's lives. My students benefit from current technical education programs because they are able to have hands on experience to expose them to potential career options. This helps them pursue a degree or get a job immediately after high school. Students also receive training in soft skills that employers are looking for. The employers and local community have benefited from students with technical education. They are able to hire students that had real life experience and other students that obtain specific skills certifications. The school districts have benefited because students enrolled in current technical

education have a higher graduation rate and higher test scores. I hope that you see that the current impact of CTE goes beyond the classroom, and current technical student organizations are an integral part of CTE's success. Every CTE pathway is aligned with the current technical student organization that is an intercurricular part of the standards. Students are asked to perform skills that they have learned in the classroom through a series of practicums, which emulate the tasks being performed in their future careers. Because of these reasons, I support the proposed B/A 101-2699 for CTE funding. I would also like to propose that you revisit *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.392 to use percentages for the disbursement of funds for the benefit of professional development of the instructors that teach CTE as well as the student organizations that provide real everyday success through soft-skill development.

BETSY GILES (Director, National Board Certification Program, Clark County Education Association):

I am the director of the National Board Certification at Clark County Education Association (CCEA). We are in support of the GTLF. We want to share some of the great work that CCEA is doing in partnership with the NDOE. The National Board Certification is teaching professions' gold standard for teaching quality. It is an extremely rigorous performance-based assessment. It takes from one year to three years for a teacher to certify. This program is presently affecting 50,000 students in Clark County. Seventy-five percent are identified as high-need students. We currently have 48 cohorts of teachers going through the certification process. Thirty of these cohorts are located at Title I schools. More than a decade of rigorous research shows that students taught by National Board-certified teachers are more effective in improving student achievement than nonboard-certified teachers. This impact is greater for minority and low-income students. After a year of participation in the GTLF National Board Professional Development school program teachers have reported a 95 percent increase in job satisfaction, a 98 percent increase in collaboration and an 82 percent increase in support for minority and low-income students. I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

Currently Clark County School District (CCSD) is recognized as the district with the highest growth in the Nation. Our program through the GTLF has been identified as the national model for imbedding site-based professional development. Currently, the *Executive Budget* is requesting \$49,000 to

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 46

reimburse teachers for the costs associated with the successful completion of National Board certification. This allotted amount would reimburse approximately 39 teachers.

In the first fiscal year, we are projecting that 85 teachers will certify. In the second fiscal year, 86 will certify. The estimated yearly amount of \$127,000 would be needed. The budget is currently falling short approximately \$77,000. We appreciate your decision to support the GTLF National Board Professional Development school programs. It will transform student achievement especially for students in our highest need communities.

RYAN MERRITT (Principal, Stanford Elementary School, Clark County School District):

I am the Principal of Stanford Elementary School in Clark County. We are a Provision 2 school. This means 100 percent of my students are on FRL. Eighty percent of my students are Hispanic. We are a Zoom School. We are doing amazing things for the students. We were the first National Board of Professional Development school in Clark County. Our teachers have shown above-average progress in obtaining the National Board certification. In the first year, we had ten teachers involved. We currently have 20 teachers on campus involved with this program to be certified. The first year, 85 percent of them passed their component the first time around. The national average is 35 percent for the first time pass rate. I am a firm believer in having the teachers go through this as a cohort and working together. It truly changes how they are able to communicate and bounce ideas off each other and support each other going forward.

My teacher retention rate is almost 100 percent every year. The teachers that transfer are either retiring or those that want to work closer to home. Our students love what we are doing and the teachers are very happy. Conversations have changed from problem children to problems in the classroom and how to resolve them. They are inviting other teachers in to watch teaching and also videotaping the teaching and critiquing one another. This is improving how we teach.

We want to change the image of teachers as professionals and the old saying, "Those who can, do; those who cannot, teach." We throw money at programs,

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 47

and they are not programs that change students. It is teachers that change students. You can give any good teacher a program and the students will learn. It is not programs; it is teachers. All of our professional development is focused around improving teaching and instruction. Every child deserves to have a quality teacher every year in the classroom.

MICHAEL THORSTEINSON (International Baccalaureate MYP Coordinator, Basic Academy of International Studies):

I am a teacher and the International Baccalaureate Coordinator at Basic Academy. When I first started teaching, I was fortunate to have a master or mentor teacher who was going through the National Board certification. I became a part of the process very early on. It has drastically affected the way that I think, the way that I teach and the results I obtain. Because of my mentor's leadership and guidance, I was able to adapt, evolve and become a teacher leader of my own. I am in my first year of the National Board cohort. The Program was quite overwhelming. When Ms. Giles rolled out the opportunity to work as a cohort and have the support, I got on board, as well as 50 other teachers in my high school. This represented over 50 percent of the teachers. We received social, economic and educational support. This program would have been unavailable to them without the support. We are seeing the teachers who previously were intimidated or unwilling to open their doors to let others come in, observe and give honest evaluations. Every student should have good teacher. This program and its support makes this happen.

BRENDA PEARSON (Director of Professional Learning, Clark County Education Association):

I am the director of Professional Learning at the Clark County Education Association. During the 2016-2017 school year, CCEA submitted a GTLF grant with Vegas PBS, called Learn to Lead. Within this grant, we have impacted 119 Title I, Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools, and 36 Title I, Tier 3 and nontitled schools. One-third of our participants are teachers with five or less years of teaching. I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

The GTLF and the NDOE have enabled Learn to Lead educators and licensed professionals to view their potential impact on the educational community as a whole. The initial goal of Learn to Lead was to offer a path for educators and

licensed professionals to develop leadership qualities that would impact their school communities.

Throughout this program, we have discovered many teachers want to become leaders, but there is no commonly agreed upon definition of leadership within our schools. We have found there are two types of leaders: those who want to become leaders in the classroom and those who want to become leaders in the school and community. We came to understand that we have leaders within classrooms and these leaders impact instruction and support student achievement. They are often times the epitome of a leader. Their passion lies within the classroom. Many of these leaders cannot visualize a role that would enable them to impact the school community on a broader scope. This view perpetuates the image of educational silos.

Our original goal of Learn to Lead was to offer a path for these leaders, but we realize there is a secondary goal to breakdown the educational silos. Learn to Lead has developed a platform where silos are broken down. Educators and licensed professionals build networks that will share ideas and collaborate. A new teacher has partnered with an experienced teacher at a Title I school simply because their concerns about their community and their passions are similar. They have collaborated to develop a program to help parents and families feel welcome and valued in their schools. We have found teams of teachers at one at-risk high school focusing on developing school-based mentoring for students of color. We have discovered that there are leaders in schools who have passion to inspire students, schools and families.

Leaders have begun to design solutions to common problems in our schools such as student dropout rates and collaborating with parents to help them realize the potential of college for their child. These solutions are grass-roots efforts and they are catching on. Building collaborative networks within and between schools fosters a sense of belonging. Research demonstrates this positively impacts teacher retention. The GTLF has been integral to the success of our teachers and ultimately our students. I am here in support of the continuation of the GTLF.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 49

JAMIE MILLER (Sales and Training Coordinator, Workforce Training and Economic Development, Vegas PBS):

I am the workforce training and economic development coordinator at Vegas PBS. The GTLF has enabled 174 educators and licensed professionals to gain new leadership skills. These educators serve students in our most challenging schools across Nevada. Since we began in October 2016, we have had a 98 percent retention rate in our program. We have only lost two teachers, one passed away and one left the district. Learn to Lead is unique because our program has blended classroom experiences with online training which cultivates into a capstone project. This unique structure has enabled us to recruit educators from rural areas as well as those who have time impacted schedules. The future landscape of the reorganized school district and individual school precincts means that teachers, whether they are serving as a school organizational team member or not, need these new leadership skills. They need to understand how NBOE-level decisions are made and how budgets work. Our teachers of tomorrow, especially our School Organization Team teachers and administrators, are going to need skills and experiences in both education and organization. For teachers to best communicate, inform and advocate for the needs of their class, school, school organizational teams or their district, they are going to need a higher level of leadership skills. Our educators and licensed professionals are gaining these leadership skills today and will be our principals and superintendents and the most influential school organizational team members of tomorrow. We are grateful for the funding we currently receive and look forward to the opportunity to expand our program. We are currently increasing the leadership skills of 172 teachers. This means there is 172 capstone projects being developed and implemented to improve classrooms, schools and communities. This means educators are spending over 270 clock hours of their time devoted to becoming a leader. Learn to Lead has helped educators and licensed professionals find their voice and pursue their passion of impacting the school community. I am here in support of the continuation of the GTLF.

THEODORE SMALL (Vice President, Clark County Education Association):

The PAR bill was referenced earlier. I would like to give the Subcommittees a couple points on PAR in Clark County. We are asking for the State to reconsider funding for the PAR and would encourage each of you to as the Bill Draft

Request comes out. Similar to the needs of last Session, S. B. 332 of the 78th Session was passed and gave Clark County \$2 million. Clark County School District put \$1 million of their own money into this fund. The collaboration around PAR was around discussions about retention of teachers once they get in schools. We are currently in 25 of our highest needs schools. We chose schools that had high-vacancy rates and attracted teachers into those schools to give them support. Senate Bill No. 4 of the 78th Session was cosponsored by Senator Ford, Senator Roberson and Senator Hammond. The current bill will expand this bill. Currently we have 1,000 new teachers in Clark County. We are covering 25 percent of them in PAR. If we can expand the PAR funds, ideally we would like to expand it to all the new teachers in Clark County because we have seen good returns. We have research from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) regarding the first year of PAR. This program was in 19 schools that year. We had a 4 percent increase in retention. We actually were able to improve what new teachers were doing on the evaluation system. We would like you to consider funding Clark County's PAR.

BRENT HUSSON (Nevada Succeeds):

We are a K-12 policy group led by the business community. I am here to speak on several issues including Read By Three, the GTLF and PAR. We were a major supporter of the bill Read By Three in the last Session. I heard questions from the Subcommittees about what it is actually becoming in reality, rather than what it is was in theory. My son is a kindergartner this year. He was a member of the first cohort of Read By Three. Unfortunately, he was fairly obstinate as a child and did not sit with us to learn how to read before kindergarten. When he started kindergarten, he was behind. We received a phone call from his teacher in the first month of school asking us to come to the school and have a discussion about our son's progress. The teacher had no idea that I worked on these types of issues. She sat us down and told us about the Read by Three. She showed us the words he knew and those he did not. It was very clear to us from the beginning he had some major hurdles to overcome. It was because he had not received what he needed prior to kindergarten. He was not in preschool. She laid out the program, about what was going to happen over the next three months and how we would get him caught up. She said she would keep us advised and explained what we needed to do at home. It was very specific and we had specific things we had to do at home every night. Now in March of this year, six months later, he is fully caught up and reading at grade level and

beyond. Whether or not the attention would have been made without Read By Three, I do not know. What I do know is that we, as parents, would not have been made aware of it. We would not have done our job. It was much more than a letter sent home.

We support the GTLF. It is very important moving forward. There are three separate programs. Regarding National Board Certification, I cannot say it any better than the folks that testified earlier. I want to reiterate what they said and how important it is. There is nothing more important than the teacher in the classroom and all the programs Mr. Canavero discussed today. If you are going to expend resources for an investment, there is nothing you can do that is a better investment than helping teachers become their very best. I think Principal Merritt said it very eloquently. If you untap the potential of the teachers in the classroom the way the National Board Certification does, you see returns beyond anything you can get from a technology program or reading program or anything else. You have the actual human beings assessing every single day what needs to happen with the children in that classroom and making decisions that are to the benefit of the child. I hope to see this program continued.

There is a UNLV project going on now. It is all about pipeline. It is getting new teachers into the pipeline that are from the communities in which they live. It is another project that, for the dollars being spent, the potential outcomes are phenomenal. You will have people returning to the buildings they grew up in to teach. They will go through a teaching program that UNLV is developing through the Mohave teacher pipeline project.

The Learn to Lead is another project that untaps the potential of teachers. It is important to focus your efforts, if you can, on untapping the potential of the humans in the classroom.

The PAR goes beyond its impact for teachers; it is also an example of the community coming together and working to put a project together. The union came together with the CCSD, the business community and I. We went to Maryland and did the research. We realized this is a program to change things for our children by expanding the ability of teachers in the classroom. I do not think you can underestimate the importance of a community doing that kind of work together.

I think this was an oversight by the Governor to not have this in the *Executive Budget*. I would encourage you to press and expand this program. The statistic that always sticks with me is, if you have a great teacher three years in a row in elementary school, you are almost guaranteed success. The converse is also true, if you have teachers not ready three years in a row in elementary school, you can almost guarantee failure.

TRACY WILKING (Consulting Teacher, Peer Assistance and Review):
Programs such as GTLF and ARL get teachers into schools. The PAR consulting teachers' role is to increase retention of these new teachers. We work with brand new teachers in 25 of Clark County's most at-risk schools. Many of our brand new teachers are from out of state, alternate licensure and business and industry licensed. They are not familiar with the student population they serve. Many ARL teachers have little classroom teaching experience in general. As consulting teachers, we work one-on-one with up to 20 teachers to help them learn and implement the NEPF standards in their instruction. We help them overcome the challenges of learning to teach with their limited experience. We work cooperatively with administrators to support them in helping these new teachers. Recently, a principal that I work with told me that she needs PAR support in her school. She could not provide the new teacher the individual support that we are able to give them. Since we are classroom teachers, we have professional conversations based on the NEPF and best practices. We meet with our mentees weekly, or more often as needed. Our work is supportive not evaluative. We are able to encourage our mentees to reflect on their growth. We work with some new teachers who are able to pick up their craft quite quickly or others need substantial support and would be not renewed without our support. In my caseload, I nominated one of my mentees as New Teacher of the Year for CCSD. I met with an administrator yesterday and due to my feedback and work with a new teacher the administrator will be renewing her contract. She will be giving her another chance because she knows this teacher will be receiving another year of PAR support. We ask for your support in helping us to continue to support our new teachers through PAR.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 53

NANCY E. BRUNE, Ph.D. (Executive Director, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities):

I want to speak about the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program, S.B. No. 511 of the 78th Session. We support the Governor's priority to continue this program. Research does show that there are two parts to the program. One part that Dr. Canavero spoke about is the actual scholarship. There is also an incentive part to that program. National research shows that incentive programs are very effective. Especially, if they are designed to help highly effective teachers go to our high-need schools or to attract STEM teachers or special education teachers. Currently the program is designed in such a way to provide school districts money to provide an incentive to new teachers. We would recommend that the Program be revised to target STEM teachers, as well as special education teachers. We have a significant number of vacancies around the State, especially special education teachers. Maybe we can tweak the Program to target these teachers. The Sage Commission also echoes this recommendation in their final report, which I believe you have a copy. Specifically, recommendation number 34 from the Sage Commission which concluded its work in December, states:

The Nevada State Legislature and the Department of Education should revise the target of current incentive programs to the following categories of teachers: high quality teachers as demonstrated by the NEPF highly effective ratings, to teach in our State's underperforming, high poverty schools, special education teachers, and math and science teachers.

CARYNE SHEA (Director of Communications, Honoring Our Public Education):

I am a member of the parent advocacy group HOPE. One of HOPE's main goals is to improve how public education is funded in Nevada. We are so grateful to see new money that was introduced in the 2015 Legislative Session is being continued. We have heard today the success rates for Zoom, Victory, GATE, Read By Three, Pre-K, GTLF, social workers and various other grants that are strategically targeting the future success of our children. We feel confident that each additional biennium will yield successful data from these concentrated efforts.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 54

We would like to remind you when it comes to larger pots of money and the requests for expansion of these grants that the budget presented today is based on what we have, and not what is needed. We have so many schools that have concentrated populations of children in poverty and ELL, who do not have any categorical funds available to them yet. Because we have such a high rate of teacher vacancies, a crisis across our Nation, we are asking you to revisit all existing sources of funding, whether it is designated for the General Fund, Rainy Day accounts, or Education Savings Accounts. Look at new ways to tweak existing taxes so that the burden can be distributed equitably, more broadly, generate additional money or even look at new sources of income.

We need to protect and build on what is working. In no greater example than education, we get what we pay for. If we do not expand these investments in our children now, we will all pay exponentially in the future.

CHRIS DALY (Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association):

I want to amplify some of the good things said about the PAR. This program does need expansion, not just within Clark County, but Statewide. I am concerned with the budget deficit in Washoe County. PAR is a great program for new teachers who are struggling with their practice. It is proven and should be expanded Statewide.

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

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 16, 2017
Page 55

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
The meeting is adjourned at 11:30 A.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Mary Sullivan,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	5		Attendance Roster
	C	71	Steve Canavero/Nevada Department of Education	Distributive School Accounts and Related K12 Budgets
	D	1	Will Jensen/Nevada Department of Education	Gifted and Talented Statistics
	E	2	Kelly Rourke/Clark County School District	Testimony in Support of Funding Chromebooks for Schools
	F	11	Betsy Giles/National Board Certification Program Director/ Clark County Education Association	Testimony in Support of Department of Education
	G	6	Brenda Pearson/Director of Professional Learning/Clark County Education Association	Testimony is Support of Funding for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund