

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

**Eightieth Session
March 22, 2019**

The joint meeting of the Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:07 a.m. on Friday, March 22, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Chris Brooks
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Ben Kieckhefer

ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson (Excused)
Assemblyman John Hambrick (Excused)

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 2

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Jaimarie Ortega, Program Analyst
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst
Desirae Munns, Committee Secretary
Felicia Archer, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan P. Moore, Acting Superintendent, Public Instruction,
Nevada Department of Education
Andrea Osborne, Director, Fiscal Support, Business and Support
Services Division, Nevada Department of Education
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of State Student Services,
Nevada Department of Education
Jason Dietrich, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator
Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Nevada Department of Education
Susan Ulrey, Education Programs Professional, Office of Student and School
Supports, Nevada Department of Education
Heather Crawford-Ferre, Education Programs Professional, Office of Standards
and Instructional Support, Nevada Department of Education
Jayne Malorni, Education Programs Professional, Office of Standards and
Instructional Support, Nevada Department of Education
Stefani Hogan, Management Analyst, Business Services Support Division,
Nevada Department of Education
Patti Oya, Director, Office of Early Learning and Development, Nevada
Department of Education
Vikki Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association
Denise Tanata, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Derild Parsons, Director, Special Services, Churchill County School District
Leslie Nix, Grant Writer, Clark County School District
Sylvia Lazos, Co-leader, Legislative Advocacy Group, Nevada
Immigration Coalition

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 3

Natha Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association and Nevada State Education Association
John Eppolito, President, Protect Nevada Children
Julie Houchins, Early Education Program Manager, United Way of Southern Nevada
Jessica Kennedy, Executive Director, Henderson Christian Academy and Angels Christian Academy
Karen Holley, Coordinator, Federal and State Programs, Nye County School District

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will hear from the Nevada Department of Education (NDE).

JONATHAN P. MOORE (Acting Superintendent, Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education):

Our goal is to be the fastest improving State in the Nation, as shown in the NDE presentation ([Exhibit C](#)). We judge our progress by the eight indicators listed on page 4. We have six goals set by the State Board of Education as shown on page 5. We have a State Improvement Plan that builds into NDE's five-year strategic plan discussed on page 6.

ANDREA OSBORNE (Director, Fiscal Support, Business and Support Services Division, Nevada Department of Education):

We will discuss budget accounts 101-2615, B/A 101-2620, B/A 101-2717 and B/A 101-2709.

EDUCATION

K-12 EDUCATION

NDE - School Remediation Trust Fund — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-30
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-2615

NDE - Instruction In Financial Literacy — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-15
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-2620

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 4

NDE - Teachers' School Supplies Reimbursement — Budget Page K-12
EDUCATION-42 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2717

NDE - Office of Early Learning and Development — Budget Page K-12
EDUCATION-104 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2709

The School Remediation Trust Fund, B/A 101-2615 beginning on page 7 of [Exhibit C](#), is funded from General Fund appropriations that can roll forward in each year of the biennium. The Superintendent of Public Instruction administers the funds, which can be used for plans to improve achievement needs of students. The funding is for Zoom Schools, Victory Schools, English Language Learners (ELL), Nevada Ready 21 Technology Program (NV21) grants, the New Teacher Incentive Program and the Social Licensed Mental Health Programs.

The NV21 Program provides students and teachers access to technology and the resources and training required to integrate technology into the classroom. Short-term goals of the project include integration of the devices in instruction and assignments, use of the devices by students and an understanding from families about how the program is part of their student's experience. Long-term goals include committed support from the schools for the program, differentiated instruction, increased student engagement, increased academic achievement and support for the program from families.

The NV21 Program is based on the premise that schools that apply for a grant are willing and ready to implement changes in the way teachers design instruction and students learn. The program was established in 2017 with Senate Bill (S.B.) No. 467 of the 79th Session. It was funded with \$10 million per year. It is meant to provide every teacher and student in the program with 24-hour access to his or her own personal portable technology device, also known as a one-to-one device, connected wirelessly to the internet. Legislation also provides the funds are overseen by the Commission on Educational Technology and requires NDE to enter into an agreement with a person or entity to carry out the program.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 5

The NV21 schools met the fiscal year (FY) 2018-2019 math targets and significantly improved the percentage of students proficient in math since the one-to-one devices were deployed. The vast majority of parents surveyed agreed the devices helped their students' learning.

Benefits of NV21 are shown on page 12 and page 13 of [Exhibit C](#). The final column on page 14 should say "spring 2019." No budgetary changes to this program are requested at this time.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Please continue your presentation, and then we will have questions on four different categories for several of your staff.

KARL WILSON (Education Programs Supervisor, Office of State Student Services, Nevada Department of Education):

Zoom Schools are shown on page 17 of [Exhibit C](#). The Zoom School Program was initiated with Senate Bill No. 504 of the 77th Session which targeted funding to support low-performing schools with high concentrations of ELL. At that time, the Zoom School program funded elementary schools with pre-kindergarten (pre-K) services, full-day kindergarten, reading centers, and summer or intersession academies to provide support for ELL. Schools were originally identified in Clark County School District (CCSD) and Washoe County School District (WCSD). Zoom was authorized again under Senate Bill No. 405 of the 78th Session which expanded the work into secondary schools. The Legislature funded the full-day kindergarten in a different way, so that was removed from the Zoom School Program. Because of limitations in funding for full-day kindergarten in the 2015-2016 school year, the Zoom School Program was asked to continue full-day kindergarten funding in the first year of that biennium. That resulted in a significant number of Zoom Schools in school year 2016-2017 because of the savings from full-day kindergarten.

Senate Bill No. 390 of the 79th Session continued the Zoom School Program, specifically intending to maintain the Zoom School Program outlined at that time.

The mandatory services in WCSD and CCSD are pre-K, reading skill centers and either a summer academy, intersession or an extended day, as shown on

page 18 of [Exhibit C](#). The districts have migrated away from a summer academy or intersession and adopted more extended-day programs. The law allows them to use up to 5 percent of their funds for professional development, recruitment and retention incentives, and family and parent engagement.

The districts have a menu of options for secondary programs. They must choose at least one program to reduce class size for ELL, provide direct instructional intervention or select from the same services mentioned for the elementary schools. They may identify other evidenced-based strategies approved by NDE.

The historical perspective and growth are shown on page 19 of [Exhibit C](#). We are seeing success. Almost every Zoom School is eligible for United States Department of Education Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (Title I) funding. Exit data for ELL students is shown on page 20 of [Exhibit C](#). Zoom Schools are exceeding the State goal of 13 percent.

The adequate growth percentile (AGP) is a measure of the percent of students who are growing in proficiency to exit the ELL Program within five years. Data on AGP is shown on page 21 of [Exhibit C](#). We need improvement in the middle schools. The goal of NDE is to have 50 percent of students achieving AGP every year.

An external evaluation of the Zoom Schools Program was conducted by ACS Ventures. Recommendations are shown on page 22 of [Exhibit C](#). We are working to learn from the practices at high-performing schools that can be shared with others. The study recommended an increased focus on professional development for teachers.

A discussion of Victory Schools begins on page 24 of [Exhibit C](#). Victory Schools were initiated by Senate Bill No. 432 of the 78th Session. The program was expanded under Senate Bill No. 447 of the 79th Session. It provides more than \$25 million per year to 35 schools identified by the NDE as having the highest percentage of poverty by zip code in Nevada and the lowest performing schools.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 7

The intent of the Victory Schools Program was to help the schools' communities achieve greater success. Service options are shown on page 25 of [Exhibit C](#). Urban areas have 26 Victory Schools, rural areas have 4 and 5 are considered Native American. Details are shown on page 26 to page 28 of [Exhibit C](#). There is a concern that schools that have been receiving assistance lose their funding when they improve. The ACS Ventures report findings are shown on page 28 of [Exhibit C](#). Stakeholders report a positive perception of the program, and say it is making an impact on their communities.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I want someone to discuss the teacher incentives in B/A 101-2615.

MS. OSBORNE:

The Teacher Incentive Program in B/A 101-2615 began in 2016 as a result of Senate Bill No. 511 of the 78th Session. Its purpose is to recruit and retain teachers in Nevada. The 79th Session added special education teachers to those eligible. Assembly Bill No. 434 of the 79th Session provided incentives for teachers at Title I schools and teacher transfer incentives for teachers transferring to Title I schools. The State appropriated \$2.5 million in (FY) 2017-2018 for incentives for new teachers in Title I schools, \$2.5 million for incentives for teacher transfers to Title I schools and \$2.5 million to the regular new teacher incentives. In FY 2018-2019, \$2.5 million was appropriated to the regular teacher program as well. No budgetary changes have been requested for this program.

As of March 21, 2019, the request is for 200 new teacher incentives, 1,721 new teacher incentives at Title I schools and 97 incentives for teachers transferring to Title I schools. The data includes all districts that participate.

The social worker program would transfer from B/A 101-2615 to the proposed new School Safety budget account in B/A 101-2698, decision unit E-908.

NDE - School Remediation Trust Fund — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-30
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-2615

E-908 Transfer To B/A 101-2698 — Page K-12 EDUCATION-30

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 8

NDE - School Safety — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-32 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2698

E-908 Trans. From Sch. Remediation Trust To School Safety — Page K-12
EDUCATION-34

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

I have questions about the roll out of this plan. I am very unhappy with how this has been handled. It created significant morale issues. I was disappointed no one reached out to me, as the author of Assembly Bill No. 434 of the 79th session, to clear up any questions NDE had. We must communicate if there are any questions about intent. The teachers are the ones who were hurt by the Department's lack of clarity on legislative intent. I want to hear your plans for moving forward.

JASON DIETRICH (Interim Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Nevada Department of Education):
The Department is undergoing large staffing changes. The program for teacher incentives has been moved to a different unit. The current staff assigned to the program and I have just this week completed a full reconciliation and audit of the program. We know the status exactly. We are fully prepared to reach out to the districts and expend funds. We know where the requests were and what funding is available. We will reach out to Speaker Frierson regarding your intent. I apologize for the confusion in the roll out and any disparate impact to the educational community.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

I acknowledge you are being asked to answer questions about situations carried out by someone else. We want to get this right. Please discuss the problems with the roll out so we can address them in pending legislation.

MR. DIETRICH:

We misinterpreted the funding amount in both years of the biennium. The \$2.5 million was not funded in both years in certain categories. There was confusion there. As the districts apply for the incentives, there is a bottleneck. The categories make it complicated to disburse money. We have \$5.5 million in requests and \$2.5 million available. In other categories, we have funds available

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 9

but have requests for far less than what is available. We need the ability to work with the Governor's Finance Office (GFO) and others to move money around, so we can send it to the districts. An acceptable-use list would make it easier for applicants and for the Department.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

It was originally \$10 million, and it was cut last Session. What are the criteria to determine who gets what when you have requests for more funds than you have to spend? Is it first come, first served? Is it apportioned?

MR. DIETRICH:

Generally, there would be a percentage cut across the board for all applications received. We need more in the new-teacher incentives and the ability to move funds into that category. This would make the programs more manageable and more equitable.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

Part of the morale issue is the program overlooked existing teachers. Would it be more effective if it first rewards existing teachers who have shown commitments to those schools?

MR. DIETRICH:

We have heard that complaint. Second year teachers were not eligible. First year teachers qualified. That hurt morale. We want to be responsive to that. You can help us do so.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

Would the program be better or worse if we focus on existing teachers?

MR. DIETRICH:

I am not speaking for the Department on this. It would be a great benefit to incentivize the teachers who have been performing well for a long time to assist in retention issues.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

I would be happy to work with you on this. I have ideas to help.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 10

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Categoricals are different than categories. For the record, we need to clarify you are talking about two different categories; Category 9 and Category 10 in new teacher and transfer teacher incentives. We are not talking about moving categorical funding like Zoom Schools and Victory Schools categoricals. That language is very important to us. The issue you shared was about moving money back and forth from new teachers to transferred teachers. Is that correct? I want a good record here.

MR. DIETRICH:

Yes. You understood me correctly.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

This is easy to confuse. I understand.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Now that we are clear on that intent, we will move on to Zoom Schools and ELL grant programs.

SENATOR DENIS:

How did the Department determine there was a need to continue \$50 million in annual funding to support ELL students?

MR. WILSON:

The \$50 million figure came from the GFO to sustain the level of funding available in the current biennium. It would be divided by the number of ELL students in each of the eligible local education agencies. That results in a per pupil amount. CCSD and WCSD have made the choice to concentrate their ELL funding under Zoom Schools to fewer schools to enhance that figure. It is approximately \$663 per ELL student received under the Zoom School funding.

SENATOR DENIS:

Will this stabilize the number of schools and students being served?

MR. WILSON:

If the funding remained at \$50 million per year, we expect the number of Zoom Schools would stay consistent. The language in Senate Bill No. 390 of

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 11

the 79th Session encouraged CCSD and WCSD to continue services in the same Zoom Schools.

SENATOR DENIS:

What is the plan to implement the recommendations from the external evaluation?

MR. WILSON:

The Department will continue to work with school districts to implement the recommendations.

SENATOR DENIS:

Do you see any challenges in implementing those?

MR. WILSON:

The main opportunities are to work to identify the promising practices in the successful Zoom Schools and to disseminate those to the Zoom Schools that have not yet achieved a level of success we are looking for. We have a process for identifying low-performing Zoom Schools and requiring corrective action. Both CCSD and WCSD have seen significant improvement in the performance of schools identified for corrective action. Of those, 90 percent saw improvement in ELL growth.

SENATOR DENIS:

Is the sharing of promising practices among Zoom Schools working?

MR. WILSON:

Yes.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Do the districts decide how to allocate the funding?

MR. WILSON:

Yes. The funds are divided by the number of eligible ELL students in each district. Allocations are made to the districts or charters. They make decisions on how to use those resources. Rural school districts have concentrated their

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 12

ELL funds to provide preschool programs for ELL students in their communities with the greatest population of ELL students.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is there overlap between Zoom Schools funding and the Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session New Nevada money?

MR. WILSON:

When Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session funds were calculated and distributed, starting in 2017, schools receiving Zoom School funding were not eligible for the Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session funds. The proposal moving forward is to clarify that in the rural school districts, where schools are not Zoom Schools, but are schools that receive ELL funding, they may still be eligible for the Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session funding.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are students in Zoom Schools backed out of the Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session calculation?

MR. WILSON:

No. Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session looks at ELL students in the bottom quartile across the State in calculating those funds.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is that true even though some students in that calculation will not receive support from the program because they are already in a Zoom School?

MR. WILSON:

Under the current funding, yes. Under the proposed funding, that issue would be resolved.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I want to discuss Victory Schools.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 13

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

What steps does the Department take to release funds in a timely manner? That issue always comes up in my District. The money comes too late in the school year.

MR. WILSON:

Victory Schools must have an approved plan in place to have access to the funding. Substantial approval to all school districts was made in July 2018. That allows them to start spending their money while they do the final approvals. Formal approval was in place for all plans by October 2018.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

So they must submit their plans in spring for approval in July. They do not get disbursement until October. The school year starts in August. Is that the schedule?

MR. WILSON:

Yes. The substantial approval that comes in July allows them to start spending their money for staffing and other purposes. The formal approval based on revisions submitted gives them approval to spend all of their money anytime during the year in accordance with their approved plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

I want to discuss the vendor approval process. Can they only choose from vendors on your list?

MR. WILSON:

You may be referring to the approval of expenditures that would meet evidence-based criteria.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

Evidence-based criteria or promising practices are included.

MR. WILSON:

There is a list of vendors that serves as a resource to all local education agencies (LEA) in the State. When they need a provider, they may choose from the list. It is not a limiting list but shows which vendors have provided sufficient

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 14

documentation to qualify. The LEAs are not limited to the list if the vendor they want to use shows they have met evidence-based criteria.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

Is there further delay in the disbursement of funds?

MR. WILSON:

Once substantial approval is made in July, the LEA is able to spend and receive reimbursement for the funds.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

I would like to talk to you more, because I am hearing funding is coming as late as January. We need to make this process flow for schools. They need it. It is a big stressor.

MR. WILSON:

We would be glad to talk with you. Purchasing within their own districts is sometimes a factor.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

When a school succeeds, we love it. What is the level of funding needed for aftercare when a school improves but needs that funding to stay successful? That is a big issue for administrators I hear from at my community forums.

MR. WILSON:

Susan Ulrey oversees implementation of Senate Bill No. 178 of the 79th Session. She is in Las Vegas and has met with some of the principals who share your concerns. A large portion of the funds are spent on personnel. If we remove the funds from the Victory School, it loses the staff that helped make the school successful. They want to continue to be able to provide the services at a level that has helped them achieve success.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

I am hearing, just as you said, the position is actually gone when improvement is shown. Counselors are gone. The impacts are tremendous.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 15

SUSAN ULREY (Education Programs Professional, Office of Student and School Supports, Nevada Department of Education):

We must wait every year to see if the program will be renewed. District policy regarding retaining teachers requires us to notify teachers by a certain date if they have secured positions. At the end of the biennium, we sometimes do not know if the program will continue and staff must be released. Part of the Victory Schools Program is hiring enough people to address the needs of the whole child. We employ social workers, mentors, counselors and more. The uncertainty of funding is very stressful.

There are many rumors out there right now that the Victory Schools Program will not continue. I am notifying people who ask that the intent is for the program to continue, so they would not release the staff they have hired. Contracts must be renewed by a certain date. We need to have some confirmation.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We have questions regarding the Nevada Ready 21 Technology Program.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

Given the recommended funding of \$10 million in each year of the biennium, how many new schools are projected to be served in the upcoming biennium?

HEATHER CRAWFORD-FERRE (Education Programs Professional, Office of Standards and Instructional Support, Nevada Department of Education):

We expect the third group of schools during the next biennium would mirror the size of the first groups as funding would be similar. Approximately 20,000 students were served in the first group.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

One challenge I have been told is students have the equipment in middle school then go on to high school and do not have it. Why have we not seen plans to expand this to high school to provide continuity? What is your long-term plan for expanding into high schools?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 16

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

We agree, and we have heard the same concerns. We are following the Nevada Plan developed at the launch of the program. The Nevada Commission on Educational Technology helped in development of that plan. Research indicated that a start in middle school to develop technology literacy is key for students to have the skills to apply to their curriculum, especially in career studies and computer science.

We now serve 25 percent of middle schoolers in Nevada. Advisors will need to make a decision as to whether we should expand at the middle schools, to the high schools or some combination of the two. Funding now available would not allow us to complete service to all middle schools and move into the high schools. Doing so would cost approximately \$80 million in the next biennium to address the middle schools interested in applying and to include only the high schools aligned with middle schools already in the program.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

Has there been any effort to locate grant money to supplement funding, particularly for students moving from middle school to high schools where technology is not available?

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

Yes. We have done sustainability training that includes a focus on soliciting funding to continue the schools' one-to-one technology, how to seek external grant funding and how to partner with the business community. That was especially aimed at schools that are exiting the State funding formula.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

Have the efforts to secure external funding been successful?

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

Yes. We have some LEAs that have been successful. In Carson City, a local business sponsored advertising on the technology carts.

SENATOR DENIS:

I am a member of the Nevada Commission on Educational Technology. We get the question about high school access all the time. We must have that

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 17

discussion. We do not know if there is continuity until we try it. Are there other programs within the State that are one-to-one technology?

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

There are other programs funded through other sources. We do not maintain the records for other programs, but we learn from the educational technology directors that some other schools are using one-to-one technology. The challenge in answering your question is how one-to-one is defined. The NV21 project uses best practices of the One-to-One Institute for programming, including professional development and individual devices being assigned to individual students. In that case, students would take the same device home with them and back to each of their classes. Some programs in Nevada have enough devices for the number of students enrolled, but the devices may or may not be assigned to individual students or may not be taken home. They may not all be the same device as technology is piecemealed.

If you want data on other one-to-one programs, you could help us by telling us how you want to define the term. We want to make sure the question we are answering is the question you are asking.

SENATOR DENIS:

I understand. People say it appears some of the at-risk schools are not on the list. Some have devices. When we discuss this, it is important for us to see what is happening in the whole State.

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

We see that in schools that receive Title I funding, because they can use that money to purchase technology. The district determines which schools they apply for, often based on other available funding. In CCSD, they will often use the other funding for technology at schools that are eligible and then apply for State funding for schools that do not have that other funding stream.

SENATOR DENIS:

I want all kids to have this opportunity.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 18

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

I had this conversation last Session. The list is not comprehensive, as other schools receive other funding for this. I saw only one school from the east side of the Las Vegas Valley. I wonder if there are other resources in the communities for the schools who are on the list. Should the State money go to the students who need it the most? There are some kids in every school who need it. Having that comprehensive list is important to me in making decisions. If you do not have the information, we need to go to the districts and get it.

We must look at which students are being served and how we transition from middle schools to high schools with the highest and best use of funding. We need more information.

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

We can provide you the information we received from the educational technology directors in each district and their contact information.

Changes were made to the review process after the 79th Session. We fully funded every school that applied in the first group. The second group was in a more competitive grant process. We funded 5 of 23 schools that applied. Additional points were added in the weighting formula to address schools with special populations including high levels of poverty, ELL or students with special needs. Doing so allowed us to bring on Trainer Middle School in Washoe County which has 100 percent free and reduced-price lunch status. We will more heavily weight those factors going forward.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Is the criteria changing?

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:

Yes. We would bring that decision to the Educational Technology Commission before implementation.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Many schools are still waiting. This is a two-to-three-year process. I am glad to see you are adding that. When I compare the schools on the list with the lunch

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 19

programs, there is no correlation. I hope that changes. We need continuity from middle school to high school. They will not succeed without these resources.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
Did group one start in FY 2015-2016?

MS. CRAWFORD-FERRE:
Yes. This is the end of their State funding. They are moving toward the sustainability model.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will hear about financial literacy.

MS. OSBORNE:
Senate Bill No. 249 of the 79th Session created the Account for Instruction in Financial Literacy, B/A 101-2620, to provide \$1 million over the biennium to be used specifically for instruction in financial literacy. The NDE presents a budget eliminating this funding. We thought this was a one-time funded program. Further discussion leaves us confused by the bill language as to whether this was intended to be ongoing. We have removed the program funding in decision unit E-490.

E-490 Expiring Grant/Program — Page K-12 EDUCATION-15

We will continue to work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the GFO staff to determine if removal was correct.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
I want to put on the record right now this was never intended to be one-shot funding. There is no way in two years we can train every Grade 3 through Grade 12 teacher who needs professional development in financial literacy and the many students who need this. I am passionate about this.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:
You said you were confused about legislative intent about Senator Woodhouse's bill. What factors were considered in determining the funding should not continue?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 20

Ms. OSBORNE:

We had confusion. We had it in the budget and took it out. Since it was new legislation, the program did not automatically appear in our list of which programs continue and which do not. When we read the bill, we had internal conversations and spoke with the GFO at the time. We were unclear. We put in that decision unit to remove funding and have since regretted that decision.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

At any point, did anybody consider asking the bill's sponsor what the legislative intent was?

Ms. OSBORNE:

No. We did not reach out to Senator Woodhouse. We are very sorry.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

You had this money. What efforts were undertaken by the Department during the biennium to make sure the awarded funding was used effectively and for its intended purpose?

JAYNE MALORNI (Education Programs Professional, Nevada Department of Education):

We have contacted the LEAs who have applied for funding. There has been progress on monitoring and checkpoints.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

Are you monitoring them? Were regulations adopted related to this program? What was in them?

Ms. MALORNI:

Do you mean are we going to the schools or communicating with them? What do you mean by monitoring?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

Total monitoring includes making sure that if a school was awarded funding it used the funding, if it used the funding appropriately, if correct procedures were used, if training was implemented and if implemented training was effective.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 21

We want to know how many people were trained and what the outcomes were. That is a full monitoring program.

MS. MALORNI:

I can speak for just the last few months I have been with NDE. I cannot speak for the full biennium. There were regulations and policies for the LEAs that have applied to make sure the money was used appropriately and to the intent specified. There is no money for personnel to go speak with the schools and to see if the money was being used effectively.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

I recognize you are new. Moving forward, how will the Department make sure teachers have this knowledge base and the skills necessary to successfully teach students about financial literacy and economics once economics becomes a required part of the social studies curriculum in July 2022?

MS. MALORNI:

We want to make sure we monitor the complete pieces. The standards developed through Senate Bill No. 249 of the 79th Session will be in full implementation beginning in the 2019-2020 school year. There will be much more need for professional development and for coordination of efforts.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

My data says CCSD provided professional development to approximately 800 teachers. The actual cost in FY 2017-2018 was more than \$494,000. In WCSD, approximately 830 teachers were trained for \$188,000. I would like to understand the differences. I know the districts make these decisions and not you. We still need to understand this to decide if it should be in your purview to make sure the money is spent appropriately.

MS. MALORNI:

Each LEA applies for the noncompetitive grant. The biggest difference between the two districts was CCSD incentivized teachers to go to the professional development, and WCSD did not.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

Was that paid training?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 22

MS. MALORNI:

Extra duty funds and substitute teacher days were used in CCSD.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

I want more information and greater detail on this training, so we can evaluate the two approaches to make sure the training worked.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Part of the CCSD expense was the need for instructional materials for the classroom. I will reach out to the two districts to get better information. This will not go away. We will hear Senate Bill (S.B.) 314 on financial literacy next week.

SENATE BILL 314: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-730)

I want to publicly thank Ms. Malorni. She was incredibly helpful in crafting Senate Bill No. 249 of the 79th Session and working with the stakeholders, school districts and the business community to make sure we came up with legislation that would work for teachers and students. I am thrilled to see her at NDE and involved in this portion of her work. She has brought a lot to the table to make sure this program is one of the stars of NDE and the districts.

We will hear teacher school supply reimbursement in B/A 101-2717 decision unit E-275, as shown on page 32 of Exhibit C.

E-275 Educated and Healthy Citizenry — Page K-12 EDUCATION-42

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK:

What efforts has the Department taken to increase the number of teachers participating in the teacher school supply reimbursement program in B/A 101-2717?

STEFANI HOGAN (Management Analyst, Business Services Support Division, Nevada Department of Education):

We have a new management analyst working on this program identified in January. That person works with the grants and programs analyst and the districts and charter schools to share best practices.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 23

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK:

Can you please give me some examples of the types of things you are doing to reach more teachers?

Ms. HOGAN:

Clark County School District has achieved 95 percent participation of teachers. The district provides a purchase card to each of its schools preloaded with a dollar amount each teacher is eligible for in that school year. That card is maintained at the administrative office of that school in the principal's sole responsibility. When teachers want to make a purchase, they check out the card, take it to purchase allowable supplies and return it along with a receipt for documentation. It is the office's responsibility to document, reconcile and audit the records of the card. The process has been easy for teachers to use.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK:

My question was more on how are we reaching teachers. I understand how the program works. How do you reach more teachers?

MR. MOORE:

There is a variance regarding participation rates. Churchill and Eureka are at 100 percent and CCSD is at 95 percent. Washoe County School District is at 29 percent and White Pine is at 24 percent. We talk to the districts with lower participation rates to help them implement some of the tactics.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK:

Please provide some examples of what has been working well and can be migrated over to other districts. How will your request for a new grants and projects analyst make sure reimbursements to teachers are at the appropriate level and they comply with requirements?

Ms. HOGAN:

The new position will be responsible for risk assessment and subrecipient monitoring. It will work closely in the monitoring process to ensure compliance.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK:

What will this position be doing that is not being done now?

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 24

MS. OSBORNE:

The position is not just for this program. The person assigned to this grant now has 33 other grant programs to run. They do not spend even one full day a month on each grant. The additional positions would help with that oversight.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

As we monitor this program, I want much more detail on compliance. I am told at some schools, principals are making large purchases in the names of the teachers for supplies and other things unrelated to the teacher. I want to make sure the teacher is using the card. There are ways to check this.

MS. HOGAN:

A monitoring procedure was developed in spring 2017 with some district input. Monitoring was completed for FY 2015-2016. We looked at receipts and documentation. That level of monitoring for this program has not been completed due to workload.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Who will address the Office of Early Learning and Development, beginning on page 34 of [Exhibit C](#)? Please provide a status update concerning your efforts to secure additional Nevada Ready Preschool Development Grant (PDG) funds for the pre-K program for the next biennium in B/A 101-2709 decision unit E-276 and decision unit E-491.

E-276 Educated and Healthy Citizenry — Page K-12 EDUCATION-108

E-491 Expiring Grant/Program — Page K-12 EDUCATION-108

PATTI OYA (Director, Office of Early Learning and Development,
Nevada Department of Education):

We received a U.S. Department of Education Preschool Development Grant Birth Through Five planning grant. This is a planning grant to help states build infrastructure across their Birth Through Five system, including pre-K and child care. It runs from January to December 2019. It is not about seats. There may be some implementation grants.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 25

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

State General Fund appropriations will pick up full costs of maintaining existing services with a certain number of full-time seats. Local districts are picking up some of that share now. State funds would supplant about \$7 million in allocations. Is it your intent to offset the local district funds and then let the district use their funds for other purposes, or is it to enhance the number of seats being funded?

Ms. OYA:

We will continue to do a competitive application for pre-K funding. The formula is \$8,000 for a full-day seat and \$4,000 for a half-day seat. The districts would be expected to braid funding, which could include Zoom Schools, Victory Schools, Title I and special education funds to make full-day seats. We want all seats to be full-day. I do not see it as supplanting.

There are many uncertainties in the braided funding. We are trying to encourage more child care centers to work with nonprofits to offer the same pre-K seats and improve quality of child care. Those nonprofits are not eligible for any of the braided funding.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are there about 3,023 seats now? At \$25 million per year, you are paying \$8,000 per chair. That means there is no local funding to fund what is proposed.

Ms. OYA:

That is correct. There are districts that support their pre-K programs with costs outside of what we give them for pre-K. Some include transportation and some do not because they pick the costs up in their transportation or general fund budgets.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

It seems like we are double spending or offsetting what the local districts are contributing to the program. We may need to reexamine our spending.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 26

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

In the interim meetings we had, there was some discussion about a pre-K star rating, similar to our other schools. We also discussed incentives and how to move high-performing teachers to low-performing areas. Has there been progress on that?

Ms. OYA:

We have a quality-rating improvement system which is a star-rating system that is different from the K-12 system. The program involves coaching, grants and assessors. We generally do not encourage high-performing teachers to move. We want to encourage teachers in low-performing schools to get the education or support they need to become high-performing. If we move high-performing teachers around, the quality of the previous classroom drops. We do not want that to happen for those children. We offer scholarships.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

Are we intentionally following that progress? Underperforming schools need quality teachers too.

Ms. OYA:

We track scholarship recipients. We look at child outcomes. Some of our data and collection methods are new, so we are not ready to draw conclusions. We showed large gains in student success in our initial testing. We work with the universities to evaluate progress.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

If the recommendation for one new administrative assistant in B/A 101-2709 decision unit E-276 is approved, would the contract position no longer be needed?

Ms. OYA:

Yes, that is the intent, but we could keep a temporary worker to work on the Infinite Campus web portal to track data. That has not been determined at this time.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 27

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

On the New Contract Quality Rating Improvement System coaches positions in B/A 101-2709 decision unit E-246, what type of workload are you looking at here? Are these the positions that help with high-quality performance?

E-246 Efficient and Responsive State Government — Page K-12
EDUCATION-107

Ms. OYA:

We have 16.5 coaching positions and 2.5 supervisors. It is a complicated funding model. The coaches serve about 20 to 25 centers each. We implemented a "steps to stars system" so we could help centers do paperwork more quickly. Coaching kicks in about six months later. They look at children's behavior, strength and weakness, and more.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

How did you determine two is the right number of positions needed?

Ms. OYA:

Two is a manageable amount to request. It is difficult to find coaches with the level of education and experience we require. We tried to be realistic in what we have asked for.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I visited one of the programs in Henderson before the Session started. It was incredible and awesome. I wanted to clone those teachers and put them in every single classroom that has a substitute in it right now. I spoke to a parent who told me this program is a lifesaver for her. I want to find a way to bring it to more of our pre-K students. I urge you to visit.

VIKKI COURTNEY (President, Clark County Education Association):

At the State of the State Address, Governor Sisolak presented a budget that included a 3 percent raise for educators and the commitment to increasing the teacher supply reimbursement. This was done without new revenue. As we witness this Session proceed, bill after bill has been presented with fiscal impacts. Only a couple of these were included in the Executive Budget. How will we fund these with no new revenue? Each day

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 28

I watch legislation being created or added to, and I think back to the Governor's words, "no new revenue." Each day I see educators leave our classes with the words, "I am not doing this anymore." I know that is one more teacher who will walk away from the profession.

Each day I see a child heading to school with the look of excitement of what that day at school will bring, I worry for their future with the thought there will be a substitute in their class each day. Will there be so many students in the classroom that, at best, you have teachers doing what they can with the resources they have?

We struggle to recruit people to join our profession. They have watched educators across the Country who are striking because the pay is poor compared to their investment in their education, classrooms are overcrowded and support from the State Legislature is lacking. It is simply a lack of respect.

A budget reflects what is valued. Legislation will be created with no new revenue. Educators across the State are looking to see if our legislators will uphold the promise of our Governor. What do you value? Will our teachers be the casualty?

DENISE TANATA (Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance):

I support the Nevada Department of Education Office of Early Learning budget proposal to support and expand the pre-K programs. Nevada ranks 40th for spending per capita on pre-K programs for states that offer preschool at about \$65 per capita for 3- and 4-year-olds.

While \$65 is an improvement, it is significantly below the national average of about \$955. Nevada serves 5 percent of 4-year-olds and 1 percent of 3-year-olds in the State pre-K program. The pre-K budget being proposed requests approximately \$8,000 per child for a full-day program. This is almost \$1,000 less than the cost per child for the K-12 students. It is also less than the cost of a private licensed pre-K program which is nearly \$9,000 per child, per year.

Without this investment, more than 3,000 pre-K seats could be lost. We already underserve our pre-K population. We need to make sure more young children in

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 29

Nevada have an opportunity to enter a high-quality preschool program that will prepare them to enter school ready to learn.

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

It is very important to the WCSD the new pre-K budget will keep funding for the 3,000 seats, and it would not be distributed on a new competitive grant basis. You have heard us talk in the past about the problems with competitive grants in terms of timing and school selection. We want this money to continue existing seats while we have the gap in federal funding. We do not want to reallocate that money to new or different pre-K seats after the school year starts.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

I know you have questions, and I want you to know we are here and happy to help you with any further information. I can track down what you need.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will do that. We appreciate that offer very much.

DERILD PARSONS (Director, Special Services, Churchill County School District):

I manage many grants, including the PDG, the Zoom Schools grant and more. We have participated in the PDG since its inception. Our program has expanded to 8 classrooms for 4-year-olds supported by braided funding. Braided funding is necessary to meet the goals of a high-quality program.

I want to talk about the amount of funding for the PDG. We have grade-level schools, so we do not have the physical space in our elementary schools for our pre-K program. The classrooms are housed in a school dedicated to early learning. The 8 PDG classrooms have the capacity to serve 160 students. Our Zoom School Program is for 3-year-olds and ELL students and serves 3-year-old students with special needs. The total cost of the program for the 2019 school year will be about \$2.5 million. The amount per student will run between \$12,500 and \$13,000.

The funding breakdown includes \$125,000 from Zoom Schools, \$80,000 in Title I, \$131,000 from Nevada Pre-K, \$935,000 from PDG, \$460,000 from

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 30

Special Education which is a transfer from our District's General Fund and an additional \$488,000 from the District's General Fund to make this work.

The teachers and paraprofessionals in the 4-year-old classrooms will cost \$1.2 million in salaries, or more than \$7,500 per student. We have been creative to offer high-quality services to some of our neediest children. Our success has helped students have a fighting chance to meet Read by Grade 3 goals.

We are in a very scary time for Churchill County with uncertain funding from the State. We are ripping apart the programs due to uncertain funding for the upcoming school year. Staffing decisions must be made two months before the date we will know what funding we will have available to us. We fear being penalized by a reduction in funding from \$8,000 to \$4,000 per seat. We have only been able to make this work by using braided funding. With the penalty invoked for using braided funding in the new grant proposal, the revenue will fall far short of our needs.

Even if we were to be able to put the program back together in time, we will need to supplement our program with additional money from our General Fund. My hope and request is if you find this initiative important, you will fund it to the level necessary to maintain our high-quality learning environments for some of our most vulnerable students. Without support from the State, the great early learning programs in Churchill County will be in jeopardy.

LESLIE NIX (Grant Writer, Clark County School District):

You have my written statement in ([Exhibit D](#)). The concept Patti Oya was trying to convey is misleading regarding the per-pupil spending. The grant application from the State and S.B. 84 explicitly allow only full-day options. Half-day is not an option for these programs. The way the funding model has changed by definition from the State this year is challenging for CCSD. The braiding model allows \$8,000 per student for our general education students and \$4,000 for our special education students.

SENATE BILL 84: Establishes a program to award grants to support prekindergarten programs. (BDR 34-338)

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 31

In a prior year we had funding from the Nevada Ready PDG funds and the State funded pre-K. I understand the State funded pre-K will be eliminated. While the Executive Budget shows otherwise, what we are told is that will not be a component. If we fund the same programs with the same number of students, CCSD will run at a shortfall of about \$700,000. The District already supplies about \$1.7 million toward the required special education staff. The program cost is \$10,194 per student. The average cost across the Nation is \$10,000 to \$11,000 per student.

The CCSD believes these dollars should be a formula. If NDE determines these should remain competitive dollars, CCSD believes it should be competitive for all participants. It is inequitable to allow set-asides as is the case in the current proposed education budget. The State Charter Authority has \$2 million directed to them for pre-K.

Older students should not have a reduced education experience to keep this program operating.

SYLVIA LAZOS (Co-leader, Legislative Advocacy Group, Nevada Immigration Coalition):

Nevada Immigration Coalition is made up of the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, the Culinary Union, Make the Road Nevada, Mi Familia Vota, American Immigration Lawyers Association, America's Voice, Planned Parenthood, Service Employees International Union, Arriba Workers Center, UndocuNetwork, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada, NextGen, Dream Big Nevada, Asian Community Development Council, America Votes and For Nevada's Future.

We are a wide-ranging coalition with varied interests. We are unified in supporting Zoom Schools and Victory Schools programs. These programs are about helping our most vulnerable children and communities. These are working-class communities where children have less than a 50 percent chance of making it to the middle class. These programs have shown themselves to be highly efficient and highly successful at making a difference in children's lives. They are changing the way education is practiced in the classroom. These are real successes. There is no reason to cut off real success for some other policy

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 32

choice. We ask you to keep the Governor's recommendations going forward as we work through the budgets.

NATHA ANDERSON (President, Washoe Education Association and Nevada State Education Association):

We are open to discussion on any of the programs brought up today. We are very excited about the Zoom Schools and Victory Schools Programs that address issues of equality and education equity. We support the Governor's proposal for an increase in teacher supply reimbursement. While we continue to add funding, we need to fix the process of how money is distributed to educators.

JOHN EPPOLITO (President, Protect Nevada Children):

I am a former teacher. I have three children in WCSD. We are not against technology. There are many issues with spending \$20 million on one-to-one technology over 2 years. It is a waste of money. Most research shows increased use of technology does not increase student performance. Some research shows it diminishes performance. Nevada chose Google Chromebooks. Google is being sued by at least two states for illegally tracking children. Incline High School spent private money to be the first one-to-one high school in WCSD. That program has failed. Devices track students.

Steve Jobs and Bill Gates severely limited their children's use of devices. Screen time and social media are problematic for many children. Some parents limit students' screen time and disallow social media. When schools require it, they force students to use free education technology vendors. That makes it difficult for parents. The Federal Bureau of Investigation warns parents about using free education technology vendors. Edmodo is one of the biggest. It had a data breach last year where 99 percent of the users had their information for sale on the dark web. Edmodo sold the entire company to the Chinese. No one tells parents this.

We believe parents should be educated on all aspects of screen time, social media and the free education technology vendors. Parents, not local school districts, should decide if their children use them.

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 33

JULIE HOUCHINS (Early Education Program Coordinator, United Way of Southern Nevada):

We are proud of the high-quality care and education our partners have provided in the Las Vegas Valley. I will read from my testimony in ([Exhibit E](#)).

We support these programs for Nevada's most vulnerable students and the Governor's recommendations.

JESSICA KENNEDY (Executive Director, Henderson Christian Academy and Angels Christian Academy):

Thank you, Senator Woodhouse, for visiting our school. We partner with United Way. The Nevada Ready PDG has allowed us to serve 280 families in three years. Funding allows us to hire teachers who are educated and highly qualified, something not possible in early childhood education without programs like this grant.

The budget allows for professional development. Teachers, aides and assistants get an opportunity to increase their knowledge and growth in early childhood education by attending monthly classes provided by the grant. The longitudinal data collected by the assessment tools provided by the funding of this grant show these children in high-quality pre-K programs not only meet the State standards, but exceed them.

KAREN HOLLEY (Coordinator, Federal and State Programs, Nye County School District):

We support maintaining the seats created with additional funds that came to Nevada through the PDG grant. Nye County School District went from 80 half-day seats to 220 full-day and 80 half-day seats filled with special education students. They are mostly 3-year-olds with speech needs. We have expanded our program significantly with this funding. We also created a career technical education pathway for early childhood education to try to raise some of our own teachers as we faced a shortage.

We hope to develop a program like Churchill County School District's in the future. One school in Nye County does not qualify for Title I or other money and depends on this pre-K grant. When those children go to college in Nevada,

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 34

they will be students just like all others. It is important to keep this program going and growing for Nevada children.

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

Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Subcommittees on K-12/Higher Education/CIP
March 22, 2019
Page 35

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

That growth is tremendous. Additional testimony has been submitted by Chris Daly of the Nevada State Education Association as ([Exhibit F](#)) and by Jennece Black, preschool director, Bill and Lillie Heinrich YMCA as ([Exhibit G](#)).

Seeing no further public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Felicia Archer,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	8		Attendance Roster
	C	42	Jonathan Moore/Nevada Department of Education	Presentation
	D	1	Leslie Nix/Clark County School District	Testimony
	E	1	Julie Houchins/United Way of Southern Nevada	Testimony
	F	1	Chris Daly/Nevada State Education Association	Testimony
	G	1	Jennece Black/Bill and Lillie Heinrich YMCA	Testimony