

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

**Eighty-Second Session  
May 9, 2023**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod at 12:33 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9, 2023, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Chair  
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson  
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy  
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig  
Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca  
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas  
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Roberta Lange, Senate District No. 7  
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alex Drozdoff, Committee Policy Analyst  
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel  
Cameron Newton, Committee Counsel  
Nick Christie, Committee Manager  
Funmi Sheddy, Committee Secretary  
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Fred Horvath, Secretary-Treasurer, Teamsters Local 14, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Jan Giles, President, Education Support Employees Association  
Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress  
Randy Soltero, representing Education Support Employees Association  
Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association  
Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association  
Patricia Haddad, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District  
Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition  
Jeff Horn, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees  
Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association  
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber  
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada  
GeorgeAnn Rice, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada  
Kelli May Douglas, Pacific Southwest Regional Liaison, Defense-State Liaison Office, U.S. Department of Defense  
Adam Diersing, Policy Analyst, Center of Innovation, Council of State Governments  
Jimmy Adams, Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.]

We have three bills today, Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 340, and Senate Bill 442. I will open the hearing for S.B. 148 (R1) and welcome Senator Lange to the table.

**Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to local school precincts.  
(BDR 34-160)**

**Senator Roberta Lange, Senate District No. 7:**

I am happy to present Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint). This bill makes changes to site-based school management and will establish staffing ratios for local school precincts when hiring school support staff. I am joined by Fred Horvath and Jan Giles, who is president of the Education Support Employees Association.

Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint) requires local precincts to meet certain ratios of personnel when hiring staff for precincts who provide custodial, maintenance, and security services. For custodial employees, the local precinct must employ at a ratio of school custodial employees to square footage required by a Level 2 Cleaning Standard of the Building Cleaning Standard Type, as stated within the Common Education Data Standards. With regard to campus security, the local precinct must employ a ratio of not less than three campus staff to every 1,000 pupils enrolled in that precinct. I would like to place emphasis on this section. We have had many discussions about staff ratios, and when talking about doctors, nurses, teachers, and certain other school-based personnel, including school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers, but we have not addressed the need to ensure these additional school support staff—custodial employees and campus security monitors—receive the attention they deserve. Enforcing these ratios will make sure our local school precincts have the necessary number of support staff to ensure students are provided with clean and safe environments for learning.

In addition, S.B. 148 (R1) requires the principals of local school precincts to select employees for that precinct in accordance with the applicable collective bargaining agreement. It also requires a superintendent making any decision regarding an assignment or reassignment of certain staff to first consult with the principal of the local school precinct and the school associate superintendent.

Lastly, this bill authorizes the local school precincts to use year-end balances to employ additional personnel to meet the staffing ratios mentioned previously.

I would now like to turn it over to Mr. Horvath.

**Fred Horvath, Secretary-Treasurer, Teamsters Local 14, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

In partnership with the Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) and their president, Jan Giles, we represent 13,000 education employee support professionals at the Clark County School District. We appreciate Senator Lange's sponsorship of S.B. 148 (R1) and the Senate's support for this legislation.

I would like to be very clear from the outset with my testimony. The core foundation of this bill is student and employee safety. It is not more complicated than that. In an incredibly tragic coincidence, as I am sure you have heard, a campus security monitor at Ed Von Tobel Middle School was shot on campus yesterday. Miraculously, the education support professional is expected to survive that attack.

Section 2, subsection 5(b) of this proposed legislation deals with the classification of campus security monitors and full-time custodial classifications, as defined in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 388.

We have dozens of locations where individual custodians are working alone in a school past 11 p.m., and there are many people besides staff and nonstaff who have access to those schools. The custodians have to get to their vehicle after hours, and the Clark County School District Police Department is not staffed or charged with providing personal safety for the protection of these folks after hours. Normal staffing levels and this bill would provide at least two custodians classified to do this work to be at the school at all times.

Section 2 of this bill is an effort to mitigate the potential disaster that could occur when external vendors, whose employees who have not been subject to rigorous background checks that all employees of the Clark County School District must go through, are able to access a campus. To reiterate what I have said, this effort is to secure and enhance the daily safety of all students and employees in the district.

The ESEA and Teamsters Local 14 do not come to you with this problem without being active participants with the district in pursuit of root-cause solutions. There are two structural impediments that have created this challenge. First, in the reorganization defined in NRS Chapter 388 that came out of the 2019 Legislature, the delegation of staffing decisions was sent to principals and the school organizational teams (SOT). These lead to competing interests for administrators, teachers, teacher aides, campus security monitors, and custodial resources, among others. Tough decisions are made on how many people are going to be in those classifications by these groups.

Unfortunately, the actual staffing levels for both custodial and campus security monitors have often suffered. Most troublesome for those of us representing support professionals is the magnitude of the unspent budget carryforwards that are now exceeding approximately \$250 million in the schools, yet we cannot fill these positions. A significant portion of these unspent dollars emanates from salary savings due to vacant positions not being filled.

The second challenge being addressed, in a collaborative manner, with the district leadership is the compensation paid to these classifications. Similar to what was a successful effort with the bus driver vacancy crisis, we conducted proper and proactive negotiations with the school district and were able to modify the starting and top-end classification of bus drivers and eliminate over 300 ongoing chronic vacancies in bus driver classification. We engaged in

exactly the same process and just completed that when it comes to the campus security monitors, literally to be approved this week by the trustees, and their compensation will be at a place where we will be able to effectively recruit and retain campus security monitors. We are at the advanced stages of those kinds of conversations on custodial classifications.

Again, it is incredibly difficult to compete when the starting salary is below what most fast food organizations are paying. It is incredibly difficult to retain staff when their top salary is below poverty level and they are eligible for Medicaid. We appreciate Dr. Jara's efforts and his executive team in addressing this up front and working to change and modify, which is to find this increased compensation for these classifications.

You will soon hear testimony from the administrators relative to the delays in filling positions and having maintenance requests sitting for months, possibly in excess of a year. We support and appreciate their frustration and offer a helping hand to work collectively with the district to remedy and accelerate the filling of vacancies in these classifications. There are hundreds of vacancies in skilled trade positions once again, for one reason: skilled trade positions are paid well below market. It is impossible to recruit and equally challenging to retain when they can leave and go into the private sector or other local governments for a significant increase.

Finally, you will hear from the administrators that this entire bill must fail because of language in section 2, subsection 4 of the bill, which is about the principal's ability to select those who reside on their campus. There is no doubt we have an ongoing dispute about the interpretation and priorities of collective bargaining agreements between support staff, between teachers, and what NRS Chapter 388 provides for the autonomy of principal selection. I will tell you, 99 percent of all vacancies filled under the current collective bargaining are filled without objection by the administrators. The only issue that remains in dispute in this process are those who are involuntarily reduced, are forced to leave their school because the SOT has eliminated their position and decided those resources needed to be used elsewhere.

We have a different opinion. We have clear contract language that provides rights for them. There is a conflict about whether NRS Chapter 388 overrides that, but it would be really disappointing to me if we would lose this opportunity and potentially create a catastrophic result for this bill to fail over 1 percent of the staffing solutions. I appreciate the ability to address you today.

**Jan Giles, President, Education Support Employees Association:**

We represent the campus security monitors (CSMs) that work in Clark County School District schools. This language will add much needed safety to our schools to protect students and staff. Due to the current climate, safety should be a priority. We know that elementary schools are not immune to violence, yet currently very few have a campus security monitor. Only high schools and middle schools currently budget for CSMs. Elementary schools do not, yet we know they are experiencing the same safety issues. This will allow all schools to have at least a minimum of one CSM per school.

This language will also add additional employees to provide a clean learning environment for our students. Currently, the square footage these employees are required to clean is unattainable. This will help prevent employee burnout and allow for coverage during employee absences.

We know no one can prevent a stray bullet from being in the area of a school, but we can definitely be prepared for an attack on students in a school setting. This bill will increase safety as a whole on school campuses. There are issues with weapons, drugs, and fights that having additional campus security monitors can alleviate. Reducing these situations will improve the student's learning environment. Students cannot focus on learning if they do not feel safe in school.

**Senator Lange:**

With that, we are open for questions.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Members, are there any questions on the bill?

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

This may be a question for our Legal Counsel. I am wondering how this works with the reorganization legislation we passed a couple of sessions ago.

**Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:**

This legislation is actually amending provisions that were adopted as part of the reorganization legislation. This is effectively further clarifying what the role of the principal of a large school precinct is versus what the role of the large school district is. Generally, the principal of the local school precinct is required to select the teachers, administrators, and other staff for the precinct. This bill would require, when making those selections, the principal attempt to select the proper number of custodial and security staff, if they are available. If not, it enables the principal of a local school precinct to move money from the carry-forward dollars for the local school precinct to employ those people. Because the collective bargaining agreement is negotiated with the school district as opposed to the local school precinct, it requires the principal to make their selections for the local school precinct in accordance with that collective bargaining agreement.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

In other words—and I am unpacking that myself—because of the reorganization bill, section 2, subsection 4 has got to be in there. Is that correct? Is that language necessary?

**Asher Killian:**

"Necessary" is not necessarily a word I would use. It does clarify the intent of the Legislature in what the breakdown of responsibilities is supposed to be between the principals of the local school precincts and the district itself. Since the collective bargaining

agreement is an agreement between the unions and the district, it does not necessarily apply to the principals of the local school precincts, but this change in section 2, subsection 4 is clarifying that it is the intent of the Legislature that the principals of the local school precincts should also be acting in accordance with that collective bargaining agreement.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

Thank you, Mr. Killian, for that clarification. As I read on page 4, subsection 5 of the bill, it says, "to the extent such personnel are available . . . ." However, on page 5 of the bill in section 3, subsection 3, it clarifies it is also to the extent that the funds are available. Is that correct? The carryover funds can be used to support that if those funds are not available in the school.

**Asher Killian:**

There are two different steps here. The first is that it is the responsibility of the large school district to employ a pool of personnel from which the principals of the local school precincts select. It is possible in that pool of personnel employed by the large school district because there may not be enough custodial and security staff for the principals of all the local school precincts to be able to select enough people to satisfy the requirements in section 2, subsection 5 of this bill.

If that is the case, where there are not enough personnel in the large school district available for the principal of a local school precinct to select, then under section 3 of the bill, the principal of the local school precinct can use their carryforward dollars in their own budget to directly employ those people rather than to select from the employees of the large school district.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

In section 2, subsection 5(b), it talks about the ratio for security services of not less than three staff members for each 1,000 pupils. Is there a ratio now? What do you expect there is now that made you land on this number?

**Jan Giles:**

Currently, there is no ratio. It is up to the administrator based on whatever budget is provided them for the per pupil funding.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I believe Assemblywoman Taylor was asking for a guesstimate. We may not have a ratio in statute, but do you have a current guesstimate?

**Jan Giles:**

I do not have a guesstimate. I can say in elementary schools, as I mentioned in my opening statement, there are a handful that have chosen to hire a campus security monitor, but for the majority of the elementary schools, there is no campus security monitor. Middle schools

have roughly two to three. High schools have roughly five. Sometimes, if they chose to add more, they chose so based on their budget. I do know of a few high schools that have eight or nine, but roughly for a majority of them, they have four or five.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

We know there are few campus monitors in elementary schools in the district as it appears, then you have two or three in the middle schools. How many do you expect will need to be added? Maybe that will help. I know you do not necessarily have a ratio, but do you have an idea of how many will need to be added?

**Jan Giles:**

I think at least one in every elementary school because it is all based on enrollment, and that changes from year to year. Depending on the enrollment of an elementary school, if it is less than 1,000 pupils, they would at least have one. Middle schools would roughly stay the same at two to three. High schools would probably increase based on their enrollment. I am sorry, I am just guessing. I do not have that information, but I can get it for you if you would like. I can do a little more research with our numbers.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I think this is where Assemblywoman Taylor is going. I am looking at section 2, subsection 5(b) as well, "Security services at a ratio of not less than three staff members for each 1,000 pupils . . . ." I will go with a school I know pretty well, James H. Bilbray Elementary School. They are just under 1,000 pupils. Am I reading it right to say they would have three security staff when they do not have any currently?

**Jan Giles:**

Yes, you are correct.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

You have three security campus monitors per 1,000 pupils. Where did that number come from? Is that the best practice you have found for other districts or schools.

**Jan Giles:**

Yes, we did some research and that was the average based on other school districts.

**Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:**

My question is about the security services. I do think that is important as a teacher in a school. I know how essential those are. It just says "security services" in the bill. At my school and other schools I have worked at in the past, that could be student resource officers, campus monitors, school police. Does this bill take a stance on which of those it is, or would that be up to the principals about which of those roles they could fill to meet this ratio?

**Senator Lange:**

I think it would leave it up to the principals and SOTs in the building to decide what best meets the needs of their school.



**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

I have two questions. I am trying to understand the context. This bill would then ensure our districts cannot subcontract with independent contractors. They would have to use the people in the union. Is that correct?

**Fred Horvath:**

That is the intent. Again, based on safety and background checks, we want to do whatever we can do. I have had extended conversations with Jeff Horn, who represents the administrators. We are very sensitive to the fact it is fair to them to be impatient. At the same time, we want to work collectively to fill those positions and get those things done, have some constructive dialogue about what it is going to take, and if there is a need for additional resources, how do we do that safely? The overall intent is to restrict these outside resources that are not subject to the same background scrutiny.

**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

I do agree with that, and I appreciate that in the bill. On page 4, section 2, subsection 7, "must be made in consultation" is struck out and changed to "after consulting." Does that mean it will be a forced placement or will the principal still get to decide the hiring?

**Senator Lange:**

The superintendent would consult with the principal and the area superintendent.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

We do have some clarification for the definition of "security services" from Mr. Killian.

**Asher Killian:**

To clarify the question regarding security services, to the extent there are any Peace Officers' Standards and Training- (POST) certified officers, school resource officers, school police officers, those are not staff who are selected by the principal. Instead, those are staff under the control of the district superintendent. The district superintendent has sole discretion on the placement and the number of those to be placed within each individual school within a large school district. The staff being referred to here who are selected by the principal of the local school precinct would be the non-POST-certified staff—other security staff who are not otherwise peace officers.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I greatly appreciate this language. I also appreciate you are recognizing it is more than the teachers who provide an educational setting. My question has to do with section 2, subsection 5(a) having to do with the custodial services at the ratio of the square footage. I appreciate the use of this item. Do you know at what point we would know how many new employees that could mean or how many more people that could mean we would have to hire in the Clark County School District, since this is only for Clark County, and since it is the big school district that is being discussed?

**Fred Horvath:**

There are five different levels that are provided by Nevada's Department of Education. I am going out on a limb to say we are not interested in Level 4 or Level 5, which start with not generally acceptable and not considered healthy. There are some places where Level 1 schools are spotless. It is a balance of those things. We have done a lot of work on what the incumbents look like, we know what the vacancies look like. It is a fluid situation because, unfortunately, it is unusual for us not to lose a custodian during the course of a week or a pay period because they found other employment opportunities that are more lucrative for them. It will not be insignificant. We currently have about 600 vacancies in that whole organization. How many it would add is still a work in progress, but at least it gives us an objective standard, which is what we are looking for to work toward a solution.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

We have our committee counsel available to give us a federal standard.

**Asher Killian:**

For reference, that particular federal standard of a Level 2 cleaning standard is cleaning approximately 11,000 to 18,000 square feet per eight-hour shift for a custodian. That would be the rough amount of square footage per custodial day that would be expected under this standard.

**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

Thank you for that clarification. This is custodial, not lawn maintenance or yard maintenance. This is pure and simple cleaning and it is for K-12. It is not a priority for elementary schools or middle schools. It is pre-K through 12 and all buildings. Am I understanding that correctly?

**Fred Horvath:**

It is agnostic when it comes to what type of school it is.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Are there any further questions? [There were none.] I will open the hearing for testimony in support of S.B. 148 (R1). We will begin in Carson City.

**Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress:**

We are in strong support of S.B. 148 (R1) and thank Senator Lange for bringing up such a critical issue with this bill. As an organization that supports measures to address gun violence in schools, we support the safety aspects of this bill with the staffing ratios, but we also support this because of the threat of outsourcing our school support personnel positions that has been around for a long time and is a dangerous one. Our support personnel are the people who make our schools run every single day. My mother does this every day as a support professional at an elementary school in Las Vegas; the one I went to. The thought of her or any other job being outsourced to an entity that is not the school or the school district is scary and another form of an attempt to privatize our education system.

I want to add a few notes to this. On the note of security, my mother has no security personnel at her school. She is the person who is the first to interact with people who come into our school, so she keeps a bat under her desk. That is an unacceptable way to make an employee deal with these situations. Also, most days they have no janitors, so there is no cleaning happening at her school. We need this bill, and we need to do better in this state because we are failing our kids and we are failing our employees. Please support S.B. 148 (R1).

**Randy Soltero, representing Education Support Employees Association:**

I think you have heard all the reasons why we support this bill. We represent these workers and would appreciate your consideration.

**Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association:**

We are in support of S.B. 148 (R1) to prohibit outsourcing and ensure staffing ratios for custodial and campus security employees, and to ensure clarity and fairness during the selection of employees in the Clark County School District (CCSD) surplus process.

Education support professionals are the backbone of CCSD, keeping schools running while ensuring students are safe, healthy, and ready to learn. While critical to the operations of schools, education support professionals (ESPs) tend to be at the bottom of district pay scales, with some ESPs making as little as \$12 per hour and an overwhelming majority making less than a living wage. Last year, over 1,600 CCSD workers, mostly ESPs, were enrolled on Medicaid. Education support professionals reflect the Nevada communities they serve, and at CCSD, a majority are people of color.

The reorganization of CCSD aimed to decentralize decision making, giving local school precincts more autonomy over school budgets and operations. However, this came with unintended consequences that negatively impacted many education support professionals. This decentralization created perverse incentives for local school precincts to consider outsourcing and understaffing positions critical to health and safety. Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint) addresses this by setting minimum staffing ratios for custodial and campus security employees. Similar to language in Senate Bill 251, S.B. 148 (R1) affirms the collective bargaining agreements regarding the selection of staff and employees in the surplus process. For too long, ESPs have felt relegated among school employees. The CCSD reorganization has made this worse. Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint) is a big step forward to giving ESPs the respect they deserve.

**Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association:**

We represent the certified professionals in the Washoe County School District. I would like to thank Senator Lange for sponsoring S.B. 148 (R1). Even though S.B. 148 (R1) is a bill that only impacts CCSD, from our standpoint we will always advocate for legislation that better supports our support staff across the state of Nevada. They are essential to the success

of our students and to the success of our teachers, and we need to continue to empower these essential workers in our schools. Preventing outsourcing and establishing staffing guidelines is a very important issue for us to address, and we encourage your support of this bill.

**Patricia Haddad, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

Gratitude for Senator Lange for bringing this bill forward and, of course, grateful to our support staff and the critical function they provide to our students and our school community each day. We are in support of this legislation.

**Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and  
Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:**

Once again, as has everyone else, my thanks to Senator Lange for bringing this bill. I checked with my contacts with the Clark County School District Police Department, and they told me very simply this is something they are very much in support of. Additional layers of trained coverage for the safety of our students is paramount to their existence, and they want to see additional liaisons to help them do it. These people do that. That is a public safety issue for our most vital resources: our children. Obviously, that is why I am here, and I am here to ask for your support of S.B. 148 (R1).

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] I will close support testimony and open opposition testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to provide opposition testimony?

**Jeff Horn, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and  
Professional-Technical Employees:**

Although the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASAPE) opposes S.B. 148 (R1), we do support components of the bill that will increase the number of custodians and campus security monitors assigned to schools. With that in mind, I would like to take a moment to recognize the dangers that campus security monitors are exposed to each day. As you know, a campus security monitor at Von Tobel Middle School was shot yesterday while ensuring the safety of students. After I had the opportunity to speak with school officials, it appears this brave employee will successfully recover from the injuries.

The importance of hiring the best possible staff for each school is critical, not only for students and staff safety, but for improved academic outcomes. Senate Bill 148 (1st Reprint), like several bills you will hear this week and next, continues to strip away the authority of the building leader to hire the most effective employees while at the same time holding principals solely accountable for student outcomes and climate. It is universally accepted that a quality teacher has the most impact on student learning. If this is true, why would we limit a principal's ability to hire the most impactful educators?

Unfortunately, like any large group, there are always a handful of ineffective employees who do not belong in their current role. If S.B. 148 (R1) becomes law as written, it will ensure this small handful of educators will always have a place teaching our most precious resource: our kids. Let me be direct, CCASAP supports protecting students' rights over the rights of poor-performing adults. I would hope to believe we all do.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone wishing to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] I will close opposition testimony and move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] I will close neutral testimony.

I do have a hypothetical question for the presenters. If this is in statute, what happens if we cannot find the workers to fill these spots? Mr. Horvath, you said people could go to a fast food restaurant and make \$18 an hour. Who would take the blame for that? What sort of outcomes do we see if we cannot fill the positions in statute?

**Fred Horvath:**

We are dealing with that every day, and we have been dealing with it for the last four years. From our perspective, we believe our collective efforts through job fairs and through fixing the compensation piece, we will be able to recruit. If we accelerate the background process, we will be able to create a pool of people available. At the end of the day, I do not see a point in time where we need to point fingers at each other. We need to create a pool of people available to fill those vacancies.

I do not have a direct answer as to what the consequence will be other than I am confident in speaking for everyone I have been involved with that we are 100 percent committed to creating the employment pool to satisfy the vacancies at the local schools.

**Senator Lange:**

We can look at our schools now and see the vacancies we have, both for teachers and support staff. We are not pointing fingers at those vacancies and why it is happening. We are wondering why it is happening, we want to get more people, and we are always going to make every effort we can to fill those positions. We will continue to do that under this bill to fill the support staff positions. We hope you will support us and pass this bill.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I will close the hearing for S.B. 148 (R1). I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 340 and welcome Senator Dondero Loop to the table.

**Senate Bill 340: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR S-10)**

**Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8:**

I am happy to be here today to introduce Senate Bill 340. This bill helps to address student learning loss by requiring school districts to provide summer school. As we continue to understand the full impact COVID-19 had on our communities, we know many of our students experienced a decline in academic, social, and emotional progress.

In fact, according to the Institute of Education Sciences, public school leaders estimated that 49 percent of their students began the 2022-2023 school year behind grade level in at least one academic subject compared to 50 percent the year before. Prior to the pandemic, 36 percent of our students, on average, were behind grade level. To make matters worse, the effects of learning loss are even greater on certain student populations. For schools with over 75 percent minority students, for example, 61 percent of the students began the 2022-2023 school year behind grade level compared to 64 percent the school year before and 50 percent before the pandemic.

Research conducted by the Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard University and The Educational Opportunity Project at Stanford University recently reported that on average, public school students in grades 3 through 8 in the United States lost the equivalent of a half year in math and a quarter year in reading. In addition to academic deficiencies, we continue hearing from our teachers, schools, and district staff that student behavior has been a significant issue since the pandemic. According to the Institute of Education Sciences, more than eight in ten public schools reported having seen stunted behavioral and social and emotional development in their students because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

While life has returned to normal in many ways for many students across the country, we still have those struggling with the effects of this public health crisis. Addressing the reality of these academic and behavioral inadequacies is an ongoing challenge and one that takes time. Senate Bill 340 continues this work the Legislature started in 2021 through Senate Bill 173 of the 81st Session.

I will now walk you through the provisions of this bill. Section 1 requires school districts and state public charter school authorities to use available resources to provide summer school and requires these entities to submit to the state superintendent a plan to provide in-person or virtual summer school to pupils in pre-K through grade 12 in 2023 and 2024. School districts and charter school governing boards must also provide for transportation and meal services to these students. Additionally, this bill outlines requirements to the hiring and payment of public summer school personnel.

Section 2 requires school districts and the State Public Charter School Authority to submit a report relating to summer school, including pupil achievement levels to the state superintendent of public instruction. The superintendent is then required to submit a compilation of these reports to various governmental entities, including the Legislature.

Senate Bill 340 is to enhance the academic recovery of Nevada students by requiring districts to provide summer school. I would tell you, there was a *New York Times* article, titled "Students Lost One-Third of a School Year to Pandemic, Study Finds" [[Exhibit C](#)]. This is amazing to watch. I have five grandchildren who are at various levels, from high school down to elementary school. I saw all of them react differently. I would submit this was highly successful in the years prior to us coming back to the Legislature. I can tell you, even my own grandchildren, who thought they did not want to go when they got there, could not wait to go, and now want to know if they are going to get to do it again this summer. I have dubbed this bill my "Iliana Bill" because every time I call home, she wants to know if she gets to go to summer school.

I recognize the inherent issues any school may have, but I will reference the school I know. Like Chair Bilbray-Axelrod, I know Harvey N. Dondero Elementary School works very hard. I was a proud teacher there at one time and know even though that school may not have summer school—which I do not know for sure, but I believe they are not having summer school—I know Frances Brandon-Pickett Elementary may have summer school. The thing I love about it is the teachers get to interact with kids on a whole different level. The kids are not just sitting in a seat all day, they are interacting with their teachers on a whole different level. For me, not only for my love of teaching but for my love of kids, we need to get going on the right path.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Thank you for bringing this bill. My daughter has done summer school since she has been in high school to get ahead. She is a double major at LVA [Las Vegas Academy of the Arts]. I appreciate this bill. We also know there is a lot of learning loss that happens over summer vacation. My daughter is going to hate me for saying this, but summer is way too long.

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

That is true. We have always had summer school and credit recovery for high school students. They have always been able to take physical education if they did not want to take it during the school year. They have always been able to get credit recovery if they had a class they struggled in. This just adds those kids K-8, if you will.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Members, are there any questions?

**Assemblywoman Thomas:**

Thank you, Senator, for bringing this refreshing bill. It is not a reactionary bill; it is a solution. I appreciate your bringing this forward. When I was reading the bill, I wanted to make sure I understood that charter schools and public schools would provide transportation for their students. I want to make sure that is what I was reading.

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Yes, this bill asks that transportation and food is required. As I mentioned, all schools do not have this program, but the schools that do, we would like them to put those things into place so children can get there and be fed.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

My question has to do with page 3, section 1, beginning on line 5, having to do with the plan and everything that is necessary. All Nevada's Department of Education is doing is getting this plan put in place. It is not approving or denying the plan if I understand correctly. Also, we start summer school in four weeks or less for some districts. I am curious as to whether there have been conversations about trying to expand it to the 2025 school year so we are not in this boat two years from now doing the same plan in May of a school year.

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

When I first did this bill during the pandemic, we did a two-year piece so we could see how it worked, see how everyone liked it, and it was, as I said, successful. We know things have changed and we know we are into a second group. I can promise you, I will be here in 2025, and I will have another bill. Even if I have to go in two-year stints, I would be happy to do that. We will see how it goes.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

To verify, the Department of Education cannot approve or deny these plans. This is the trustees and superintendents filing the plan with the superintendent of public instruction. Am I understanding that correctly?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

We are just asking them to provide a plan. I will not use a number. We could have 5 schools do this or 25 schools do this. A small county may have one school that does this. It is a plan to provide some summertime assistance and experiences for our kids.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

We are looking at the next two years and it seems as though the intention, based on section 1, is for those who are either credit deficient or learning deficient in some way, and also students with disabilities or English language learners. Is that the target of this bill?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

We gave those as suggestions. If you read on page 2, line 13, it says, "including without limitation." The reason is because we wanted to give some examples of students who may attend at a school for whatever reason. Frankly, I do not know if my granddaughter fits into all of these examples. She fits into some of them, maybe. She would go because she cannot wait to get there. She would go no matter what. These are just examples, so that is why it says "without limitation."

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

It could be anyone, correct?



**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Absolutely.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

Thank you for the clarification. Every district has to do this, but not every school. Is that correct?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

That is a hundred percent correct, yes.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

When we talk about charter schools and the transportation portion, you said "may" provide summer school. Charter schools do not get transportation dollars now. How would the charter schools pay for that transportation?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Actually, the charter school authority was allotted \$15 million in accordance with the provisions of *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 353 to address the impacts of learning loss. That money is still sitting there. They have not used all that money. There is money there for transportation. I would submit, a lot of kids in different areas do not necessarily need transportation. It depends on where the school is located. Some schools are going to have a lot of kids from their area, and other schools may not. In a high school setting, kids may or may not be able to get there on their own. There is funding available for all of this.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

This is obviously a quick turnaround time. That is my large concern. I love this legislation. I am a big supporter of summer school. In fact, when my school did not offer it when I was a child, my mom did school at home. We had a white board the size of our kitchen wall and we did summer school at home. I definitely believe summer school is effective and helps propel a child's education and keeps them on track with where they need to be. My concern is the time limit of putting all of this together. You are requiring some type of report for this summer school, so by the time this bill is signed, summer school will already have been done. In many districts they would either just be starting or just about to finish. I am wondering if there was consideration for requiring some type of report for summer school for 2023. I understand the need for requiring that for the future.

Regarding your previous statement about transportation, I would agree transportation may not always be necessary for many schools, but probably more necessary for magnet schools than anything else. Maybe we should change "shall" on page 2, line 28 regarding transportation to "may."

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Thank you for those suggestions. I feel like we did this during the pandemic, so for me, we have already done this. We have some things in place. The larger school districts, and possibly some of the small school districts, already have something in place. They are

already planning to do this. This is not something they have to turn around tomorrow and figure out. The actual plan or what they submit is not due in June. If you look at section 2 on page 3, "On or before November 30, 2023, and November 30, 2024, respectively, the board of trustees of each school district and the State Public Charter School Authority shall submit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction a report . . . ." The reports are not due until after it is over with, if that is what you were referencing, Assemblywoman Torres.

While I recognize the transportation piece, it is important we value this and this is one of the ways for us to do so. I just think it is important for us to help these kids. I get all the pitfalls, and we can sit here all afternoon and say we do not have this and we do not have that. This morning in our subcommittee, I felt like education is that game show on TV called *The Wall*. We stand at the top of the wall and we push this ball down and pray it goes in the \$1 million, but if it goes in the \$1, we say, Oh well, because it is a game show. I feel that is what we do with education. We stand at the top, we throw this ball down, and keep our fingers crossed. It is important we stop keeping our fingers crossed and put some stuff in place. We need to do this, value the kids, do what is right, and move forward with it. We can find all kinds of reasons.

I have been there. I taught for 30 years. I could find all kinds of reasons if I wanted to as to why this may not work. I can tell you every one of them. If we went through this Committee, every one of us could find one. I am just hoping we do not find any reasons and move forward.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

I noticed on page 2, line 17, it says, "Pupils in grade 11 or 12 who are credit deficient . . . ." I think that can be expanded for pupils who are credit deficient. I think they can be deficient in high school and middle school as well, so just allowing for that expansion.

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

As I said, if you look at line 13, it does say, "including, without limitation." Any school district or charter school can plug in what they want. They could say kids in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Thank you for the suggestion.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

When we did this during COVID-19, were charter schools required to offer transportation?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Yes.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

We do have a few more questions, but I would like to put on the record we found out we could do a lot of things we thought we could not do during COVID-19. I am a big fan of finding silver linings in things. We can do this. We have pulled it together before, and we can do it again. It is the right thing to do for kids.

**Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:**

As a teacher, I think it is essential we have summer school programs for our students. I had many questions, but they have now been whittled down by other questions asked already. I do want to follow up on Assemblywoman Torres's question. I know you said, "including, without limitation," but as a social studies teacher, I know world history is one of our top-failed courses in high school. It is a sophomore-level course. That would not fall on kids in grades 11 or 12, and it would not fall under section 1, subsection 1(b)(5) on line 21, which lists science, technology, engineering, the arts, or mathematics.

Before you say, "without limitation," which I know is going to be your answer, I also know when we list things, it becomes a checklist and the other things become secondary or things that may not be a priority. I wonder if you are open to any changes on that or if there was a reason why you prioritized those subjects over English and social studies.

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Frankly, we just put a list. If I were in your shoes and I knew a school was having summer school, I would be marching into the principal and saying, I would love to take over this class and I think I could get lots of students to take it. That is exactly why. I could put social studies there and someone else would want dancing. We had to put some ideas there. We feel this list gives us those students we want to reach for sure. We want to reach those kids who are deficient. We want to reach those students who maybe needed more help in kindergarten to move forward. The middle school kids may be the kids who have not been in school since fourth grade and now are in sixth grade. I watched my own grandson do this. He went from not going to school to being on steroids with homework. Maybe that is the kid who may need to go back and maybe even learn some study skills.

There are so many options. I know one school with fourth graders, rather than sitting in class all day, they did science experiments with physical education, science, and art; whatever the subject was, they came up with science experiments. They kind of did science all day, but it was on a different level than the curriculum normally used. There are so many awesome ideas out there, and we know that, and you know that because you are a teacher. If you had a summer school class for social studies, you are probably not going to teach straight out of the book. That would be my suggestion.

**Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:**

I know you mentioned it does not have to be in all schools. If a school district offered this at one single school in the entire district, would they technically be meeting the requirements of this bill? Is there a way we could encourage them to not just have one school in the entire district? We know some schools are better equipped to support their students than others. How do we ensure the kids who need it the most are getting that support?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

They came up with a plan for that reason. Perhaps they will use one area over other areas. Perhaps Procter R. Hug High School is a better place to have summer school than Damonte Ranch High School because of the location or the number of kids who might want to go, or

what have you. The high school in Winnemucca has summer school, but there is only one high school there. There may be two elementary schools in another small town, and one may have summer school and the other does not. In Las Vegas, there may be two, three, or four schools in different regions. It depends on how the school district plans to do that. It certainly does not denote the teachers who work there. In other words, if you do not work at a specific high school but you want to teach there for summer school, I am sure they would be happy to have you.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Maybe it would be best if Mr. Killian spoke to this, but the way I am reading this bill is it requires the district to target the pupils who are most at risk of loss of learning rather than limiting what summer school is.

**Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:**

That is correct. Under section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b), which is where the list of different pupils exists, all that paragraph does is require these plans to target the pupils who are most at risk for loss of learning to receive these services through summer school. It provides a list in subparagraphs (1) through (8) of various kinds of populations of pupils who may be most at risk for loss of learning. This paragraph does not limit the pupils to whom services can be provided, it just provides a list of examples of pupils to whom this bill would require summer school be targeted by the districts who effectively would benefit the most from attending summer school.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Thank you for that clarification.

**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

The past three summers we have been partnering with two nonprofits and a charter school in east Las Vegas to make sure we had summer school for K-12. It was all different types of students at one school. As a quick clarification, you said it is not for every school, it is just for the district. Is it the same thing for the Charter School Authority? As long as one school does it in the Authority, or is it all of them?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

No, the Charter School Authority could have as many as they wanted; every school or one school.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Seeing no further questions, we will move to testimony in support of S.B. 340.

**Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:**

We are speaking in support of S.B. 340. This continues work we supported last session, so we want to see that good work succeed.

**Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress:**

We are here today in support of S.B. 340. The learning loss caused by COVID-19 is real and learning loss over the summer is real. As I stated before, my mother is an educational professional and we have seen the effects of it firsthand. I have seen it; we all have. Making sure summer school is an option for all kids but they are also able to have transportation and meals and that their teachers and school staff are compensated fairly for that is a big step in addressing the learning loss we have all seen. Please support S.B. 340.

**Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:**

The Vegas Chamber is also in support of S.B. 340. As you have heard, learning loss is a concern to all of us, and obviously with employers in southern Nevada hiring graduates of CCSD, any efforts to help close the educational gaps are important.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Seeing no one else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide support testimony, is there anyone waiting on the phone? [There was no one.] I will close support testimony and move to opposition testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide opposition testimony?

**Patricia Haddad, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

We appreciated this discussion, but we are here in opposition. I want to be clear; we absolutely agree summer school is critical. We are offering summer school and have offered summer school for a number of years. We are planning to get started May 30, which is just a couple of weeks out. We worry about being able to fulfill the targeting and reporting requirements on top of what has already been planned, collectively bargained, and negotiated, and getting ready for student registration.

I found the conversation very interesting on the CCSD side. We will have to go back and rereview this conversation and rereview the legislation to make sure we are fully understanding the requirements of the targeting and the language therein. We do appreciate Senator Lange's commitment to education, the education space, and ensuring our students' learning can continue to be accelerated. We look forward to additional conversations with them.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:**

Believe me, it is tough to come before you and oppose a bill Senator Dondero Loop has brought forward because she is an icon of education here in the Legislature. I think we have hardly, if ever, opposed one of her bills. In this particular bill, we have some concerns about the summer school bill as it is written right now.

First of all, I want to reconfirm and reassure all of you that summer school has gone on for many years. It has been too many years since I was a superintendent, so I do not want to give all that information. We always had summer school and it certainly was not something I invented, it was in our school district for many years and at many school districts here in Nevada.

Summer school should be a local decision. In talking with the superintendents and the reason they have some concerns is meeting all the parameters of the bill. It should be a local decision, and as a former superintendent and my conversations with them, what they offer is based on what they are seeing with their student data. That changes from year to year. They are looking at the math tests and seeing how the kids did in the fall, and then they are watching the progress through the year. Of course, they are getting input from the teachers as to what needs to happen. For instance, I know in Carson City—and this is the first time I have ever heard it offered—they have Ready Rock kindergarten going this year. They started their curriculum building for that particular program in January because they saw their new kindergarteners not only unprepared but having behavior issues. That is part of their summer school program this year. They are looking at what they have and how the kids are doing. That is how they determine what they are going to offer.

Another issue is about who they can get to work at summer school. Some teachers do not teach summer school. I have to say, a lot of teachers are going back to school themselves, working on advanced degrees. Many teachers are in summer school themselves and there are other family issues that prevent some of the teachers from working. They need to look at who is going to be able to teach, and they start asking that in January and February. It is a long planning process for summer school.

The other issue in the bill and a concern that has been expressed to me is the mandate of providing transportation and breakfast and lunch. It is a concern the superintendents will not be able to adhere to the law because, again, problems districts ran into this year are of course getting the bus drivers, which is especially important in the rural areas. Some of these kids have to go a long way and need transportation. Another problem expressed to me, which surprised me, is getting people to work the lunch programs and the meal programs.

The last concern is the rate of pay. This year in summer school, they are able to pay a good salary commensurate with what is in the contract because a lot of them are using the federal funds that were provided because of COVID-19, which has been wonderful. They are able to do that, but in years moving forward, will they be able to do that? Keep in mind, summer school is not funded by the state, it has to be funded by the local school districts.

Those are some of our concerns. We are happy to work with Senator Dondero Loop on any amendments we can make to this bill. We appreciate your listening to our concerns today.

**Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada:**

We are here in opposition to the transportation portion of the bill. We would be more comfortable if it went from "shall" to "may" for that portion. For context, only one of our public charter schools offers what we consider traditional transportation, so this would be a challenge.

In addition, we did some research on Assembly Bill 495 of the 81st Session. This was part of the mining deal that allowed certain funds to go to learning loss at public charter schools. From this, it was only allocated to Title I schools, which is about half of our charter schools.

Our schools have applied for that funding in the sum of \$24.8 million, and they have been awarded about \$15 million, but it will be about two years before the wheels of that money will come down. It has only been the last month that the money started trickling down. While on paper, it looks like there is \$15 million, those funds have been allocated and are slowly coming down to our charter schools.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Seeing no one else in Carson City or Las Vegas, is there anyone waiting on the phone to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] I will close opposition testimony and open neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

I do not come up for closing comments very often, but there are a couple things I would like to say. First, when people oppose something that is literally already in place, it is mind boggling. They have come up with a lot of reasons why this cannot work, and I have come up with a lot of reasons why it can. One is when they say the school districts have to pay for themselves. The school districts are funded through state appropriations. We do that in this body. It does not matter what we are doing at our schools, it is funded by the state.

The other thing is, there is an old saying, What if I gave a party and nobody came? What if we had summer school and everyone came? We need to do what is right for kids. If you have not read the book *A Fine, Fine School* by Sharon Creech, please do. I read it often to children in classrooms. It is a wonderful book about a principal who loves his school so much and thinks it is such a fine, fine school that we should have school every day of the year, much to the children's angst. It is a very cute book and it talks about a fine, fine school and would it not be great if we could all say that.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I know the kids at Dondero Elementary as well as Bilbray Elementary think they go to a fine, fine school. I will close the hearing on S.B. 340. I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 442 and welcome Senator Dondero Loop.

**Senate Bill 442: Enacts the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact. (BDR 34-83)**

**Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8:**

I am presenting Senate Bill 442, which enacts the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact. This Compact is an exciting opportunity for Nevada today. I am joined by my copresenters, Dr. GeorgeAnn Rice in Las Vegas, and Adam Diersing, Jimmy Adams, and Kelli May Douglas who are on Zoom, I believe. We had a few technical issues, so we are crossing our fingers. Dr. Rice is a longtime educator from the Clark County School District (CCSD), and I will tell you more about her in just a minute.

Before I go into the specifics of the bill, I would like to provide you with some context. The Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact is an initiative of the United States Department of Defense, the Council of State Governments, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). It is a licensing compact to help alleviate barriers teachers face when relocating or seeking employment in a new state. The Legislature has debated on measures over the years to address these and other barriers of teaching, including the near unanimous passage of Senate Bill 100 of the 80th Session, which expedited Nevada teaching license applications for spouses of active duty members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and allowed those members, veterans, and their spouses who obtained a license through another state's Alternative Route to Licensure program to obtain a license here in Nevada. These and other opportunities will help support our focus on removing barriers to teaching and will address, in part, the teacher shortage crisis we face.

My copresenters will speak more on the Compact, including the development process and how it works, but first, I would like to tell you S.B. 442 enacts the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact which establishes requirements for the issuance of a teacher license to an applicant who holds an equivalent license from another state that is also a member of the Compact and the sharing of files and information regarding investigation and discipline of a teacher between member states. This bill requires the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions contained in the Compact and provide for the licensure pursuant to the Compact.

Additionally, S.B. 442 exempts a person who obtains a license pursuant to the Compact from the examination required for initial licensing. This bill also exempts a person who applies for a license under the Compact from submitting proof with the application that he or she has completed an approved course of study or training.

Finally, it is important to note the Compact becomes effective upon ratification from ten states. According to [teachercompact.org](http://teachercompact.org), currently Utah, Colorado, and Kentucky have enacted legislation, and another 16 states, including Nevada, have pending legislation.

I would like to turn it over to Dr. GeorgeAnn Rice in Las Vegas, who has been working diligently on this measure, and others if they are there to address this as well. As I said earlier, Dr. Rice is a well-known educator. We cannot give her enough accolades for all she has done for Nevada, and we respect her immensely.

**GeorgeAnn Rice, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I would first like to thank Senator Dondero Loop for shepherding this bill through the Legislature. I think it is very needed and will help us in our quest to fill many of those positions that remain vacant. I would like to introduce our copresenters. First, we have Kelli May Douglas, who is representing the State Defense Liaison Office of the U.S. Department of Defense. The U.S. Department of Defense put up the original funding necessary in order to seek these reciprocity licenses.



**Kelli May Douglas, Pacific Southwest Regional Liaison, Defense-State Liaison Office,  
U.S. Department of Defense:**

I am here in support of the policy expressed within Senate Bill 442. I am pleased to share the highly beneficial impact that policies such as the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact (ITMC) have on the military community. The U.S. Department of Defense has prioritized working with states to resolve licensure issues for military members and their spouses for many years. As our military members and their families move from state to state, being able to transfer a professional license easily and quickly to obtain employment is critical to their economic stability and wellbeing.

Specifically, military families are disproportionately affected by states' specific licensure requirements that can cause delays and gaps in employment with over 36 percent of the working population requiring state licensure to practice in a profession and an annual cross-state relocation rate more than ten times higher than their civilian counterparts. Accordingly, military spouses experience unemployment and underemployment at significantly higher rates than their civilian peers.

After over a decade working with states to modify licensure policy to assist military members and their spouses, we have identified occupational licensure compacts, such as the ITMC, as the optimal mechanism for creating true reciprocity among all participating states. In adopting the ITMC, Nevada can increase its pool of highly qualified teachers, many of whom are members of the military community, address the documented teacher shortages being experienced within the state and throughout the nation, and support learning for all students.

Given that teaching has been found to be one of the most prevalent for military spouses, this policy has the potential to have a significant impact on our population. It is important to note, however, that licensure compacts such as the ITMC not only benefit military spouses, but also apply to all eligible professionals coming into the state, to include active-duty service members, members of the reserves, veterans, and civilians.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to provide comments on the positive impact of this measure to the U.S. Department of Defense and military families. [Written testimony was also received, [Exhibit D](#)].

**GeorgeAnn Rice:**

I would now like to introduce Adam Diersing, representing the Council of State Governments.

**Adam Diersing, Policy Analyst, Center of Innovation, Council of State Governments:**

I want to take the opportunity to speak today to discuss the development process for this Compact, as well as the national perspective of legislation to enact the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact across the country just touched on by Dr. Rice.

The development of this model legislation began in September 2021, although these goals have been a matter of discussion in this community for many years. In September 2021, we assembled a technical assistance group composed of legislators, state education department officials, members of professional associations, licensed teachers, and other stakeholders, which included Senator Dondero Loop. The group met over the course of several months to determine the needs of the profession, the immobility, and what model would be best used to approach those needs. A separate drafting transitioned those recommendations and model from the technical assistance group into a full draft of the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact, which went through several months of public comment and stakeholder review over the summer of 2022. The final draft of the model legislation, which is reflected in this bill, was released in November 2022.

After that point, we have seen significant movement in the early legislative sessions this year to enact the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact. To date, five states have signed the model legislation into law, those being Colorado, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky. Several additional states have passed the legislation through at least one chamber of their legislature. As noted in the legislation, once the tenth state enacts the model legislation, the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact will go into effect and the commission will be convened, represented by all states that have enacted the model legislation.

I want to thank you for your time today and the opportunity to speak to you all. I am happy to answer any questions you might have.

**GeorgeAnn Rice:**

Now I would like to introduce the executive director of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, Jimmy Adams.

**Jimmy Adams, Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification:**

Thank you for allowing my colleagues and me to be here today to talk on behalf of the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact. For 95 years, NASDTEC has worked to improve the portability of educator licenses. In 1965, NASDTEC established the first agreement between states to support educators who were relocating across state lines. Since then, the agreements between states have had many names. Our current version is known as the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement. This agreement was successful in that it opened lines of communication and resulted in the establishment of agreements regarding the minimum requirements for professional license. However, the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement is not reciprocity, it is not binding on the jurisdiction, and it is not an interstate compact.

Thanks to funding through the U.S. Department of Defense and technical support from the Council of State Governments National Center for Interstate Compacts, NASDTEC was selected to provide administrative support for states interested in using an interstate compact to facilitate the portability of educator licenses.

The Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact, which you are discussing today in S.B. 442, allows each member state to identify those high-level licenses within their state that meet the same level of professionalism as in other states with a professional teacher holding a bachelor's degree, have completed a state-approved education and preparation program with no outstanding requirements, and is subject to a criminal background records check by the receiving state. By meeting these criteria, the compact member receiving state can issue an equivalent license based on the three components of content, grade range, and student population, eliminating the overhead and processing paperwork and delays due to the teacher having to provide additional verifying documentation that the sending state has already verified.

Through this Compact, states maintain their autonomy and have full control over the licenses they issue. The Compact simply creates a streamlined process by which a teacher can receive a license and become eligible for employment. This is a win-win, as professional educators gain increased mobility which is consistent with being a professional, and states benefit from a wider door of effective educators, including sharing of educators across state borders, teleteaching, and reclaiming those who have left the profession rather than try to navigate the out-of-state requirements for licensure.

At this time, I will turn it back over to GeorgeAnn Rice.

**GeorgeAnn Rice:**

Thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the passage of S.B. 442. I retired in 2007 with 34 years of service to the Clark County School District, with the last 16 of those 34 years serving as the associate superintendent of human resources for CCSD. My remarks today come from that experience and my continuing work with states and school districts in our country as part of the leadership teams of Heroes to Education.

As an aside, on the basis of this particular bill and other things we have going on, I have already begun to work with Nellis and Creech Air Force Bases to be able to reach out to military spouses before they even arrive at Nellis or Creech when they are being transferred in. Nellis is working with us when they do orientation webinars. Clark County School District will be part of those webinars explaining the jobs that are available and helping people two and three months out in order to apply for not only the job, but whatever licenses are required. Every month, the Nevada Department of Veteran Services receives from the Department of Labor a list of those people all over the country and the world who are getting out of the service and have indicated they want to come back to Nevada to live. Working with that department, we will again be able to reach out for the entire state to those veterans and their spouses who are coming back or relocating to Nevada to know about the jobs we already have available and help them begin the application process.

The issues this Compact addresses are not unique to our state, but are of particular importance to our state. At the beginning of the second semester of this current school year, CCSD had 1,400 certified positions vacant, unable to find teachers necessary. Washoe County School District (WCSD) had almost 300 such positions, and even Lyon County, a

much smaller county, had 28 teacher vacancies. Looking at the coming school year before we even know the number of teachers who will resign or the number who will retire, CCSD is already recruiting for 1,300 teachers, WCSO for 350, and Lyon County is facing the biggest shortage of teachers they have ever had, with 100 expected vacancies.

At the same time, colleges of education all around the country are dropping in enrollment. You just have to turn on the news at night to hear all the negatives about public education. We face an uphill battle. In my 16 years, a majority of our new hires had to be sought from outside Nevada borders because we could not produce enough teachers for all 17 districts. That issue has not changed and has even grown worse.

With the bill before the Legislature to decrease class size, a much-needed initiative, we will need to find and hire even greater numbers of teachers. Remember, we are also competing with companies and fields offering many more extrinsic rewards than we are able to offer. Again, thank you for this opportunity to advocate on behalf of this very important bill. I emphasize, the first ten states to pass the Compact into law will have the right to send a representative from the Department of Education to Washington, D.C., to draft the governing rules and regulations. As you heard, so far 19 states have introduced the bill, and we want to be number six to actually pass it. I would like to thank Senator Dondero Loop and former Senator Joyce Woodhouse, both of whom have been instrumental in getting this far with the bill. Thank you, Committee members, for listening to the things we had to say today.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Thank you for your testimony. Obviously, you have many years of experience within the district, so we thank you. As we say, none of us retire, we just get repurposed. A lot of our questions were answered by your very thorough testimony, but we do have a few questions. We will start with Assemblywoman Mosca.

**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

I am very excited about this as a military spouse. I talked to Ms. Douglas about this issue before the session started, so I am grateful you took it on. You alluded to it earlier, but with the Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL), pages 18 through 21 of the bill, it says as long as it is equivalent. As I know there are so many different ARL programs, if someone came here and it did not match, would there be a way for people to appeal? For those ARL teachers, is there a way for them to make sure it is reciprocating?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

I believe I am going to let Dr. Rice answer that question.

**GeorgeAnn Rice:**

I will give it a try. Alternative Route to Licensure is very important, as you know. I believe what is provided is we have states that have approved alternative route programs, so it is not a matter of once they approve the route then you look class by class or whatever. I can tell you, it is also designed for the military spouse who comes here and has a provisional license.

As we know, with an alternative route, you get a provisional license, and then after you have served three years as a practicing teacher, you are in line for a professional license. This provides the military spouse who comes with the ARL will get the license from the receiving state that is also a member of the Compact. Mr. Adams?

**Jimmy Adams:**

That was very well said. I appreciate your sharing that with them. The Compact is about the license that the teacher holds. It is not about the preparation the person went through in order to get that high-level professional license. As Dr. Rice said, there are special accommodations for military spouses who may have a temporary provisional-type license. What will typically happen—and I know your office in Nevada will also work with anyone who would like to obtain a license coming from another state—if a person does not qualify under the Compact, all of your current routes to obtain a license in Nevada still exist. This is just a streamlined process for those who have reached that high level who do meet the qualifications for the Compact.

I can tell you, every state in the United States works diligently to issue licenses to anyone who is eligible for a license in that state. If the Compact is not able to help, they will, in most cases, be able to find a way to issue a license for that person as long as they qualify for a Nevada license.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

My first question is you continually use the word "teacher," and I understand why, but is this for all education licensed personnel, including counselors and speech language pathologists, or is this only for teachers specifically?

**Jimmy Adams:**

The Compact is actually set up for the teacher license, but the language in the Compact allows a jurisdiction to go ahead and say if they have other licenses in addition to the teaching license, such as a school psychologist, a counselor, or administrator, then it is up to that jurisdiction to say while they are issuing the teacher licenses, they can issue these other licenses.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

Thank you for the clarification. My other question is one I thought about this morning and messaged Senator Dondero Loop about. It has to do with the language in Article I, section 3 and the disciplinary information. I need to explain the scenario a little bit. As many of us know in education and those who care about education, we continually see some states enact laws where people are not allowed to teach certain subjects, discuss certain items, or even bring forward specific books. If individuals who are licensed in our state go to one of those states because they have in fact entered into this agreement—maybe they are staying with their mother or grandmother who is sick for a year or two years—they get in trouble for

teaching a banned book—we will go with *To Kill a Mockingbird*—and they then come back to our state, would those disciplinary actions be something that could impact their license in our state or is that something the Compact has not necessarily discussed? In other words, are we putting someone's license in jeopardy if there is a different law in a different state?

**Jimmy Adams:**

Where that is built in is NASDTEC has the Educator Identification Clearinghouse, which has been in place since 1985. Anyone who has ever had adverse action taken against their license in any state is reported into that clearinghouse. Basically, what happens now is to check that clearinghouse to see if there is adverse action taken in another state before you issue that license. It is up to the state issuing the license to determine whether they want to issue a license based on any adverse actions that may have occurred in the past. That does not prohibit any state from being able to say they will not issue a license, but they are at least issuing the license given full understanding and background on that person with licenses held in another state.

If a person in Nevada goes to another state and has adverse action and then comes back to Nevada, it is up to Nevada whether to issue that license based on whatever that adverse action may have been.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

Thank you for that clarification. I was also thinking about *Inherit the Wind*, which is about teaching Darwinism, so thank you for that clarification that it is up to the states regarding those items.

**Assemblyman D'Silva:**

I have a tripartite question. The Compact is not currently in existence, correct? We are waiting for a critical mass of states to join. Second, this is not an immediate reciprocity of licenses. Is that correct? From what I am reading, you have to apply to a state you may be moving into. It is not a reciprocity-based licensing system where if you have a license in one state you will now be licensed in all of them. Third is regarding the funds. It seems to be the funds are based upon membership dues. Correct me if I am wrong. When a state joins the Compact, the Compact will then be funded by the dues the state will pay toward the membership of the association.

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

I am going to turn those questions over to Mr. Diersing. I want to say yes, yes, and yes, but I will let him answer.

**Adam Diersing:**

Essentially, yes, yes, and yes. The legislation requires ten states to enact the Compact before it becomes effective. That being said, there will probably be some lead time after the tenth state enacts for the Commission to be stood up and the initial rulemaking process takes place. We are likely looking at several months after the tenth state passes, not years of lead time after that point.

To your second question, yes, there are other licensure compact models that utilize a system of multistate practice. This was built specifically to meet the needs of teachers, whose mobility patterns are mostly based on at least one year of employment in another state. This requires states to grant their own licenses, both to protect teachers and to protect individual state sovereignty on what licenses they are granting teachers coming from out of state through the Compact.

Lastly, on funding the Commission, that will be a determination of the member states themselves. Every state that joins the Compact will have a voting member on the Commission. That person will be the delegate of or the head of the licensing office in any given state. Any funding that is required will be a collaboration of the member states to determine what funds are needed and where those funds will come from. No membership dues will be expected without the input of every member state. It is also possible to seek outside funding, so not all of that funding needs to come from state appropriations or licensing agency budgets at any point, and any decisions made on the funding will come from the states themselves. I hope that answered your questions.

**Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:**

Thank you for bringing this important bill. As a teacher, I recognize the need for this to address our shortages. I have two questions. First, do we know how long it takes someone to get licensed now when they move from out of state to Nevada?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

I cannot give you an exact timeline. I can tell you I just renewed my teaching license, but it was fairly seamless. I think within a month I had everything. I got my fingerprints, I had gone to the state department and paid my fee, and they checked my background. I think a month later I received an email saying it was done. I have helped many teachers and principals along the way who have contacted me telling me they do not have their license and are in a panic. Almost always, 100 percent of the time, something has not happened. They have forgotten to send their college transcripts; the college has forgotten to send their transcripts. In other words, it is not a department issue as much as those outside things we need to do. They had trouble getting fingerprints because they did not know they could go other places for fingerprints. There were a lot of reasons. They missed an email that said they had to renew their license. I can tell you, there has been an array of reasons, so I cannot tell you how long because I am not in that process, but I would say as a guess, four to six weeks would be standard practice if everything was there.

**Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:**

From my experience, we have had teachers start the school year without their license even though they applied in May and are still waiting for it. They have to be hired as a substitute until they can get it all sorted out, and that is even when they graduated from the University of Nevada, Reno. I do appreciate it takes some time.

My second question is regarding page 5 of the bill, Article III, sections 3 and 4. I want to make sure I fully understand these two sections. Section 3 is for someone who moves from a member state to our state, then our state has the discretion to grant them a license or not. On line 10 it says, "may include a determination that the applicant is not eligible for any of the eligible licenses of the receiving state." That is specifically for member states. I want to confirm that in section 4 a military member or a military spouse does not need to be moving from a member state. They could be moving from any state. On line 19 it says, "the receiving state shall grant . . . ." I want to confirm for military spouses and military members, it will be granted and it does not matter where they are coming from. Is that correct?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

I can tell you in section 3 my guess would be—not having a conversation specifically on this—is we need to remember someone could come to our state who does not qualify for a license for some reason. Mr. Adams, could you answer that question?

**Jimmy Adams:**

You are exactly right. Someone may come in with what would appear to be a qualification under the Compact but Nevada is not comfortable issuing that license for whatever reason. As I mentioned earlier, that could be around disciplinary issues that may have taken place. Your concern about a member of the military, in order to use the Compact, they would still have to be coming from a member Compact state in order for the Compact to be able to issue their license. However, keep in mind, in Jeff Briske's office [Director of Licensure] in Nevada, they will work with anyone who is applying and will try to do their best to issue that person a license if they are able to do so.

**Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:**

That makes sense. I want to clarify then, for the military member or military spouse, if there is a disciplinary issue or something else, is it the state's discretion for the state not to grant a license, or is it automatic?

**Jimmy Adams:**

It is the state's discretion whether they would issue that license.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

I think the presentation answered a number of my questions. I am trying to conceptualize this and make sure I am understanding the bill as well as possible. Would this create a standard? We have the ARL license with specific requirements and the national boards have specific requirements, which is an extensive process to get your national boards. Not every teacher wants to do the work to get national boards. Is this going to create a minimum if a person wants a specific type of mobility? Am I understanding that correctly?



**Senator Dondero Loop:**

I will answer first and then if someone on Zoom wants to jump in, please do. What this creates is, if I am a military spouse who is a teacher in Alabama and gets stationed at Nellis or Creech or wherever, this means the Compact is going to help me streamline the process and get me in the classroom faster. If I came here and had to go through all of the processes, that might take longer. This just streamlines the process for military folks.

**Jimmy Adams:**

Senator Dondero Loop is exactly right. For the military personnel, it could be a temporary provisional-type license when they were working on a full professional license. For people who are not in the military, they have to have what we refer to commonly as a full professional license in order to qualify under the Compact. The idea is if they have reached that level, all of the states can say—and Nevada would enter the list—these are our full professional licenses. Kentucky and Utah would list theirs. People coming in from Kentucky to Nevada, they would be able to see whether they have the professional license in Kentucky and then they would apply to Nevada, and Nevada would issue the equivalent or as close to equivalent as they have for that license.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Seeing no further questions from the members, I will open testimony in support of S.B. 442. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide support testimony?

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:**

We certainly want to thank the Senator for bringing this bill forward and the hard work Dr. Rice has done. She has done a lot of work for teachers and the licensure process here in the state. We are in full support of this bill, and it fits very well with our iNVEST [Investing in Nevada's Education, Students, and Teachers] document, which is to increase the teacher pipeline.

**Patricia Haddad, Director, Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

Clark County School District is in support of this legislation and legislation that reduces barriers and creates more streamlined pathways to ensuring educators can join us here in Nevada.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Seeing no one else in person, is there anyone waiting on the phone to provide support testimony? [There was no one.] I will close support testimony and open opposition testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] I will close opposition testimony and open neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments?

**Senator Dondero Loop:**

Thank you for hearing this bill, thank you to Dr. Rice and all those on Zoom for helping today, and thank you to former Senator Woodhouse for spearheading this bill.

**Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 442. Our final agenda item is public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.] Our next meeting will be Thursday, May 11, 2023, at 1:30 p.m. That concludes our meeting for today. This meeting is adjourned [at 2:32 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Funmi Sheddy  
Recording Secretary

---

Lori McCleary  
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a *New York Times* article dated January 30, 2023, titled "Students Lost One-Third of a School Year to Pandemic, Study Finds," submitted by Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8, regarding Senate Bill 340.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony dated May 2, 2023, submitted and presented by Kelli May Douglas, Pacific Southwest Regional Liaison, Defense-State Liaison Office, U.S. Department of Defense, in support of Senate Bill 442.