

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Eightieth Session
March 6, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Moises Denis at 1:05 p.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Vice Chair
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Senator Dallas Harris
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Keith F. Pickard

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jen Sturm, Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Shelley Kyle, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brad Keating, Clark County School District
Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Teri White, Superintendent, Douglas County School District; President, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Adam Young, Superintendent, White Pine County School District
David Jensen, Ed.D, Superintendent, Humboldt County School District
Wayne Workman, Superintendent, Lyon County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Jessica Ferrato, Nevada Association of School Boards

Senate Committee on Education
March 6, 2019
Page 2

CHAIR DENIS: We will begin our work session with Senate Bill (S.B.) 80.

SENATE BILL 80: Revises provisions relating to providing a safe and respectful learning environment. (BDR 34-502)

JEN STURM (Policy Analyst):

The first bill is S.B. 80 which was sponsored by the Clark County School District (CCSD). I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

I would like to ask Brad Keating of the CCSD and Chuck Callaway of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) to come to the table. I understand the two of you had issues with some of the amendments. Were all of the issues addressed and agreed to?

BRAD KEATING (Clark County School District):

Yes. I will walk through the amendments. The CCSD had some questions with section 3, subsection 2 and how we would define "handle with care". We discussed doing a tier system. A tier system being a level 1, 2 and 3 trauma system.

In our conversations with stakeholders, we changed the idea of a tier system to defining the program into four categories that we felt were the most severe and necessary for reporting. Those categories where reports will come through are: domestic violence in the presence of a child, death of a member of the family or household of a child, arrest of a parent or guardian if the child is present and child abuse or neglect.

Addressing Senator Pickard's concern, we discussed providing additional information to the schools. Just saying "handle with care" was not enough information for the schools involved. By selecting just four categories, it is our hope that working with these four categories we are able to better train the schools. When the "handle with care" tip comes to a school, the tip must be in one of the four specified categories. There will not be a myriad of circumstances that have happened to the student. Our school personnel will be able to better deal with the situation.

The second amendment came from a comment from Senator Harris which was incorporated stating "The Handle with Care Program shall use the support center established for the SafeVoice Program and teams appointed pursuant to NRS 388.14553". Originally, we had the word "must". Now a school shall do one or the other.

The third amendment pertains to adding new verbiage in section 14 giving the police departments the ability to make a decision in their professional capacity and judgment to determine whether a tip needs to be provided. They would not have to disclose the facts of the Handle with Care event if an ongoing investigation is involved, as it would interfere with the investigation.

The fourth and last amendment will change the original wording of the program of SafeVoice Nevada to SafeVoice, which the Nevada Department of Education will be using moving forward.

CHUCK CALLAWAY (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I appreciate the CCSD working with the LVMPD on these amendments to this bill. The LVMPD is 100 percent on board with these amendment changes.

SENATOR PICKARD:

Thank you, Mr. Keating, for considering my concerns. These changes go a great distance to bridging the gap. My question is when we typically use "may" in conjunction with the words "without limitation", it is rare to see "shall" with those words.

With breaking it down into four categories, are we also allowing them to go beyond that point if they think the circumstances require more information? Can they do that? Is that correct?

MR. CALLAWAY:

Yes. My understanding of the intent is if an officer was to believe the child had suffered trauma and the school needs to know that, they can make that notification. Nothing in this bill or amendments prevents the officer from making a notification to the Handle with Care Program, even though it is not listed in these categories.

SENATOR PICKARD:

My recollection from the original testimony was law enforcement is to hand the event off to Handle with Care and say nothing more. With this amendment, now it is law enforcement's opportunity if they feel the details need to be communicated in order to handle the situation properly with care; law enforcement is allowed to do so. If this understanding is correct, then I am okay with this bill.

MR. CALLAWAY:

The way I read the bill and the amendment, it did not give law enforcement the opportunity to provide more information about what had occurred. It just gives law enforcement the ability to use their discretion when making the notification.

I had given some examples when I testified on February 6, 2019. For example, domestic violence could be a very broad term. There could be a 17-year-old present who witnesses his or her mom and dad arguing and mom shoves dad and that is all that happens.

Another example would be a 3-year-old witnessing dad severely beating mom. In this second scenario, no doubt this situation warrants notification to the Handle with Care Program.

In the first situation, the officer may, based on the totality of the circumstances when interviewing the 17-year-old, choose not to report this circumstance to the Handle with Care Program. Does that answer your question?

SENATOR PICKARD:

Not really.

CHAIR DENIS:

I want to ask our Legal Counsel, Risa Lang, to weigh in on this question.

RISA LANG (Committee Counsel):

The way I read it is if you leave in the words "without limitation," then these are just four basic categories that would always merit consideration of including in the report, but it is not inclusive. I guess they could still make a determination under other circumstances. If they wanted to limit it to this, we would remove the wording "without limitation". Section 3, subsection 3 still says you do not

provide information about the traumatic events regardless of what the event is. Under this amendment, that language is not changed.

MR. CALLAWAY:

From a logical standpoint, if this bill passes, what we probably would do is adopt in our policy that if an officer responds to these situations that occur in the primary categories, the standard would be to make the notification.

The officer would have at his or her discretion to not notify, if he or she did not feel it was warranted. In our policy, we probably would outline, in most cases, when an officer goes on a call and a child is present at one of these events, the officer makes the notification.

SENATOR PICKARD:

I want to avoid the retraumatization of the child when he or she has witnessed this event. The school district is trying to get their arms around what has happened. The district may interview the child or the child's friends and the child will be subject to scrutiny that we are trying to avoid. Thus, by doing so, we are retraumatizing them.

I recognize the sensitivity, but if we can give just enough information to administration, so that they have actionable data, I can support this.

If we are limiting what law enforcement can say this may result in the school investigating to know what has happened in order to act appropriately. Thus, we retraumatize the child. I cannot go there. It does not make sense to me.

CHAIR DENIS:

Ms. Lang, does this prohibit law enforcement from doing that?

MS. LANG:

It says that the report is not supposed to provide any information about the traumatic event. I think that the way it currently works, and the proponents may be able to speak to this, is it was just to notify the school if the child is acting out or having difficulties. This is to help the child in school, but not necessarily to address the traumatic event. I think that is why the amendment was written this way. It is not really to try and get the child services for what has occurred to him or her. It is more to help the child at school. That is how I understood it.

MR. CALLAWAY:

That is my understanding. The intent is if a child's behavior is different than usual, the classroom teacher has the opportunity to know something has occurred. This would alert the teacher that the child might need to be handled differently, because he or she had suffered some type of trauma. As Ms. Lang stated, it is not necessarily to provide treatment for the trauma.

The American Civil Liberties Union expressed concerns about providing information of a private nature to the classroom. I do not know if that is a deal breaker for Senator Pickard. The intent is to give the teacher in the classroom some knowledge that he or she may have to handle the child differently.

CHAIR DENIS:

Mr. Keating, since the CCSD is the originator of the bill, is that your understanding?

MR. KEATING:

Yes, Mr. Callaway's statement is correct.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

As an elementary teacher for 30 years, I had many instances where I had a student with trauma. In one circumstance, an entire family was killed in a car accident, except for my student. The neighbors know, the community knows and the school knows. If the teacher does not know, the teacher cannot address the fears the students might have. It is better to tell the story and address the fears the students have.

While we argue over a may, a shall, a must or whatever, the 300, 400 and all the legalese, I am not going down that road because we are protecting children. We are not protecting adults. Those kids are a teacher's caregiver responsibility for 180 days.

CHAIR DENIS:

The concern that I heard from Senator Pickard was not less information. My understanding is he wanted to be certain the teacher had enough information. There does seem to be some legal issue that we need to deal with. How do we currently do this?

MR. CALLAWAY:

I do not want to throw a wrench into the bill. From a law enforcement perspective, aside from the cases where it might damage an ongoing investigation which this amendment addressed, I have no problem if law enforcement provides more information. I believe there are people in the communities that do have a problem with that. From a law enforcement perspective, I will be clear, I do not.

We currently do not have this program in place. We have Fusion Watch in our Fusion Center and we have a school police officer embedded in our Fusion Center. We work very closely with the Safe to Tell program.

When we get information about threats that are occurring on campus, we have the ability to communicate the information. We currently do not have this system in place to give specific information to a teacher about a student that may have suffered trauma. This bill closes that loophole.

CHAIR DENIS:

A heads-up would be given to the teacher if there is a trauma without being specific. Am I correct?

MR. KEATING:

That is correct. Through the SafeVoice system, the multi-disciplinary team at the school could then notify the teacher. To address Senator Pickard's concern, the "without limitation" may cause some issues. If we narrow it to the four categories, then we are able to train the schools specifically on those categories they will be dealing with. These people then would know the student has gone through one of the four categories.

SENATOR PICKARD:

I like the "without limitation". I have had students who have gone through traumatic experiences, and we did not know what happened. Human nature took over, and then people were asking questions.

Those subsequent questions asked of the child retraumatizes the child. My goal is to structure this so enough information gets to the people who are working with the student so these people do not have to ask the child the question "what happened?"

These people do not have to have the litany of all the details. I thought by going with the four categories that we give just enough information to the educators and administration so they will know what they are dealing with and do not have to ask the "what happened" question. It is a balance issue to not go beyond that.

If we are going to allow law enforcement and administrations to share enough information in order to actually avoid the retraumatization, I am completely on board. If we stop short of that, we will end up victimizing the child.

SENATOR HARRIS:

It is my understanding the purpose of limiting the instances under traumatic events is to make it clear that there are times when these events need to be reported.

Now we have limited it to four categories, yet you are still asking for discretion under those four categories. I am a bit worried. Your example of the 17-year-old witnessing his mother shoving his father, that act is not normal. In fact, that may be a traumatic event and should be reported. Can you explain why we cannot require, in these now limited four categories, the police to report every time?

It is no longer domestic violence, it is domestic violence in the presence of a child. This addresses the concern brought up earlier. Can we get to a point where we can agree every time these events need to be reported, and then there is discretion in other areas? I am nervous about limiting the instances for police to report and maintaining the discretion.

MR. CALLAWAY:

The discussions I had with the CCSD after the first hearing was we were open to an amendment. We had discussed a tier level where there were certain categories that were mandatory reporting and there were categories that were optional or at the discretion of the officer.

I agreed with this amendment when it came from the CCSD. I am not opposed to certain criteria where the officer must report. The one area I have some consternation is the domestic violence area. As an officer who worked the streets the majority of my career, domestic violence cases are a very broad, vague area.

You may have cases where the neighbor hears arguing. The officer shows up to the residence and it is a domestic violence call. The officer discovers there was no physical abuse, but there was screaming and arguing and the child was present. Is it a child of 17-years-old and turning 18 next month, like my example, or is the child a 2- or 3-year-old or a child in kindergarten?

Because of the totality of those circumstances and how each circumstance may vary widely, adding a blanket mandate that every time an officer goes on a domestic violence call with a child present, to make a report, is not reasonable.

The scope is for a professional police officer in the field to have the judgment in those cases to determine when a child has suffered some trauma on the call, and a notification is needed. Or, a particular instance did not rise to the level of notification.

Police officers do the job of social workers often while on the job. We are not certified social workers. Obviously, there may be cases on any call when an officer may think a person was a victim or they were not; someone else may view it differently. That can happen here.

Senator Harris, if it is the desire of this Committee to mandate for an officer to report domestic violence, my only request would be the definition of domestic violence that a child witnesses be defined narrower and not just as domestic violence. Does that make sense?

SENATOR HARRIS:

I would like to get to a point where we can all agree when mandated reporting should happen. Even with the death of a member of the family or household of the child, the child may not have liked his or her uncle, so it is not that traumatic to him or her. This incident should still be reported. There will always be examples where the child is not actually traumatized even if he or she experiences a traumatic event.

Frankly, I would disagree that domestic violence calls are not always traumatic. Even if a father or mother are yelling at each other and the child is present, regardless of the child's age, the event is likely to have an impact on the child.

In general, I am not necessarily impressed with police and their handling of domestic violence cases over the course of the history of the world. Not anyone

in particular. I simply do not agree that domestic violence may or may not be traumatic. I would like you to possibly reconsider that stance.

MR. CALLAWAY:

Senator Harris, I fully respect your opinion and would be happy to work to define this issue better. I do not know if you have been out in a police car on ride-alongs and gone on domestic violence calls with our officers. I would encourage you to do that so the experience might change your opinion of how you view officers handling domestic violence calls in the field.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you. I accept your invitation.

CHAIR DENIS:

We have more work to do. We cannot handle all of the issues that were brought to our attention. We will discuss the issues and bring the bill back and we will close the hearing on S.B.80.

TERI WHITE (Superintendent, Douglas County School District; President, Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

Thank you for having the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) here today. I am Teri White and the Superintendent of Douglas County School District and President of the NASS.

I am here with my colleagues to share the tenets of iNVEST ([Exhibit D](#)). Since 2003, the superintendents of our State have worked together to produce a document which encapsulates our collective vision for the vibrant future of Nevada with over 473,000 students.

This Session, the iNVEST document presents our position on five precepts which we see as critical to our work. The document speaks to a model classroom which is led by a highly effective teacher who designs personalized learning opportunities in innovative spaces with a variety of student supports. Through leadership and partnership with engaged families and communities, students reach their academic and social potential. To be able to accomplish the model classroom, the document addresses: the need to reset per-pupil funding to align with current costs of education, to increase local control so districts are able to make the best decisions for the students, to protect fund balances so districts are better able to plan ahead without fear of losing the balance to decisions

made around collective bargaining and arbitration and to create structures which create partnerships between districts and the State in budget development.

Adequate funding is key to ensuring every student in Nevada is well prepared to compete with their counterparts within the global environment.

We are here today as partners committed to ensuring our graduates are able to compete in any market through any platform. We are eager to work with you to find solutions that will put Nevada at the forefront of student success across our Country.

I am joined at the table by three superintendents: Dr. David Jensen, Superintendent from Humboldt County; Mr. Wayne Workman, our NASS Vice President and Superintendent from Lyon County; and Mr. Adam Young, Superintendent from White Pine County. Each of these colleagues will share specifics of each section of the iNVest document.

In your audience are the superintendents of the other 13 school districts and charter schools from across our State.

ADAM YOUNG (Superintendent, White Pine County School District):

Education in Nevada is in my blood. My father was a White Pine graduate in 1954 and my mom was, and still is, a teacher in the White Pine County School District (WPCSD).

I graduated from White Pine High School and obtained my post-secondary degrees from University of Nevada, Las Vegas. My sons attended, and currently attend, White Pine High School. We all have benefitted from an excellent education in little old Ely.

I am the Superintendent of WPCSD having served as a teacher and then becoming the principal of White Pine High School at the age of 28. Many of the staff, including my mother, had been my former teachers. They continued to teach me, and we learned and grew our way to becoming a high achieving, 4-Star school, a National Model School and other designations including a science, technology, engineering and mathematics school.

During that time, I taught choir and English, advised and published the school newspaper. I still teach choir every day. On Monday, I transported my all-state

choir students to Elko for our regional rehearsal, arriving home that evening after 11:00 p.m.

I share this information for context. There is nobody who cares more about the students in my district than I do; their academic achievement, social and emotional well-being and college and career readiness. What I share with you today, I want you to understand, I share this through the lens of being in the trenches.

Our vision in WPCSD is to create a world-class learning environment. When I say this, I am not referring to buildings and infrastructure, although it would be nice to replace our 1913 middle school. I am referring to instruction, outstanding instruction, not adequate Tier 1 instruction within every classroom; state-of-the-art, not passable, intervention systems; personnel to assist students who struggle; first-rate college and career ready opportunities for students who excel; finally, diverse and in-demand Career and Technical Education programs to assist students in future decision making.

I think we can all agree that each and every Nevada student, regardless of geography, deserves access to these types of experiences. So what is the barrier? Let me illustrate with an example. This case study could be applied to any school within my district and across the State.

I began my career as a social studies teacher in 1999 at White Pine Middle School (WPMS). We had 300 students. There were three social studies teachers, three math teachers, three English teachers and three science teachers. There was a Spanish teacher, two physical education (PE) teachers, an art teacher, a band teacher who split time with the high school, a choir teacher who also split time with the high school, three special education teachers, a counselor, a principal and an assistant principal.

All year long, there were robust athletic programs, including intramural activities for all kids. There were multiple academic clubs that included math, social studies and science. Each core teacher taught an elective or two as well. My assignment was two recreational reading classes, where I conducted read alouds with fiction and facilitated independent learning and reading outside of students' regular English classes.

I was proud to be a teacher at the school. It was a school I wanted my own kids to attend. It is now 20 years later and you may not recognize what I am about to describe.

There are zero social studies teachers. There are still three math, science and English teachers. There is no Spanish teacher. There are no PE teachers. There is no art teacher. There is a band teacher, whose time is split with both the high school and two elementary schools and a choir teacher, whose time is split with the elementary schools. There are now only two special education teachers. There is no counselor. There is still a principal. There is an instructional coach paid for through a grant.

If you were keeping track, that is a difference of eight instructional staff. Eight instructional staff are no longer in the WPCSD. Plus there is no counselor and the second administrator/instructional coach is Grant funded. This funding ends in June 2019. The WPCSD has lost ten certificated positions. What else has changed?

Because there are ten fewer people, there are far fewer extracurricular activities. Intramural sports are done by the community. Despite their great efforts, these programs are disjointed and lack cohesiveness. There are almost no academic clubs. There are almost no electives like the reading class I described earlier. There simply are not enough people to run the school. Is this world-class?

Despite these challenges, and through absolutely Herculean efforts from the staff and principal, the WPMS is a 4-Star school and a very high-performing school. But the burnout, fatigue and emotional grit of the individuals making it happen is a very, very real and serious issue. And we wonder why people do not want to go into education.

What has changed in the 20 years? The population of the community is the same. The student enrollment is very comparable. The makeup of the district as a whole has seen similar cuts. It is not like resources are being diverted away from the school toward other projects. There are fewer district office staff and administrators now than then, so it cannot be blamed on administrative overload.

The first priority of iNVEST is to reset per pupil spending to current market costs and eliminate structural funding deficits. The current proposed budget is the perfect illustration. The teacher and staff rollups, cost of living increases and benefits changes outlined within it do not cover what the actual costs of those items will actually be. Based on the calculations of district personnel, who have been collaborating and doing this work for decades, the proposed per pupil allocation, even with the increase currently under consideration, is still \$185 per student short of putting schools in a place where they do not lose. In other words, how can WPMS progress toward being world-class when the figure being considered is still \$185 short of breaking even?

Investing in essential classrooms does yield results. Those results are illustrated in the iNVEST document, [Exhibit D](#), we have provided. These results have all occurred while schools across the State have experienced struggles similar to the ones I described in WPCSD.

Imagine what we could do if each classroom and each school had the resources to not just be adequate, but to be world-class. Imagine if PE, music, art and foreign language were not viewed as "extras", but as critical components to world-class learning. Let us strive for world-class learning.

I know I speak for my colleagues when I say we are thankful for the time you spend away from your families and for your willingness to tackle these difficult issues. We look forward to creating world-class learning with your support.

DAVID JENSEN, Ed.D. (Superintendent, Humboldt County School District):

I am the Superintendent of Humboldt County School District (HCSD) and I will share with you two topics. The first topic is per-pupil allocations and the second is relative to Ending Fund Balance (EFB).

Per-pupil allocation or per-pupil funding is frequently referred to as base funding. Base funding is the dollars that are directed toward the everyday operations of our schools and include necessities such as personnel, curriculum materials and school operation dollars. In the absence of base funding, impacts such as increased class sizes, aging bus fleets and out-of-date curriculum materials become the norm.

For HCSD, when General Fund and special education expenditures are combined, 86.7 percent of those funds are directed toward salaries and

benefits. This leaves 13.3 percent for basic operations and support of everyday activities.

As we prepare for the upcoming school year, each of the superintendents are starting to develop their tentative budgets. We are basing those budgets on a number of unknowns, including both revenues and expenditures. In looking at that, questions remain about: base funding, categorical funding, weighted funding, the increase in the Public Employees' Retirement System contributions, health insurance increases, negotiations and step and column movement for staff members.

Mr. Young has articulated that we sincerely appreciate the fact the Legislature and the Governor's Office have supported an annual 2 percent increase in education funding; however, the 2 percent does not meet the annual increased expenses impacting the ability of individual districts to meet critical needs that each school district faces.

As we engage in discussions regarding weighted funding for our State and for our most at-risk students, we ask our esteemed Legislators to consider the importance of base funding in that conversation as we balance both base and weighted funding. We believe every classroom deserves a high-quality teacher to provide the necessary curricular supports to ensure the next generation of Nevada's students are college and career ready.

The second topic is EFB. In terms of this topic, turn our recollection back to April 2018, especially for our friends from southern Nevada. The *Las Vegas Review Journal* reported that the CCSD had lost an arbitration based on disagreements on compensation with their bargaining units. This decision had an immediate and overall fiscal impact of approximately \$68 million to the CCSD. This decision resulted in an EFB balance of 0.78 percent.

This is significant, as school districts are expected to maintain a minimum of 4 percent EFB of the prior year's expenditures as defined in *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 354.650, subsection 1 and contradictory to NAC 354.660, subsection 2, which defines that up to 8.3 percent of an EFB is protected from both negotiations and arbitration.

In preparation for today's presentation, I asked Dr. Jesús Jara, Superintendent of the CCSD, what a difference the \$68 million could potentially have had for his district, if it had not been redirected to the EFB.

He shared with me a recent survey of the CCSD teachers that is consistent with all of the school districts in our State. Their two primary concerns are classroom sizes and curricular materials to facilitate educators' instruction. We wonder what that difference would be had those funds been available to the CCSD. The loss of this critical revenue, further eroding the EFB of the CCSD, limited this option. As Dr. Jara, the CCSD and other districts work toward ensuring fiscal stability and responsiveness, protecting the EFB will be essential.

With the full support of the NASS group, the CCSD has submitted S.B. 26, which would seek to amend NRS 354.6241 and mirror the language currently in NAC 354.660, subsection 2. I would like to remind you that NRS 354.6241 allows local governments to carry an EFB up to 25 percent that is protected from negotiations and arbitrations.

SENATE BILL 26: Revises provisions governing school financial administration.
(BDR 31-398)

We recognize that is not a reality for public schools, but if we can get that to 8.3 percent, it would make a profound difference. To categorize that, an 8.3 percent equates to one month of expenditures.

We believe in being transparent with our collective bargaining process, while also recognizing the importance of being fiscally responsible with the sacred taxpayer dollars used to support public education. For that, we ask for your consideration on those topics.

WAYNE WORKMAN (Superintendent, Lyon County School District):

I appreciate the opportunity to talk about protecting the Distributive School Account (DSA), creating a Rainy Day Fund and categorical or specialized funding.

School districts, schools, and unfortunately, students are still feeling the effects of the vast cuts that were made during the Great Recession. Many educational jobs were lost, maintenance was deferred and long-term school supplies were not purchased. This snowball effect continues today.

Unfortunately, funds that were created to help solve education funding deficits, such as the 2009 Initiative Petition No. 1 tax and the Regulation and Taxation of Marijuana Act, the recreational marijuana tax, have not actually increased the DSA, but were instead used to supplant intended funding. That coupled with decreased State General Funding for education and continued property tax abatements or caps means that we are still funding education at a lower level in Nevada than we were before the Great Recession.

Therefore, we are requesting that all funding sources intended for the education of our children be secured in the DSA and, when there is excess revenue generated from educational funding sources, that it be used to create a Rainy Day Fund so that the impact during less prosperous times is mitigated for our students.

School districts, schools and students appreciate all the efforts made in previous Legislative Sessions which were intended to address many of the educational funding shortfalls. This was primarily done through specialized or categorical funding initiatives, such as Read by Grade 3, Social Workers in Schools, Pre-K, Zoom and Victory Schools, among others.

Regrettably, there are unintended negative consequences of specialized or categorical funding. Instead of being a dedicated, ongoing funding source, these funds must be reauthorized every biennium. This means that our more qualified and expert people will not risk applying for these positions, because they are seen as temporary positions and not stable for employment.

For example, many districts have been required to revert some of their categorical funding back because interventionists, social workers, teachers and other specialists would not apply for the newly created positions.

Additionally, specialized or categorical funding comes in the form of grants which must undergo onerous application processes, thus delaying the dissemination of these funds. This means that even if there is a social worker, interventionist, teacher or other specialist who is willing to take the position, they are not able to be hired until well after the school year has started, resulting in a loss of educational services to our students.

We are requesting specialized and categorical funds be dedicated, ongoing funding sources and that they be distributed to all students requiring specialized

instruction and not through the grant process. This will create more stability for the students who we serve, while still holding school districts and schools accountable for educating all students.

MS. WHITE:

I thank the Committee for listening to our comments and for the work you do for the students of our State and the support you give each of us.

CHAIR DENIS:

If you would, please make certain each of the Committee members receive a copy of the iNVEST document. We do not have a copy and it is not online. We want it on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) for others to view. The superintendents from the CCSD and Washoe County School District were unable to attend today's meeting because of scheduling conflicts.

We appreciate the work the NASS is doing. We know you have many challenges trying to make things work with what we give you. Perhaps, someday, we can get the funds where they really need to be. You superintendents are doing amazing things in each of your school districts.

We will now return to our work session and hear S.B. 147.

SENATE BILL 147: Revises provisions relating to the education of pupils who are experiencing homelessness or who are in foster care. (BDR 34-394)

MS. STURM:

Senate Bill 147 is sponsored by the Legislative Committee on Education which was heard on February 20, 2019. The summary of this bill is ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 147.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Education
March 6, 2019
Page 19

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DENIS:

We will now hear S.B. 159.

[SENATE BILL 159](#): Requires each public school and private school to adopt a policy concerning safe exposure to the sun. (BDR 34-583)

Ms. STURM:

Senate Bill 159 is sponsored by Senators Woodhouse, Denis, Dondero Loop, Harris and Brooks. The summary of the bill is ([Exhibit F](#)).

CHAIR DENIS:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 159.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

I have the pleasure to represent the NASS. First of all, I want to apologize for the confusion on the iNVEST document. Brad Keating and I did deliver copies to your offices last Friday. We have extra copies and want to make sure you each receive a copy. This document is full of good information, as you have heard today.

CHAIR DENIS:

I want to be certain the iNVEST document can be put on NELIS, for those wanting to view it.

JESSICA FERRATO (Nevada Association of School Boards):

I am here on behalf of the Nevada Association of School Boards. I want to express their support for the iNVEST document and the concepts within it. This

Senate Committee on Education
March 6, 2019
Page 20

is indicative of the collaboration between the districts and the State. There is a lot of work that went into this document over the interim. The Association supports all the principles in the document and wants to thank everyone who participated in putting their concepts, time and energy into the iNVest document.

CHAIR DENIS:

I want to comment on the iNVest presentation. It is amazing that there are 17 different superintendents with different conditions who can come together and come to a consensus on what needs to happen in education. This is incredible, because it was not always like this in the past.

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

Senate Committee on Education
March 6, 2019
Page 21

For a large part of my legislative career, you have done that and it has been amazing to see. I appreciate your efforts. If there is no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Shelley Kyle,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	5		Attendance Roster
S.B. 80	C	3	Jen Sturm	Work Session Document
	D	16	Teri White / Douglas County School District	Presentation iNVEST in Education
S.B. 147	E	3	Jen Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 159	F	1	Jen Sturm	Work Session Document