

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

**Eightieth Session
May 16, 2019**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 1:46 p.m. on Thursday, May 16, 2019, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Connie Munk
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst
Victoria Gonzalez, Committee Counsel
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, Clark County School District
Kellie Ballard, Director, Office of the Deputy Superintendent, Clark County School District
Bradley Keating, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District
Tyson Falk, representing Microsoft Corporation
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District
Linda Jones, Political Field Coordinator, Clark County Education Association
Brenda Pearson, Director, Professional Learning Program, Clark County Education Association

Chair Flores:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have no bills that we will be hearing today. We are going straight to the work session documents. There will be a few points of clarification that will be necessary. As we go through the work session documents, we will make sure we clarify whatever outstanding issues and questions we still have. Our intent is to not have to meet after today and after this meeting. The first document on the work session is Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint)

Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the licensure of teachers and other educational personnel. (BDR 34-337)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education on behalf of the Department of Education and was heard in Committee on May 14, 2019 ([Exhibit C](#)). Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint) revises various provisions relating to teacher licensure, including: (1) eliminating the special qualifications license; (2) revising requirements for early childhood licensure; and (3) making various changes for a qualified provider. A parent or legal guardian of a public school student may request information concerning the professional qualifications of any licensed employee at the student's school.

The bill also requires Nevada's Department of Education to provide notice to certain personnel if their license is due to expire. The bill also provides for additional reasons a license may not be issued under certain circumstances and revises provisions concerning the suspension or revocation of a license when the Department receives notice of certain convictions. The State Board of Education may issue a letter of reprimand to certain personnel upon receiving notice of certain types of conduct.

Nevada's Department of Education may require an employee who has access to confidential information relating to professional licensure to annually submit his or her fingerprints. The Department is authorized to deny access to confidential records for certain employees.

Finally, S.B. 41 (R1) requires one of the two administrator members of the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to be a school district superintendent. The Commission must submit its action report to the State Board of Education and the Legislative Committee on Education by December 31 each year.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 41 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Torres will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 57 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 57 (2nd Reprint): **Revises provisions relating to school property.**
(BDR 34-415)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 57 (2nd Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education on behalf of the Attorney General and was heard in this Committee on May 14, 2019 ([Exhibit D](#)). Senate Bill 57 (2nd Reprint) makes a blueprint of the layout of a public school confidential. The most current blueprint of the layout of a public or private school must be disclosed to a public safety agency upon its request. For public schools, the bill also authorizes such disclosure to certain other individuals or entities for purposes related to the school. Any blueprints received by such entities must not be disclosed, with certain exceptions.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 57 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 57 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Krasner will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to background checks required to become a volunteer at a school. (BDR 34-14)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Seevers Gansert and was heard in this Committee on May 9, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)). Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint) clarifies existing law concerning background checks for school volunteers who will have regular or unsupervised contact with students, including volunteers at achievement charter schools. Such a volunteer may submit his or her fingerprints to certain entities authorized to forward fingerprints to the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History. Reports of background checks authorized under the bill must be reported to the school district superintendent, the governing body of the charter school, or the private school administrator in certain circumstances. The bill also removes the requirement that a volunteer who will have regular, supervised contact with students receive a background check.

The bill further declares void and unenforceable the State Board of Education regulation allowing certain exemptions from a background check and instead clarifies what exemptions are allowed. Nevada's Department of Education must compile a list of acceptable entities who have performed background checks on potential school volunteers that are at least as rigorous as the background check normally conducted.

Finally, S.B. 185 (R1) authorizes a private school administrator to exempt volunteers from a background check in certain circumstances.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 185 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 185 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Gorelow will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 239 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 239 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to bullying in schools. (BDR 34-641)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 239 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Seevers Gansert and heard in Committee on May 9, 2019 ([Exhibit F](#)). Senate Bill 239 (1st Reprint) authorizes a school administrator to extend the two- or three-day period for conducting an investigation into reported cyber-bullying to not more than five days after the report is received in certain circumstances. After the completion of an investigation, any action taken to address the bullying or cyber-bullying must be carried out in a manner that causes the least possible disruption to each victim and, when necessary, the administrator or his or her designee must give priority to protecting the victim over any interest of the perpetrator when determining actions to take.

The bill also requires that if the administrator or his or her designee defers an investigation because of a pending criminal investigation by a law enforcement agency, the administrator or his or her designee shall immediately develop and carry out a plan to protect the safety of each pupil directly involved in the alleged violation.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 239 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 239 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Hansen will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 253 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 253 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the suspension of licensed school employees. (BDR 34-582)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 253 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Goicoechea and Assemblyman Ellison and heard in Committee on May 2, 2019 ([Exhibit G](#)). Senate Bill 253 (1st Reprint) authorizes the suspension and admonition of a licensed employee of a school district for a reason that the administrator believes may lead to demotion or dismissal. The bill changes from not later than five days to not later than ten days the time a school district superintendent has to begin dismissal proceedings after a suspension becomes effective. The bill removes the requirement that the superintendent initiate proceedings for the dismissal of an employee charged, but not convicted, of a crime and instead requires the superintendent to offer such an employee the opportunity for an informal hearing concerning the continuation of the suspension within ten days after the employee receives notice of the suspension.

Chair Flores:

Members, I had the opportunity to speak with Senator Goicoechea at length regarding this specific bill as I was concerned about the effect that, in a regular criminal proceeding, could take two to three years. My biggest opposition to this bill was that in two to three years it is possible that you do not get convicted, and you have been placed on suspension for two to three years, and while there is back pay, you have not been able to feed your family for two to three years. Unfortunately, the criminal justice system is very slow.

That was my biggest concern. For the good actor who gets accused, which often happens, how can we put that person on suspension and at the same time let them feed their families? We discussed the possibility of reassignment, but then after a thorough conversation with both legal counsel and Senator Goicoechea, my understanding is—and I want to get the intent and assurance from our committee counsel that this is, in fact, true—that if a licensed professional is suspended, they do have the option of getting paid while they are suspended. Currently, in law, the procedure is that as long as you can ensure that you have some type of mechanism to pay that back should you, in fact, be convicted and be suspended, you are going to pay that money back that is owed. That is the recourse.

Hypothetically, if a teacher who is suspended for two years and is paid for those two years does get convicted and terminated, those two years of salary would have to be paid back. I would like some type of insurance in place to ensure that teacher is going to pay back those two years if pay is continued. Is that how the law currently works?

Victoria Gonzalez, Committee Counsel:

The way I read the bill, section 11, subsection 4 states, "A licensed employee who furnishes to the school district a bond or other form of security which is acceptable to the board." That would help them repay that salary if they continued to be paid during that time.

Chair Flores:

Perfect. That alleviates my biggest concern. That way, should that teacher never be terminated because that teacher was not convicted, that teacher can continue to feed his or her family while they are suspended.

I appreciate your working with me last night, Senator Goicoechea. That alleviates my concern. With that, I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 253 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 253 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I want to reiterate the comment that I made in the hearing that it is important that in the event that someone has come across a situation like this, they may be able to move into another district without too much effort, to enable themselves to continue working in the field, if it is too hard to work in that local community. I want to put that on the record that we want to ensure our teachers can stay in Nevada.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any further discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Krasner will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 267 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 267 (1st Reprint): Makes revisions concerning the effect of social and environmental factors on education. (BDR 34-578)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 267 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Spearman and Assemblywoman Spiegel and was heard in Committee on May 9, 2019 (Exhibit H). Senate Bill 267 (1st Reprint) requires the State Board of Education to adopt regulations requiring the board of trustees of each school district and the governing body of each charter school to identify for each school the social and environmental factors that affect a student's educational experience. These entities must report such factors to Nevada's Department of Education and consider these factors when making decisions concerning the school, including decisions affecting the allocation of money, the provision of integrated student supports, evaluations of school staff, salaries of school staff, and the discipline of students.

Assemblywoman Peters asked to be added as a cosponsor to the measure.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 267 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 267 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Miller will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 296 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 296 (1st Reprint): Provides for the issuance of a license by endorsement to certain teachers who have a license or equivalent issued in another country. (BDR 34-607)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 296 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Hammond and was heard in Committee on May 2, 2019 ([Exhibit I](#)). Senate Bill 296 (1st Reprint) directs the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to adopt regulations authorizing the issuance of a license by endorsement to applicants who hold an equivalent license or authorization from another country. The qualifications for the equivalent license or authorization must be substantially similar to those prescribed for an applicant for a state license as determined by the state superintendent of public instruction.

The bill authorizes the state superintendent to enter into reciprocal agreements with appropriate officials of other countries concerning the licensing of teachers.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 296 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 296 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Hardy will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-1063)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senators Dondero Loop, Woodhouse, Denis, and Parks, et al., and heard in Committee May 9, 2019 ([Exhibit J](#)). Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint) establishes the duties of a counselor, psychologist, and social worker employed by a school district. A school district is required to add 5 percent to the base salary of these professionals and those employed as an audiologist, occupational therapist, or physical therapist, who present satisfactory evidence of national certification, unless a collective bargaining agreement provides for a greater increase.

To the extent money is available, the bill requires each public school to provide access to a full-time school counselor and provide for a comprehensive school counseling program.

Chair Flores:

Are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Tolles:

There were some questions with regard to parental consent before assessments were conducted. I asked the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau to take a look at what provisions we currently have in statute. With your permission, I want to ask our committee counsel to get that on record.

Chair Flores:

Yes, please.

Victoria Gonzalez, Committee Counsel:

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 392.029, subsection 4, requires a public school that administers a certain survey analysis or an evaluation to comply with 20 U.S.C. § 1232h, which is the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment. What that federal law requires is that no student shall be required to complete certain surveys that address certain mental or psychological problems without the consent of a parent. That NRS section requires schools to comply with that law and will require parental consent in this situation as well.

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Tolles, do you have any additional questions?

Assemblywoman Tolles:

No.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I also found some comfort from the existing answer. I had that question about the parental consent portion. I also received some information that social workers who are licensed as social workers by the Board of Examiners for Social Workers, per NRS Chapter 641B, which specifically requires consent for services by a parent or guardian if the client is a minor. This would include the biopsychosocial assessment mentioned in S.B. 319 (R1). I knew there were some concerns about that aspect of testing. I am pleased to report that I have received the comfort I need, and I am glad to support this legislation.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any additional discussion? [There was none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 319 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Tolles will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning the placement of pupils in certain more rigorous courses. (BDR 34-681)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senators Dondero Loop and Woodhouse, et al., and heard in this Committee on May 9, 2019 ([Exhibit K](#)). Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint) requires the State Board of Education to adopt regulations that provide for the identification of certain students for placement in advanced coursework. A school must place the student in such a course unless the student's parent or guardian submits written notice of the objection to the placement. If financial resources are available, the bill requires the board of trustees of a school district or the governing body of a charter school to establish certain advanced courses.

Ray Bacon, representing the Nevada Manufacturers Association, proposed adding science to the list of advanced coursework.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND
DO PASS SENATE BILL 320 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I know we have a lot of bills to get through, but I love this bill. I call it the Marva Collins bill. I love that we are encouraging excellence and I appreciate the Senator and look forward to casting my vote.

Chair Flores:

Is there any additional discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Hansen will take the floor statement. Next we have Senate Bill 350.

**Senate Bill 350: Revises provisions relating to Nevada Promise Scholarships.
(BDR 34-308)**

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 350 was sponsored by Senators Denis, Woodhouse, Harris, and Dondero Loop, and Assemblymen Torres, Thompson, Flores, Carrillo, and Neal, et al., and heard in Committee on April 18, 2019 ([Exhibit L](#)). Senate Bill 350 transfers the authority governing the awarding of Nevada Promise Scholarships from each Nevada community college to the Board of Regents and requires that entity to administer the program.

The measure removes several statutory provisions and deadlines to receive the scholarship and instead requires the Board of Regents to adopt related regulations. A student who meets certain requirements may remain eligible for the scholarship each year and not be required to renew the scholarship each year.

The bill revises several existing scholarship requirements, including:

- Decreasing the number of required community service hours prior to receiving the scholarship from 20 hours to 8 hours;
- Decreasing the number of community service hours needed to retain the scholarship while in college from 20 hours per year to 8 hours per semester;
- Decreasing the number of training meetings a student must attend from two to one; and requiring the student to attend the meeting prior to enrolling in a community college; and
- Requiring that a student obtain a high school diploma or equivalent by 20 years of age.

Finally, S.B. 350 provides that a student may be granted a leave of absence from the program and remains eligible for the scholarship.

An amendment has been proposed to make the following changes:

1. Provide that a student who is otherwise eligible for a Promise Scholarship and who is not eligible to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)—a non-FAFSA eligible student may be eligible for a Promise Scholarship if the student is eligible for financial aid through an alternative determination for financial aid for non-FAFSA eligible students; and
2. After money available for Promise Scholarships for FAFSA-eligible students who are eligible for Promise Scholarships has been exhausted, require the Board of Regents to award a Promise Scholarship to those non-FAFSA eligible students who are otherwise eligible for financial aid and who are otherwise eligible for a Promise Scholarship.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 350.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND
DO PASS SENATE BILL 350.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Torres will take the floor statement. Next we have Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint).

**Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to data privacy for pupils.
(BDR 34-309)**

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Denis and was heard in Committee on April 30, 2019 ([Exhibit M](#)). Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint) requires a public school, including a charter school and a university school for the profoundly gifted, and a private school to post on its website information related to school service providers and data security before allowing a student to use a service operated by a school service provider and before providing a student with technology. A school service provider must give notification if there is a breach of the data security plan.

Finally, S.B. 403 (R2) revises provisions governing targeted advertising and the use of student data by a school service provider. A student's personally identifiable information may be used for performing certain research required or authorized by federal or state law.

Assemblywoman Krasner asked to be added as a cosponsor to the measure.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 403 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Duran will take the floor statement. Next we have Senate Bill 414 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 414 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning the Kenny C. Guinn Memorial Millennium Scholarship. (BDR 34-884)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 414 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Kieckhefer and was heard in Committee on May 7, 2019 ([Exhibit N](#)). Senate Bill 414 (1st Reprint) increases the amount of the award of the Kenny C. Guinn Memorial Millennium Scholarship from \$4,500 to \$5,000 each year. It also increases the number of scholarship recipients from one to two students who attend certain colleges or universities in northern Nevada, and from one to two students who attend certain colleges or universities in southern Nevada. The bill provides for scholarship eligibility to include students enrolled at nonprofit universities that award a bachelor's degree in education to residents of northern or southern Nevada.

Finally, S.B. 414 (R1) allows a prospective scholarship recipient to demonstrate an equivalent level of academic achievement if his or her institution does not use the grade point system.

Chair Flores:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 414 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 414 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Munk will take the floor statement. Next we have Senate Bill 441 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 441 (1st Reprint): Provides for the separate regulation of online charter schools. (BDR 34-392)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 441 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Education and heard in this Committee on May 14, 2019 ([Exhibit O](#)). Senate Bill 441 (1st Reprint) establishes separate provisions for a charter school

to operate exclusively as a charter school for distance education and authorizes the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) to approve such a school. A charter school sponsored by a school district that offers a full-time online program is prohibited from enrolling a student in the program who resides outside of that district.

The bill authorizes a charter school for distance education to consider using certain methods to collect student information already required in statute.

Finally, S.B. 441 (R1) designates the SPCSA as the local educational agency for all online charter schools that it sponsors and authorizes it to deem such a charter school as a local education agency.

Sarah Nick, representing Nevada's Department of Education, submitted the attached amendment [page 2, ([Exhibit O](#))], which proposes to revise sections 13 and 14 of the bill to allow the Department to adopt related regulations rather than the SPCSA.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 441 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 441 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Peters will take the floor statement. Next we have Senate Bill 451.

Senate Bill 451: Authorizes variable-length renewal of charter contracts. (BDR 34-391)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 451 was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Education and was heard in this Committee on May 14, 2019 ([Exhibit P](#)). Senate Bill 451 changes the renewal term for charter school contracts from six years to not less than three years, but not more than ten years.

Chair Flores:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 451.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 451.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Hardy will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 453.

Senate Bill 453: Revises the eligibility requirements for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program. (BDR 34-383)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 453 was sponsored by Senate Committee on Education on behalf of the Committee to Conduct a Study Concerning the Cost and Affordability of Higher Education, and was heard in this Committee on April 18, 2019 ([Exhibit Q](#)). Senate Bill 453 raises the minimum required grade point average (GPA) to 2.75 during each semester of enrollment for a student to be eligible to receive a scholarship under the Millennium Scholarship Program. The bill allows a scholarship recipient who does not meet this requirement in one semester to continue eligibility, without penalty, in the following semester. However, the recipient permanently loses eligibility if he or she does not meet the requirement during any subsequent semester.

During the hearing on the bill, the Office of the Treasurer and Nevada System of Higher Education submitted an amendment which proposes to retain section 1, subsection 5, as currently codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes*, which means that you would not have the change to allow a student to continue eligibility without penalty in the following semester.

Also, for the record, if you downloaded the work session document immediately after it became available, this amendment did not appear until later [The amendment was not included in ([Exhibit Q](#))]. Staff omitted it in error.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 453.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 453.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Torres will take the floor session. The next bill is Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the reorganization of certain school districts. (BDR 34-818)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint) is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education and was heard in this Committee on April 30, 2019 ([Exhibit R](#)). Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint) revises provisions affecting school districts that have more than 100,000 pupils enrolled in its public schools—currently the Clark County School District—by removing the requirement that each school associate superintendent oversee no more than 25 local school precincts and adding utilities to the list of responsibilities that a large school district cannot transfer to a local school precinct.

The bill also classifies as restricted the money that is necessary for a large school district to carry out the responsibilities that are not transferred to a local school precinct and increases the percentage of unrestricted money to be allocated to the local school precincts from 85 percent to 90 percent. Finally, funding allocations will be based on the district's estimates for attendance for the following year, rather than being determined by the number of students attending in the previous calendar quarter.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 469 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Miller:

Do you mind if we bring some people up for some further clarification on some questions?

Chair Flores:

Sure, bring them up.

Assemblywoman Miller:

There are so many questions around this: I am trying to make sure that the spirit of the school organization teams is still intact and maintained through the intent of this bill. It is a struggle for me right now because I see it from both sides. I do have some particular questions about the bill after looking over a sample of a budget that the Clark County School District shared with me. I know there are many other samples, but I am referring to this one in particular.

This first question I had was when we have instances where in many schools we have substitute teachers filling positions. We also know that substitute teachers are much cheaper than a certified teacher—especially as you are not paying benefits. Could you tell us where that money goes? If the school is assigned so many full-time equivalents (FTEs), but so many positions are covered by substitutes—I hear many things, but can you tell me where that money goes?

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

I believe Jason Goudie can answer that.

Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, Clark County School District:

The answer is simple in that the monies that are allocated to the school budgets for salaries as well as other pieces—it is not just the salary piece—it is a number of whatever is allocated for supplies, et cetera. If there are vacancies to where the expenses are not incurred by the school, then whatever the cost differential between that substitute teacher and that teacher is—approximately \$60,000—that \$60,000 will be carried forward by that school into the next school year. It will be restricted funds that will then be dedicated to that school itself.

That is just happening this year, fiscal year 2019, for the first time. When I came in 2018 that had not yet been done, even though Assembly Bill 469 of the 79th Session was enacted. However, we have budgeted that way and that has been communicated in every budget meeting that I have provided. Most recently, the tentative budget has set aside approximately \$27 million for what I am calling vacancy savings in schools. That will be restricted and carried forward for use in fiscal year 2020.

Assemblywoman Miller:

When you say beginning the year 2019, would that include the savings from this current 2018-2019 school year?

Jason Goudie:

Correct. The 2018-2019 fiscal year—when we get done with this year we will calculate how many open positions were offset by the cost of the substitute, et cetera, and come up with the amount for each school that has the savings, then that amount will be added to their budgets for the following year. It has to be one year, essentially in arrears, because we have to calculate the actual difference.

Assemblywoman Miller:

Is that going to penalize the schools? Is the district then going to say that you have a \$30,000 savings that is being carried over, so we will supplant the money and not have to give them the full FTE because you already have a \$30,000 carryover? Is that going to be considered? At that point it sounds like a use it or lose it situation. Can you explain what the intent will be?

Jason Goudie:

There is no supplanting in the way our funding model currently works. Obviously there is a new funding model bill that is going to be enacted, but the current way our individual district budget works is we fund off of a model. That does not consider the carry-forward amounts. We do carry forward funds now, but that is just for supplies. We have not carried forward what I call vacancy savings in the past.

Essentially, now the schools get the benefit of all unspent dollars. That includes vacancy savings as well as the supply differential. Those carry forward to the next year and are not offset. They still get fully funded based off the model as to what that school would get, then that becomes incremental funding.

Assemblywoman Miller:

I see another item on here. I know we are trying to stay focused on the bill from section 1, subsection 5, paragraphs (a) to (u) and the different utilities and services necessary, but I see something for juvenile correctional schools. Many of those schools have been closed in the past years, so it was explained to me that for the two that are still operating, basically every single school has to pitch in. Are we going to do some carryover for the difference between substitutes and certified teachers? Not all schools have students going into juvenile correctional schools. We have some schools where during that school year, there may never be a student who needs to go to a correctional school, while another school down the street may have a dozen or so different students. Is every school paying the exact same price? What happens to that money if, again, you did not need to utilize that service during that school year?

Kellie Ballard, Director, Office of the Deputy Superintendent, Clark County School District:

What you are describing is exactly why we are here. This kind of confusion comes up with each of our service level agreements. We tried to take the cost of that service and work with the department that manages the service and tried to calculate and estimate as closely as we could to a per pupil or per use cost. However, for services that we could not predict usage, like behavior schools, we got it down to the per pupil amount of all eligible pupils. The cost of those programs is what the cost of those programs is regardless of how many kids from each school go there—you still have to provide for the staff and the facility costs. What we did was allocate a per-pupil amount which is just a ratio of the cost of that program to each school based on the number of eligible pupils who could be referred to the program, then they will be charged as per the service level agreement the very same ratio amount back at the end of the school year.

Assemblywoman Miller:

Will the school that does not have any students who utilize that service get that money back?

Kellie Ballard:

No, they will not. The money has been spent on the cost of the program. When we discussed it with the principals, we talked about it in terms of an insurance policy. If we were to allow the schools to keep the money that was allocated to them for behavior school programs, we would no longer be able to pay for the program to exist for the students who do go there. That is one of the challenges in many of the things we have transferred under service level agreements that are central functions. The principals are having to do a lot of this work and consider a lot of these costs of things they do not have any control over. I am glad you brought it up; it is exactly the reason we are here today.

Assemblywoman Miller:

Just to be clear, schools are being charged for services that they may never access.

Kellie Ballard:

They are being allocated for and charged for services that they may not use. Correct.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

One of the main purposes of doing the reorganization of the Clark County School District was to provide more local control to precincts and schools. I spent some time talking with parents and administrators in my district at several schools, and they have some serious concerns that this will undo a lot of key things that were done in previous legislation. I, too, have those concerns. I will be voting no on this for those reasons.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I have concerns regarding the transparency of budget and actual spending through the funding education pipeline. In conversations and in the hearing, my biggest concern is in ensuring that we have an accountability for where these restricted funds are being spent, how they are being spent, and how that potential savings is being reallocated in the districts. I have hope because I think that a lot of these services included in the restricted funding, including utilities, have the potential for group negotiation and some pretty significant savings. I look forward to seeing the implementation of this, including that line item of how much we were able to negotiate and save by bringing these resources together, using them, and being able to negotiate as a whole. I will be voting yes to get this out of Committee, and likely voting yes on the floor, but I really want to take a look at this in two years and ensure that what we are doing has some accountability and has transparency in the process.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

I have some questions concerning section 1.5, subsection 1, regarding "The superintendent shall assign a school associate superintendent to oversee one or more local school precincts." Right now, it looks like they are currently overseeing about 25 schools. Can you quickly explain to me how many schools would be in a precinct? If it is one or more of those precincts, how many more are we looking at that an associate superintendent could be overseeing?

Bradley Keating, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District:

I am going to ask Ms. Ballard to jump in here as she has reorganized the districts in these regions.

Kellie Ballard:

Yes, the law does currently require 25. When the superintendent first came onboard last summer, he learned from some feedback sessions he conducted all over the valley with principals and school communities that they were not receiving the consistent kind of message from central office and from their supervisors that they wanted. I have said to this Committee before that we knew this was a risk and tried to mitigate some of that at the very beginning by pulling the school associates all together in one building. Unfortunately, that did not happen. There were some inconsistent things coming out from central office to schools which created some issues for the principals.

Dr. Jara worked with the former state superintendent to reimplement a tiered level of service that would bring us closer to a consistent message and allow us to make some really fast, high-quality improvements in the district over the next five years, which is outlined in our strategic plan. What that results in is approximately 120 schools per region, each region led by a regent superintendent, each regent superintendent supported by two school associate superintendents. If it were to be divided equally, which it may not necessarily be, it works out to be 60 per regent superintendent.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

With this, they could theoretically be overseeing more than 25 schools. Is that correct? I do not see a cap on how many schools they would be overseeing.

Kellie Ballard:

That is correct. It would be over the current requirement of 25.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any additional discussion?

Assemblywoman Miller:

At this point, I am going to vote to move it out of the Committee, but I still have some questions and I still think there are some clarifying issues that I would like covered in the meantime. At least that gives us the ability to keep it alive and keep working toward it. I may change my vote; I will let you know. Of course I will vote it out of Committee.

Assemblywoman Munk:

I will say "ditto" to that.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I still have too many concerns with the ones that were raised, so I will be a no.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN HANSEN, HARDY, KRASNER, AND TOLLES VOTED NO.)

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Duran will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the evaluation of educational employees and makes various other changes to provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-816)

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education and was heard in the Committee on May 2, 2019 ([Exhibit S](#)). Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint) requires Nevada's Department of Education to develop an electronic tool that provides documents used in evaluations to certain educational personnel. The Department must also study the impact and validity of the statewide performance evaluation system and report its findings to the Legislative Committee on Education.

For school year 2019-2020, the bill decreases from 40 to 20 the percentage of a teacher's or administrator's evaluation that is accounted for by pupil growth and further reduces the percentage to 15 percent for each school year thereafter. The State Board of Education is required to provide for annual evaluations of counselors, librarians, and other licensed educational personnel, except for teachers and administrators.

Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint) removes the authorization that a district may not renew the contract of a probationary teacher or administrator designated as "developing" and further removes the requirement that personnel designated as such for two consecutive years serve an additional probationary period.

Senator Harris and Assemblywoman Miller submitted the attached amendment which proposes to:

1. Provide that pupil growth will account for 15 percent of the evaluation effective July 1, 2019, and onward;
2. Require the Department to make recommendations to the State Board of Education concerning the remaining 5 percent of the teacher evaluation by December 31, 2019; and
3. Require an administrator who conducts an evaluation to consider the pupil-teacher ratios recommended by the State Board of Education and the impact of class sizes that exceed those recommendations when applying scores.

For further clarification for the Committee, on point No. 2, Assemblywoman Miller wanted to modify that to make sure the recommendations adopted by the State Board of Education were made in conjunction with the Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada, which is within the Department of Education.

Chair Flores:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 475 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I want to express my gratitude to the bill's sponsor and to Assemblywoman Miller for working together in order to come up with some type of agreement.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

Existing law says that student growth counts for 40 percent of the teacher's evaluation, and I understand that the amendment would make it 15 percent of the teacher's evaluation in perpetuity. I still have some concerns that this is too low. I understand that there are other factors that are out of the teacher's control. I respect our teachers and support them. I just feel that 15 percent is too low and for that reason I will be voting no today.

Assemblywoman Miller:

Those of us who have been around for the past few sessions and those people who are in education know what a seriously impactful issue this is. It is sometimes a cantankerous issue. For us to be able to recognize all of the things that teachers are evaluated on—including our administrators—and especially this session we have heard so many things that are not within control of administrators. For those items that are not in the control of the administrators or the teachers, we want to make sure they are being evaluated on what they are in control of.

I asked the question before about other professions and evaluations being legislated. We have to remember that while this is very serious, no one in education takes lightly the job ahead of them, but there is pressure and the scrutiny that comes on this one particular profession by the state. I really appreciate that there has been a real turnaround this session with appreciating the hard work and the working conditions that our educators in Nevada go through every day. I appreciate that there have been many groups, including Teach Plus Nevada, spending a lot of time working to lower that to make it more feasible and more reflective based on multiple considerations for educators. Bringing that as a focus of attention and helping everyone move toward a more conducive direction should be commended.

Of course, we also know that sometimes working between two houses and multiple people—again, just to know that people could appreciate all of the people behind the scenes: the different groups, different parties, different stakeholders, and of course, my fellow legislator, Senator Dallas Harris—I do appreciate it.

Assemblywoman Tolles:
Ditto.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any additional discussion? [There was none.] I will say thank you to the Committee, specifically Assemblywomen Miller and Torres. I know they worked diligently with Senator Harris on a topic we have all been very passionate about, but you all have been working up until the last minute before we started. I appreciate you all.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Miller will take the floor statement.

We need to revisit Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint). I want to make it clear that it was Senator Denis' original intent that an additional amendment be proposed with Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint), and my understanding is that never made its way to the work session document. There was, in fact, an amendment there. We have a stakeholder here who can explain the purpose of that amendment. Because we previously made a motion to amend and do pass, the way we need to proceed is by rescinding the original motion. We can then make the motion once again with the new proposed amendment. We will not make a new motion until we have the stakeholder and Senator Denis explain the purpose of that amendment so everyone is clear on exactly what we are doing.

I will entertain a motion to rescind Senate Bill 403 (Second Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER MADE A MOTION TO RESCIND
THE MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 403
(2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We have rescinded our original motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint). Before we take any further action on Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint), I would like to give the Committee an opportunity to understand exactly what amendment is on the table.

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

I am going to let Tyson Falk go through the amendment ([Exhibit T](#)). As with anything we work on, sometimes we can make things better and sometimes we cannot. In this case, we are working with Microsoft Corporation, and they had some good ideas that I thought would help make this a stronger piece of legislation, so that is what we have before you today.

Tyson Falk, representing Microsoft Corporation:

We have two technical changes in this proposed amendment. The intent of the first change is the language in section 2.5, subsection 3. It references a breach of the plan for the security of any system of any data. We propose to strike "plan for the," and replace it to read "of any breach of the security of the system data." We think that cleans it up a little bit. It refers to an actual breach of the data rather than the plan for the security.

The second part of the amendment concerns the purple crossed out language in section 2.5, subsection 3, "and any actions taken or being taken by the school service provider to address the breach." We are proposing to strike that language and refer back to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 603A.010. Within that statute it outlines a variety of things relative to data breaches. It defines what personally identifiable information is, what a breach actually is, remedies, and penalties. We think those two changes help clean up the bill and make it a little stronger.

Chair Flores:

Members, to make it abundantly clear, if you are on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), click on exhibits and go to the bottom to see the proposed amendment for Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint). If you open that document you will have an opportunity to see the amendment as was just discussed ([Exhibit T](#)). Because of how recent this language is, rather than take a motion now, we are simply going to recess for a couple of minutes. I am going to ask everyone to stay in the room and give everyone a chance to look at the amendment and confer with committee counsel to make sure everything is germane and there is no conflict. We will come back from recess and make that last motion.

[The Committee recessed at 2:48 p.m. and reconvened at 2:55 p.m.].

Chair Flores:

Thank you for being so patient. We wanted to make sure everything was cleared through Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Assemblywoman Torres, please go ahead.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I would like to propose a conceptual amendment to section 2.5, subsection 3, to change the language to "of any breach of the plan for the security and/or the system data." I would also like to add Assemblywoman Krasner as a cosponsor.

Chair Flores:

Members, just for the sake of clarity, the proposed amendment that appears on NELIS is not the amendment that Assemblywoman Torres has just proposed.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO AMEND
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 403 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Duran will take the floor statement. We have completed all of the bills for the work session. I would like to invite those forward wishing to speak in public comment.

Bradley Keating, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District:

As we have been celebrating teachers over the past week with Teacher Appreciation Week, one of the things the Clark County School District does is honor seven teachers across the district as new teachers of the year. They are incredible educators who are doing amazing things in just their first year.

I want to highlight one of them—Nitza Brand Restrepo is a teacher of high school dance. She is a new Teacher of the Year for us. She coordinates all kinds of activities at our school—FAFSA [Free Application for Federal Student Aid] night, film studies classes, and she was a former Nevada GEAR UP instructor helping students look at how to best get into college. She is also very similar to one of your own on the dais today—she teaches at Eldorado High School and we are incredibly proud of her, so we want to give a quick shout out to Nitza and thank her for what she does. Assemblywoman Torres is incredibly proud of her as well.

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

I am here with our good news minute. I want to tell everyone that on May 22, 2019, we are having a ground-breaking for the new middle school in south Reno, which has been a long time coming. It was part of our WC-1 promise to voters. I want to mention that the school is named after Marce Herz, who taught in northern Nevada for ten years, including five years at Mount Rose Elementary School. She was a world-class athlete who set U.S. and world records in track and field sports, as well as 16 amateur alpine ski titles. She founded a program in northern Nevada called the Junior Ski Program, which is where I learned how to ski as well as many kids who have gone through that program. We are excited to break ground on that new middle school next Wednesday.

Linda Jones, Political Field Coordinator, Clark County Education Association:

I am also the school organization team coordinator for Clark County Education Association. I have also created the other licensed professional representative council for non-classroom teachers. I am here to thank you all for voting to pass Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint). It has been a long time coming for this to happen and they were very excited that you have this bill.

Brenda Pearson, Director, Professional Learning Program, Clark County Education Association:

I am here to speak briefly in support of Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint) as written. The Clark County Education Association supports the bill.

Additionally, regarding Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint), we are opposed to this new amendment and new language that has been included within this bill. It is not in line with the Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada recommendations, so we stand against this specific bill.

Chair Flores:

Is there anyone else wishing to speak for public comment? [There was no one.] Thank you members, and I appreciate everyone working through those last-minute amendments and making it work. At this point, I do not see a need for us to reconvene this week.

Meeting is adjourned [at 3:01 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 41 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 57 \(2nd Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 185 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 239 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 253 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 267 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 296 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 319 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 320 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 350](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 403 \(2nd Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 414 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit O](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 441 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit P](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 451, presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit Q](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 453, presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit R](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 469 (2nd Reprint), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit S](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 475 (1st Reprint), presented by Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit T](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 403 (2nd Reprint), presented by Tyson Falk, representing Microsoft Corporation.