MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Eighty-third Session
March 19, 2025

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Angela D. Taylor at 12:35 p.m. on Wednesday, March 19, 2025, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Angela D. Taylor, Chair
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chair
Senator Fabian Doñate
Senator Michelee Cruz-Crawford
Senator Carrie Ann Buck
Senator Robin L. Titus
Senator Lori Rogich

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Skip Daly, Senatorial District No. 13

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jen Sturm-Gahner, Committee Policy Analyst
Alberto Quintero, Committee Policy Analyst
Cameron Newton, Committee Counsel
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Timothy Gibbs, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fiona Perreault, Intern, Senator Angela D. Taylor
Trevor Parrish, Vegas Chamber
Patricia Charlton, Interim Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
Jose Ibarra Lira

Kent Ervin, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Doug Unger, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Amy Pason, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Greg Esposito, Nevada State Pipe Trades
Alexander Marks, Nevada State Education Association
Robert Munson, Nevada State Education Association
Kaly Krentz
Shelbie Swartz, Battle Born Progress
Kaylee Edinger
Brianne Intrapairote
Edward Ableser, Academica Nevada
Nicole Rourke, City of Henderson
Nick Schneider, Vegas Chamber
Sarah Adler, Coalition of Independent Public Charter Schools of Northern Nevada
Zach Bucher, City of North Las Vegas
Ann Barnett, Nevada Contractors Association
Ryan Reeves, Academica Nevada
Ricky Gourrier, Academica Nevada
Gil Lopez, Charter School Association of Nevada
Giovanni Lazzarotto
Gabe Shirey, Signature Preparatory
Ashley Perkins, Principal, Elko Institute for Academic Achievement
Christine Whetten
Ignacio Prado, Futuro Academy Charter School
Brighid Fronapfel
Brett Harris, Nevada Labor Commissioner
Cyrus Hojjatty

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We have Bill Draft Request (BDR) 34-856 to introduce and consider today.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 34-856: Revises provisions governing education (Later introduced as Senate Bill 411.)

I will entertain a motion to introduce the BDR at this time.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 34-856.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Today, we will have a work session to take action on measures that we have already heard in previous meetings. I will turn the meeting over to our policy analyst, Ms. Sturm-Gahner.

JEN STURM-GAHNER (Committee Policy Analyst):
The first bill on the work session today is Senate Bill (S.B.) 38, which was presented by the Division of Emergency Management of the [Nevada] Office of the Military on February 12.

SENATE BILL 38: Revises provisions relating to school emergency operations plans. (BDR 34-270)

The bill, included in the work session document (Exhibit C), authorizes the Division of Emergency Management to disseminate school emergency operation plans, updates or approve deviations of these plans to a local public safety agency in certain circumstances, including in the event of an act of terrorism or related emergencies and for emergency preparedness, coordination and response efforts. There are no proposed amendments at this time.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 38.

SENATOR TITUS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 38.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MS. STURM-GAHNER:
The next bill in the work session is S.B. 45, which was presented by the Department of Education on February 10.

SENATE BILL 45: Revises provisions relating to educational programs. (BDR 34-275)

The bill, included in the work session document (Exhibit D), revises the calculation and the limit on the grant amount to school districts and charter schools for career and technical education (CTE) programs by providing that the limit is based on the proportion of pupils enrolled in advanced courses within a CTE program rather than the proportion of all pupils enrolled in CTE programs.

The bill as introduced also eliminates the requirement that the board of trustees of a school district and governing body of a charter school—which offers a work-based learning program—must submit a report containing certain work-based learning program information. There was one proposed amendment. Chair Taylor proposed an amendment to mirror the list of federally required work-based learning reporting metrics in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) rather than removing the reporting requirement.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended S.B. 45.

> SENATOR DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 45.
>
> SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MS. STURM-GAHNER:
The next bill in the work session is S.B. 52, which was presented by the Department of Education on February 19th.

SENATE BILL 52: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-273)

This bill, included in the work session document (Exhibit E), authorizes a pupil, who would otherwise be retained in Grade 3, to receive a good-cause exemption for promotion to Grade 4 by demonstrating the mastery of reading academic standards for Grade 3 rather than beyond Grade 3. The bill also requires the board of trustees of each school district to determine the percentage, in addition to the number, of certain pupils enrolled in the school district and revises the definition of "long-term English learner" for reporting purposes. At this time, there are no proposed amendments.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 52.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 52.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MS. STURM-GAHNER:
The next bill is S.B. 176, which was sponsored by Senator Doñate, and the bill was heard on March 3.

SENATE BILL 176: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-45)

Senate Bill 176, as introduced in the work session document (Exhibit F), requires pupils enrolled in a CTE program for certain healthcare professions to take the corresponding licensure or certification exam for that profession to receive credit for the program. Furthermore, S.B. 176 revises eligibility requirements for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship. There were several proposed amendments for this bill.

Senator Doñate proposed the following amendments: The first amendment eliminates provisions contained in the bill as introduced relating to the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship. The second eliminates provisions waiving the age requirement for licensure or certification in certain professions. The third amendment eliminates provisions requiring pupils enrolled in certain CTE

programs to take licensure or certification exams and the waiver of related exam fees.

The fourth amendment involves authorizing only pupils enrolled in a CTE program for certified nursing assistants (CNA) to opt in to taking industry-recognized credential or licensure exams as part of their CTE program. The fifth amendment involves exempting pupils enrolled in a CNA/CTE program from taking the end-of-course exams prescribed by the Department of Education if the pupil elects to take an industry-recognized credential or licensure exam aligned with their CTE program.

The sixth amendment requires the Legislature to provide each school district up to $300 per qualified pupil to cover the exam registration fee of those enrolled in CNA/CTE program who opt in and complete an industry-recognized credential or licensure exam aligned with their CTE program and satisfies all exam prerequisites. The seventh amendment requires school districts offering related programs to coordinate with the relevant licensing entities to establish the process of dispersing these funds, facilitate the administration of the exams at approved sites, provide relevant information to eligible pupils and ensure equitable access for eligible pupils.

The eighth amendment defines the healthcare profession as used within the provisions of this bill. The ninth amendment appropriates $148,800 for this two-year pilot program to the Clark County School District, Elko County School District, Lyon County School District and White Pine School District to be used to assist pupils in a CNA/CTE program to cover the cost of corresponding certification and licensure exams.

The last amendment changes the effective date for various portions of the bill, including applying the provisions related to pupils who opt in for the licensure or certification exam to those enrolled in CNA/CTE programs during the school years 2026-2027 and 2027-2028.

SENATOR TITUS:
I want to just clarify some things with these amendments. I know during the bill hearing itself, I was concerned that this did not include any charter schools that might have nurse's aide programs. I'm also worried about the potential costs. My two questions are regarding the charter schools and the potential costs.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will turn it over to Senator Doñate who is the sponsor of the bill to answer the first question, but the second question is a finance question, so we will leave that to the finance committee.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
Just to confirm, I did have a conversation offline with the Board of Nursing. At this time, there are no CNA programs for charter schools, so they would not be applied to this pilot program.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended S.B. 176.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 176.

SENATOR DOÑATE SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR TITUS:
I definitely appreciate all the effort that Senator Doñate has put in this program. I do think that nurse's aides are indeed the pipeline to nurses as I was a nurse's aide also. I am going to support this out of committee but may change my vote on the floor once we see the fiscal aspect of this.

SENATOR BUCK:
I am going to vote no today because it does not include the possibility of all public schools.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR BUCK VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MS. STURM-GAHNER:
The next bill in the work session is S.B. 229, which was presented by Senator Dondero Loop. The bill was heard on March 3.

SENATE BILL 229: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-680)

The bill, included in the work session document (Exhibit G), changes certain requirements for a student to qualify for a State Seal of Financial Literacy—including lowering the grade point average (GPA) that a pupil must earn from 3.25 to 2.5 on a 4.0 grading scale or from a 3.85 to 2.5 on a weighted GPA scale—and revising provisions by which a student may demonstrate proficiency and financial literacy. Finally, S.B. 229 changes the requirement that the board of trustees of each school district and the governing body of each charter school ensure financial literacy instruction is provided to students in kindergarten and Grades 1 through 12 rather than Grades 3 through 12. It also ensures that the related teacher professional development is provided and resources are offered through certain partnerships are encouraged. At this time, there are no proposed amendments.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 229.

SENATOR DOÑATE MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 229.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR TITUS:
Although I definitely appreciate financial literacy, I am concerned about lowering standards, and I will be a no on this bill.

SENATOR BUCK:
I am going to go ahead and be a yes and reserve my right to vote no on the floor. I agree with my colleague on lowering standards; however, I am kind of wavering on the fact that we want to give as many students as possible—even with low GPAs—the financial background that they need. I will be a yes today but reserve my right for the floor.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
I just want to clarify that we are not lowering standards on anything. This is a certificate or a seal that will go on their diploma. This is not lowering their total GPA. This is saying that in this area only—I think I used the scout badge the other day as an example—you achieved certain things and you get this seal—so we are wanting to encourage more children to be involved in these programs.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I did want to say that in the State for Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting, 60 percent meets proficiency, so this is significantly higher than our proficiency standards nationally. People that do have the seal of completion—completing classes and course work and meeting achievement—do have a standard of GPA of just that coursework. This standard is higher because it is a total GPA for all of their high school classes. I just wanted some comparisons on how we show meeting requirements, both in our State and nationally.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR TITUS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MS. STURM-GAHNER:
Our last bill in the work session today is S.B. 245, included in the work session document (Exhibit H), which was presented by Senator Lange on March 10.

SENATE BILL 245: Makes various changes to education. (BDR 34-827)

The bill Exhibit H creates the Advisory Council on Civics Education within Nevada's Department of Education and requires initial members to draw lots to stagger their initial terms. The Council must assist the Superintendent of Public Instruction with the development and implementation of the State Seal of Civics Program and develop and set forth Program criteria. The bill also requires the Superintendent, in consultation with the Council, to adopt necessary regulations to carry out the provisions of the Program. The Superintendent may apply for any grants or accept gifts, grants or donations to support the Program.

Additionally, S.B. 245 changes the academic requirements for a pupil to be eligible to receive the State Seal of Civics by lowering the GPA a pupil must earn from 3.25 to 2.5 on a 4.0 grading scale and requires a score of at least 80 percent, rather than 90 percent, on the civics exam to demonstrate proficiency. The bill also appropriates $20,000 to the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement to raise awareness of civics education programs and create awards in areas of civics education. At this time, there are no proposed amendments.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will entertain a motion at this time to do pass S.B. 245.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 245.

SENATOR DOÑATE SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR TITUS:
I am going to be a no on this bill. I support civics education, and I think it is critical that we continue it. Regardless of what the response will be to my comment, I feel that we are again lowering GPAs and lowering the percent to pass. Additionally, in a day and age where we have identified that we have too many advisory councils and too many committees, we are creating yet another advisory council and so I am going to be a no on this.

SENATOR BUCK:
I will be a no today because it does not include voices of all public schools and all public entities in education.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS TITUS AND BUCK VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR TAYLOR:
That completes our work session for today, and we have two bills in front of us to hear, S.B. 318 and S.B. 322.

SENATE BILL 318: Revises provisions relating to charter schools. (BDR 34-89)

SENATE BILL 322: Revises provisions relating to the Board of Regents for the University of Nevada. (BDR 34-764)

VICE CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will now open the hearing on S.B. 322.

SENATOR ANGELA D. TAYLOR (Senatorial District No. 15):
This bill requires certain training for every member of the Board of Regents for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) in order to provide them with the necessary knowledge and tools to effectively govern in this role. I will go through my Required Training for NSHE PowerPoint (Exhibit I) and then turn it over to my intern, Fiona Perreault.

We have 13 elected regents with constitutional status. We have two research universities, one State university, four community colleges and one research institute. These regents are responsible for setting policies, approving budgets and setting the direction for NSHE. The scope of their responsibilities is to set priorities and approve budgets. They hire all of the institutional presidents; they have oversight of two medical schools and one law school; they have a fiduciary responsibility for the system—all those institutions that I just mentioned.

The purpose of the Board of Regents is to ensure the highest standard and uphold the highest expectations of accountability, transparency, quality and trust. You may ask why S.B. 322?

VICE CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Why S.B. 322?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I will answer that. Right now, NRS 386.327 requires training for school board trustees. As legislators, we know that we have required training as well, but there is no similar requirement for members of the NSHE Board of Regents. This bill is similar to the legislation that established NRS 386.327 but is applied to the Board of Regents. At this time, I will turn it over to Ms. Fiona Perreault, and she will walk us through the bill.

FIONA PERREAULT (Intern, Senator Angela D. Taylor):
Section 1 of this bill would require every member of the Board of Regents to complete training—the amount of time and frequency of that training is still being discussed as is mentioned in the conceptual amendment (Exhibit J). The training topics will include—these are ones they are currently already trained in—Nevada Open Meeting Law, public records law, duties and responsibilities of Regents and employment and contract laws. This bill would expand that training to include higher education board governance, elimination of bias and discrimination in education, prevention of power-based violence, Regent, Legislator and Executive Branch relations, best practices for searching and hiring and evaluating presidents.

The reporting of the hours [completed] would be managed by the Secretary of the Board, as well as scheduling of the trainings as directed, up to $2,500 from the hosting account.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I will discuss the conceptual amendment. I have been working with members of the NSHE Board of Regents, and particularly the Chancellor. We are still working on a few of the details in terms of the frequency of the training and the numbers of hours. We are also working with other stakeholders to make sure we land in a place that makes sense. We're very close; I feel very confident we will land in a place that requires the training of our Regents and supports them in their endeavor for transparency, trust and accountability.

SENATOR TITUS:
I need a little bit more insight into the history behind the need for this bill.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
In terms of our governing bodies from a State standpoint, the Boards of Trustees for our Washoe County School District, Clark County School District—all 17 districts—have required training. With the scope of the responsibilities that they have in NSHE, [they require training] in the same way that we do as legislators. Additionally, when we look at the things that we see publicly and the challenges that boards sometimes have, adding some training to that from a governance standpoint is something that we think will strengthen it.

As a former member of the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, when this body passed mandatory training for the Board of Trustees, it really helped us. Part of the help was that it opened some doors for us to work better together, and it helped us to gain more confidence, more credibility and more trust from the community that we serve, which I think is very important. From my standpoint, I thought that was something that our Board of Regents could benefit from as well.

SENATOR TITUS:
From my understanding, the Board of Regents has been in existence since 1864 when we became a State [*sic*], and we have had other entities which have mandatory training—but that was not addressed. Because of this, I was just wondering, was there an incident? Is there any other State agency that maybe needs this education? Is this the only one left that does not have mandatory training once they are elected? Do all other elected officials? I know that justices of the peace are required to do judicial training. I am looking at the broader scope instead of just picking out one agency to give mandatory training because I agree with you; we have mandatory training, and I think it makes us

all better at our jobs. Is this the last one out there, or are there other State agencies who do not have training? Maybe the Research [Division] can get back to us. I am just curious, are there other State agencies where they get elected to a position and there's no mandatory training?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I did not do a broad scope. I was looking strictly from the educational lens and the other educational bodies that we have across the State and all 17 counties. We have had that mandatory training, and it helped our school boards. I have my personal opinion of that, and I thought the same could be applied at the higher education level. Most of us have training—and I do not mean to imply that they have no training because they do have some training—but there are areas where they do not. If we just look at what we see, what we hear and what we have all experienced, we see that there's always an opportunity to get better.

One of the things I did in putting this together was I reached out to the Chancellor and the Regents to get their input on it, and there's agreement that some training can be beneficial.

SENATOR TITUS:
Thank you for that because I just think, "Somehow, we missed the Board of Regents." I mean, even our hospital board members are mandated. If you become a hospital board member, you have to have some training to be a good board member, so I am just wondering how we missed this in the past.

VICE CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will just give you a little add-on to the State's history. It [Nevada Board of Regents] was established in our constitution in 1864, but it actually did not take effect until 1865, and at that time, we only had one institution.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I was lucky enough to be a Regent before I was in this seat and I can tell you the training that I had was some online training and once it was completed, I would forward it to HR; there was no accountability in that piece. It was mainly about bias. I think this is very necessary because there's a lot of confusion from the board members; a lot of us did not really understand what the scope of practice was. There were a lot of governance issues, and so getting training on what the purpose is and how they are interconnected with other agencies—like

the Legislature—is very important to their overall effectiveness. I really think this is valid, and one of the things I saw in there is [training for] presidents.

Right now, we are hiring for Truckee Meadows Community College; we're going to be hiring for University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV); we just hired for College of Southern Nevada and Great Basin College. We have been hiring for a chancellor since this last year. That is glaring, right? When we have that many institutions, and over 50 percent of them need hiring, we really need to look inward to the Board so that we are more effective and—I would honestly say—less chaotic. I think this piece of legislation is very necessary in the effectiveness of maintaining some of our most valuable resources in the State—our higher education institutions.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
I know it is very important, especially to the progression and involvement of the Board of Regents, to be more professionalized. I just have a clarifying question in terms of section 1. My question deals more with noncompliance and how we are going to make sure that the Board of Regents are accountable. As my colleague mentioned, there are other mechanisms or other institutions, for example the Legislature, that must do so. So, my question is why was this struck out? Was it just more for intent purposes? And then maybe as a follow-up, if our Legal [Division] can this look up, if the Board of Regents or if a member refuses to do the training as required, is that grounds for a recommendation to the Ethics Commission? How would we resolve any matters if folks say, "I do not want to do this," "I do not care," or "I was elected, and you can't do anything about it"? Maybe if you can provide us a little bit of your intention, and then if we can get the follow-up for that from Legal.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
The conceptual amendment that you have—that is where we left off and ran out of time, so we are continuing to work on that accountability piece. I do think that is important. Regarding the ramifications if someone says "I will not do it," I really do lean to our Legal Counsel. This is part of continuing to work on this. I do believe there's an accountability piece, and that is important.

CAMERON NEWTON (Committee Counsel):
Due to some of the complexities of the question, I will need to look into this further and provide an answer to the committee later.

TREVOR PARRISH (Vegas Chamber)
We're in support of S.B. 322, as additional training will help improve accountability for the Board and provide parity across our educational landscape. We'd like to thank the sponsor for bringing this forward.

PATRICIA CHARLTON (Interim Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education):
I too want to extend my appreciation to Senator Taylor, the bill sponsor and chair of the committee, for the opportunity first to be here today and to work in consultation with Board Chair Amy Carvalho to work through the amendments. We just literally ran out of time and that was it. I would like to provide support for the bill today with amendments.

JOSE IBARRA LIRA:
I am a third-year honors college student pursuing political science, public policy and public communication advocacy from UNLV, as well as a member of the seasonal undergraduate student government. I currently represent our largest academic college, the College of Liberal Arts. I am here today to express my support for S.B. 322, which seeks to implement critical reforms in the governance of our State's higher education system.

As a student, we depend on the integrity and professionalism of the Board of Regents to make decisions that directly affect the quality of our education, resources and our future opportunities. Requiring each member of the Board to complete training for professional development ensures that our elected higher education leaders are equipped with the necessary tools to uphold the highest standards of ethical conduct and decision-making that directly impacts us as students. This aligns with their need for a governing body that is both accountable and well-prepared to handle the complex issues facing our universities.

As a member of the student government, I understand firsthand the impact that good governance can have on our student body. We deserve a Board of Regents that is professional, ethical and dedicated to serving us students first and foremost. Thank you for your time, and I urge you to support S.B. 322 for the benefit of the students pursuing higher education across the State.

KENT ERVIN (Nevada Faculty Alliance):
We support S.B. 322 as introduced. The legislation would require members of the Board of Regents to undergo training on various topics related to their

governing and fiduciary duties. Mandatory training is currently in statute for school board trustees, and Regents should have similar requirements for this large and complex enterprise. The only requirement to be a candidate for Regent is to be a resident of the district and some new Regents have little prior familiarity with NSHE or with higher education. Training topics should include Open Meeting Law, nondiscrimination, State and federal laws and regulations applicable to NSHE, ethics for public officials, best practices in governance and board procedures, shared governance in academia, academic freedom and other topics relevant to NSHE governance and student outcomes.

I have observed Board of Regents meetings for years. Frankly, they often struggle with procedural matters, Open Meeting Law, governance, executive searches and understanding the complex finances, budgets and employment law. We fervently hope that training will help improve the functionality of the Board. The only enforcement stick in S.B. 322 as written is frankly public shaming of Regents who do not complete the training, and that is the same as in statute now for school board trustees. The provision in S.B. 322 as introduced provides nominal compensation to Regents for taking time to complete the trainings outside of board meetings, which is reasonable given that most Regents have other jobs and responsibilities. Regarding possible amendments, we would be happy to work with the sponsor. I have submitted my written testimony (Exhibit K) to the committee.

DOUG UNGER (Nevada Faculty Alliance):
The Nevada Faculty Alliance-UNLV Chapter supports S.B. 322 as introduced, which will provide what we feel to be much needed basic training for Regents in State laws, ethics and standards of public comportment, board procedures and best practices for higher education governance.

I have been observing the Board of Regents and attending meetings since 1996—and steadily since 2017—and note that for many Regents, there's an extended learning curve for many of the topics covered in the listed trainings in S.B. 322. Some Regents, but not all, now learn on the job—which makes the Board's meetings at times not optimal either for the individual Regents or for the smooth and efficient deliberations of the Board as a whole. We believe S.B. 322, if passed and implemented, will make the Board of Regents function more effectively. These trainings will better serve our colleges and universities, NSHE faculty and employees and our students. We stand in support of S.B. 322.

AMY PASON (Nevada Faculty Alliance):
I have served as the UNR Faculty Senate Chair and as the chair of NSHE Faculty Senate Chairs Council. I am in support of S.B. 322 because, like our previous caller, I have attended and participated in a number of Board of Regents meetings. A lot of time and effort is spent on just trying to clarify the scope of work, the authority of the Board and other procedural issues. Having some training, not only in statute, will allow us to have some accountability and some better clarity and understanding about the roles of the Regents and will help us better serve our students overall.

VICE CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Our sponsor has closing comments.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
Let's just be clear. My intention in this is to position the Board of Regents so they can do the best possible job in leading the system of higher education in our State. As I said before, we had a time—and we all remember this—when we had a lot of dysfunction in our K-12 school boards and having mandatory training helped us get better. That is my intention; I would like that same benefit and that same opportunity for the NSHE Board of Regents. Their job is important, and we need them.

VICE CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will now close the hearing on S.B. 322.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We are now on to the second bill that we will review today, S.B. 318.

SENATOR SKIP DALY (Senatorial District No. 13):
Senate Bill 318 has to do with education, but primarily with charter schools and charter school sponsors. The bill does two main things: it addresses the educational management organizations (EMO) and issues regarding charter schools complying with prevailing wage and other provisions.

I have some comments here and some stuff I will read into the record if you'll bear with me really quick. I think it will outline a couple of the issues. Regarding the application of prevailing wage—over the interim, I was the chair of the Sunset Subcommittee, and we brought the [Nevada State Public] Charter School Authority in for some questions and various things. In the testimony, the

director of the Authority assured our subcommittee that the charter schools are in fact subject to the State prevailing wage laws. Notwithstanding that statement, the director in her testimony also qualified that assurance regarding prevailing wage by stating "when using charter school funds." I think that is where some of the questions come in.

The director went on to testify that the Authority does not monitor the entities—that the Authority has issued a charter to—for compliance with the State prevailing wage laws. When the committee that forms charter schools applies for a charter, there is a section in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) on the proposed charter school facility. I believe that is in NAC 388A.140. That section, for example, requires information that must be provided. This includes, but it is not limited to, location, whether there is an existing building, if there will be a new building, how the facility will be paid and whether there will be a lease or rent. There's a whole section on the information you have to put in regarding their facilities.

Despite an applicant being required to provide an extensive amount of information regarding the charter school facility, there are no questions or reference to prevailing wage being applicable. The first statement was that everybody knows it is applicable, but nobody asks any questions.

The director testified that the Authority does not ask or provide any guidance to applicants regarding the required application of prevailing wage to the construction of charter schools. The director went on to say that it is not the Authority's responsibility to enforce the prevailing wage laws. Now, that is true. The Labor Commissioner would enforce the prevailing wage laws, but I can tell you, it says 25 or 30 times in NAC 388A that as part of what the charter schools sponsor—whether it is the authority or a school district or now cities or counties—is to ensure that the people who are issuing charter schools are in compliance with all State and federal laws.

They do not have the authority to enforce, but they are supposed to ensure compliance, which is what this bill does. I asked the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) if the governing board of a charter school met the definition of a public body under Nevada law. The LCB confirmed that charter school governing boards are political subdivisions of the State, meaning that they meet the definition of a public body and are required to follow the State prevailing wage laws.

With all of the above being true, there are still many examples where charter school construction does not comply with the prevailing wage laws. I believe this is in part due to the lack of oversight—and maybe a little bit of intentional and unintentional neglect on the part of the sponsoring authorities—to ensure that the entities they issued a charter to comply with the prevailing wage laws. That was the context I wanted to get on the record.

Before I get into the bill, I wanted to read some similar comments concerning the use of for-profit EMOs. Then we can get into the questions and the various things from there. The use of for-profit EMOs has created a charter school environment that has had several negative unintended consequences, in my opinion. While the idea of being able to hire an administrative management organization sounds like a reasonable approach for the charter school model of education delivery, the reality is that using a for-profit model to deliver these services for charter schools has fundamentally changed this charter school education delivery model. The charter school education delivery model under a for-profit system shifts the focus from educating students who are at risk of failing traditional public schools to a system influenced and controlled by the for-profit EMO—focusing on maximizing profits of the EMO.

It is indisputable that the number one goal and purpose of a for-profit business is to make money. Sure, businesses want to provide a good product, but they are primarily motivated by keeping and growing their market share and thereby increasing their profit. Making a profit is the ultimate purpose of a for-profit entity, not education. Understanding the fundamental and universal truth about any for-profit entity is vital to understanding how for-profit elements have caused a change in the charter school model in the State. Because EMOs are motivated by profit, the only way they can grow is to get more schools and more per-pupil funding that comes with it under the for-profit EMO charter school system.

The original concept behind charter schools were for them to be a complementary option to the initial public-school model. Charter schools were designed to try new curriculums, teaching methods, career-oriented studies and other nontraditional elements designed to help at-risk students; if these new models were successful, the traditional public school system would then utilize the most effective methods as applicable and practical.

This new for-profit element, now prevalent in the State, has changed its charter school equation from a complementary relationship to an adversarial relationship. The for-profit EMOs view traditional public schools and non-charter schools as competition, but they are not their competitors. Members of the State Public Charter School Authority have spoken publicly about their desire to compete with and target traditional public-school districts while supporting the rapid expansion of corporate franchise charter schools run by for-profit EMO corporations. The Authority has issued—approximately when we were in the interim—80 charters covering well over 100 schools. Of those charters, 33 utilize an EMO. Of the 33 EMO charter schools, 28 have contracts with an EMO called Academica, and are essentially run as franchises of Academica's for-profit corporation.

Academica operates corporate franchise charter schools across the country and under the same corporate brand names including Doral, Pinecrest and Matter. Concerns have been raised in several parts of the country over Academica taking public education funds and using those funds through lease and rent agreements to build a primarily publicly-funded and privately-owned real estate portfolio. Educational management organizations were intended to be just a vendor providing management services. The current state of the for-profit EMO business model is not to simply be a vendor providing a service to an otherwise independent charter school. Instead, the corporate for-profit EMO business model has the EMO operate as a franchise where the corporate EMO owns the name under the corporate brand and owns the operation of the school facility.

Educational management organizations have evolved into much more than a vendor chosen by a charter school. They essentially own what are supposed to be public schools. With those comments in mind, when we go through sections 1 through 12, I believe only 4, 10 and 11 are different. All the other sections—I think 1 through 3 and 5 through 9—just eliminate the reference to EMOs. I believe those are all just conforming changes.

When we get to section 4 on page 6, we have the new language where the sponsoring authority has to ensure that each charter school complies with the provisions of NRS 338.013 to NRS 338.090 inclusive. Except as otherwise provided, in one section is NRS 388A.635 where you can get a financing option through the State. If you use that, you are not subject to the public bidding portion of NRS 338. But if you do not have that loan under that section, you are subject to the bidding provisions of NRS 338 as well.

The next section is section 10, which is not just the conforming language to remove the EMOs. It requires a charter school to provide written notice to the sponsor of the charter school of any project for new construction, repair or reconstruction where their value is over $100,000. We are trying to get into the oversight and monitoring of the sponsor of a charter school to make sure that the schools they are issuing charters to are in compliance. We're asking the charter school—whenever they are going to do some construction that is going to meet the threshold to apply prevailing wages—to provide notice to the charter sponsor. Then they have that oversight. Once they get the notice, they are then supposed to give them some guidance and make sure that they actually comply with following the prevailing wage.

Section 13, which is not just conforming language, says you have to phase out [a contract] and that you cannot enter into a new contract with the EMO. That's the part where they are going to be phased out and eliminated, with one exception: if you are within a year of when the contract is going to expire, you can renew again for a limited period of time. The period is two years, but it can only be done one time. It gives people some time to make a transition. For example, if I have an agreement with an EMO right now and it is good for another four years, then I have four years to plan and make that change, and when that contract ends, you can't renew. This only applies if you have one year left on your contract. You can renew for up to two years to give you time to make that transition.

Section 14 has the provisions that are repealed by this. When you talk about the definition of what an EMO is and what the definition of a contractor is, they use that exact language. I know some people have pointed out to me that you might need to tighten up the definition of a contractor because you can have a contractor for a variety of other things. You can hire a contractor for accounting, and they can do the accounting. That's not what we are talking about. You can hire a vendor to do janitorial work, and that is not we are talking about. Oftentimes, EMOs will do both of those things, but they also own the brand of the school. It is not like they are independent; it is not an arm's length transaction. Some of these people who have contracts with an EMO that has their brand name as Lancaster Doral—they really can't fire the EMO. They can't make an independent decision under this scheme. The definition of the contract says “You are not to do any of the things that the EMO does the same way” so there may need to be an adjustment on that language.

Section 15 of the bill gives you the effective date.

SENATOR ROGICH:
I have a question regarding if the charter school is built by a private developer and there's no government funding assistance or reduced pricing of any kind, would that still be considered a public work?

SENATOR DALY:
I know there are several complaints in Southern Nevada and at least one in Northern Nevada asking those very questions, and it is a difficult one to answer for sure. Looking at either direction, people have legitimate arguments to say that it is not, or that it is privately funded. I think there are legitimate arguments on the other side that say that the governing body, which is the charter school board, is sponsoring this job. In other words, it does not get built unless there's going to be a public school. Then how is that paid for? Maybe they finance it and do all this stuff and that is theoretically private, but it is 100 percent paid for by the lease and rent agreements, right? Maybe you are not leasing it back to own it, but it is 100 percent paid for with public funds. I think that is what we are trying to get to.

We need to put the charter schools on notice that construction is going to happen. Charter schools need to make sure they are complying with that. The Labor Commissioner has complaints that are under review right now that they are dealing with. I think that argument was going to come down to what other statutes say on what constitutes public work, and a public body is either financing or sponsoring public work. My opinion is that it would be covered, and we are going to find out when the Labor Commissioner finishes her review of the complaints that we have now. She is just going to follow the law, and we are going to get this done, and if we then need to make other changes, we will. I would answer your question that it is still covered as a sponsoring of the job.

SENATOR ROGICH:
Were any of the charter school leaders, parents and students consulted on this bill and this issue?

SENATOR DALY:
I believe the Charter School Authority is aware. I don’t think that some of the school districts were aware that I go out and talk to parents of charter schools or students.

SENATOR TITUS:
First, I think it is important to address a comment that you made, and I am questioning where that came from. During your testimony on your bill, you referred to the entities or this process as schemes. You are on the record of addressing them as schemes. I am just wondering if have you met with the EMOs? Have you met with their corporations? Have you ever investigated it or has the Labor Commission investigated, such that you would call them schemes on the record?

SENATOR DALY:
Educational management organizations talked to me a little bit during the Sunset Subcommittee meetings, and I believe they came and testified a couple of times and told me I did not understand. I said, "No, I think I understand plenty." They have not come to talk to me since this bill has been out. They know where my office is. They know what my phone number is. It is on my website. You can talk to me any time.

Some of what they are doing—and to clarify this is the for-profit EMO model in public schools—was a mistake and an experiment that has not worked out and has had unintended consequences.

I think the scheme part, and I will stick with the scheme part, is how they are financing these otherwise public schools by saying, "Well it is all private, it is all private!" The thing is, we're funding it over here; it is 100 percent paid by public funds. That's the scheme, and I will stick by that. It is a scheme.

SENATOR TITUS:
You are very passionate about prevailing wage and workers getting a fair wage. But if I recall last session, there was a bill to support teacher raises across the board—public school teachers—that you supported, but you left off charter schoolteachers. Are you saying that prevailing wage is only good for the workers and not the teachers?

SENATOR DALY:
I do remember the bill and I did vote for it. I was not involved in the bill. Other people sponsored that, and I do support the public school and charter schoolteachers getting paid. They are working for a different organization and they're not working for a school district. These are two different areas. I support all workers getting paid fair wages and benefits. If we had the

resources, we could go from there. I have spoken to a couple of charter schoolteachers, some who might be in this building as a legislator. He said, "They are getting paid higher than what they were getting paid at the school district." As a result, I do not see it as that big of a problem.

SENATOR TITUS:
You have emphasized for-profit agencies. I am just wondering about something. When schools contract—and we as a State contract—with for-profit agencies, we contract with Medicaid and with other healthcare corporations for our patients that are for-profit. And yet, we do that, and the bills have been supported. The votes have been out there when we pass these managed care organizations, and they are for-profits.

Are you just objecting the for-profit agencies in charter schools? You do not think that across-the-board the State should not engage in for-profit entities? Where is the concern with the for-profit component?

SENATOR DALY:
Yes, we contract with for-profit agencies all the time. I have advocated in my position from the labor union before that they should contract with private for-profit companies to build roads, buildings and various things because the government is not that good at it sometimes.

The difference here is with the for-profit EMOs and the service they provide in the total management deal, namely regarding owning the brand name. In other words, Pinecrest is a brand name owned by them. These are not arm's length transactions, and that for-profit element on the management, education, curriculum—and in every aspect of what is the educational part—does not exist in other educational organizations. I am not saying that you can't have a charter management organization (CMO), which is nonprofit and does many of the same things, but the motive there is different than hiring a janitor company that is for-profit. Obviously, you are going to do that, but they are not running the school. They do not own the brand. You can hire and fire them. You can hopefully try to get a better deal if they do not give good service. But if you are in a facility that was built under the scheme I referenced earlier, which evades prevailing wage, it is not like you can up and move to another building or say, "Hey I have to get rid of the lease."

That same person who owns that building where you are paying rent also is providing new teachers, new curriculum, management and making sure you are doing all the compliance and all the other things that you normally do. You could hire arm's length transactions for all of those services, but they can't get rid of that EMO. I challenge you to say that they can't. I challenge you to say that it is as easy as saying "Hey, we do not want to have that." They are going to have to under this bill if we pass it.

SENATOR TITUS:
To be clear on that, you support the State hiring for-profit all across the board. You represent a lot of folks in your building industry. All the other industries in our State subcontract for-profit businesses: the concrete businesses, our roads and everything else that we do in the State. But in an education system that is proving results, you do not want to have a for-profit system.

SENATOR DALY:
I think we are talking about two different things. It is a different relationship. You and I can disagree on that all we'd like. I have my position and other people have theirs. I think that looking at where this has gone in the education delivery system, it is more than just a vendor that we have hired—that yes, is for-profit. The relationship is not arm's length.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
I understand the sentiments that you are sharing regarding the for-profit system taking advantage of the education system that we have because obviously we want to consider the public good. We want to make sure that this money we allocate for students actually goes to them, and not to the corporate interests or the profit margins of the corporate interests. In talking through the semantics of the bill, I think the main concern that I have heard is just the potential market shift that could occur if we were to enact this law. Have you had a conversation as to whether or not we could grandfather in the EMOs or the charter schools that are already operating under this? And maybe look more in the future in terms of any new charter school that gets approved not being able to operate under this structure, so that the ones that we already have are not affected?

Would you be interested in working more on the approval process of what it takes to be a charter school, because we have brought up concerns before that

they are getting approved and there's no verification process as to whether or not they could be stood up.

SENATOR DALY:
As far as grandfathering in the EMOs, I have not spoken to anybody about that or thought of it. It is a possibility. I think people can be weaned off and make the change, and that is the way the bill is structured currently.

I will now speak about approval processes. When they are coming in and putting in their application—and we expanded that last year so cities and counties theoretically can do it as well—most of the ones that are chartered by the school districts do not have the EMOs. It is mainly a Charter School Authority type of deal. I think there could be more on the vetting when they are getting their charter and being stood up. A lot of times on these deals—because I asked the director for the Charter School Authority, "Well how does this start?"—there's a process where one's ahead of the other. The committee to form a charter school comes in and says, "Here is all this stuff we are going to do," and they actually do not have any authority to do anything yet. They can't enter into contracts. I think some of that is backwards and needs to be looked at, but that is not what I was trying to solve here.

A lot of those are not grassroots; some of it is—I am not saying it is never grassroots. But largely those people, when they say, "Hey, we are going to do this," they get approached by the EMO and they said, "Hey, we can help you, we can get you a facility and we can do all of this stuff." Their motive is to increase their market share, have more schools and have more per-pupil dollars coming in to their mechanism, and they are trying to increase their land portfolio. Nevada is not the only state; there have been other states that have raised these red flags about EMOs and how they are really just land companies building their portfolios through public dollars in schools. It is an issue. Strengthening the vetting process is a different bill at a different time, and it could be done. The grandfathering is an interesting thought, but not my first one though.

SENATOR BUCK:
I am going to put this in two different aspects. The first one surrounds the whole prevailing wage aspect. Does the city or State provide any facility funding to charter schools at this time?

SENATOR DALY:
As far as I know, specific facility funding is not provided by the city or State to charter schools. Charter schools get the same per-pupil funding as others. I do not want to get into the whole thing about how charter schools operate and how they are on the same level playing field as a regular school because in my opinion they are not; they do not accept every student. They say they do and that they have to, but regularly they are diverted if they say, "Well we can't meet that need. We can't provide that service." Those students, especially with disabilities or Individualized Educational Plans (IEP), often get sent over to the traditional public school area. So, do they have specific facility fundings? No. Do they have other advantages that are built in and not part of this bill? I believe yes.

SENATOR BUCK:
Are you aware that charter schools have to use their per-pupil dollars to fund and allocate toward facilities? Are you aware of what percentage of that per-pupil funding would actually go to facility funding?

SENATOR DALY:
I know that they use all of the funding sources available to them, including the per-pupil funding for those types of things. I do not know the percentage and I am sure it varies school by school, but I would also say that that is part of the bargain they signed up for when they apply to become a charter school. They agreed to it, and they asked for it, so they have to figure out their own way forward.

SENATOR BUCK:
So instead of for students, that money is going to facilities. You are saying that more funding is going towards facilities?

SENATOR DALY:
I am not saying that; you can make the argument on that. We can have a whole different discussion on prevailing wage and the benefits and where that goes, but they already have to comply with the State law regarding prevailing wages. We're not here to discuss or dispute that, so it is also part of the bargain that they signed up for when they applied to be a charter school.

SENATOR BUCK:
I wanted to bring up the EMO issue. I want to remind you that you are on record, and that you need to be truthful, because I have lived in both systems. For 18 years and the majority of my career, I was in districts, and now I am in charter. Can you explain the governance of a charter school—whether it be EMO or CMO? I ask this because what you said earlier was not necessarily the truth when it comes to what the governing boards do and who they hire. What is your understanding? I just want you to clarify the record.

SENATOR DALY:
That is a roundabout way of calling me a liar, but I am not lying. I understand plenty. The governing board of the charter school gets set up after they have received their charter. There are rules on who can be on that board and various things. Deciding on whether or not they are going to have an EMO happens before that. The governing board is the public body that is responsible to make sure they are complying with the prevailing wage and various things. They've already hired the EMO, and they've already made that deal. The EMO is going to supply them with the building and a variety of different things on the management—bent towards the for-profit side of it. They do target and view regular traditional schools and other non-EMO charter schools as their competitors. They are looking to improve their market share and various things. I understand that the governing board of a charter school gets put in place after the charter is approved, and then they are responsible going forward.

You can shake your head and that is fine. When I was going through this stuff, I read the entire NRS 338A and the regulations. I think I am fairly familiar. We can argue offline all you would like. You have your opinion, and I have mine. I would say some of the things you just said are untruthful as well.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
I think we should be respectful in this body. What I would say is—and what I have always said, and it does not have anything to do with this bill at all—with public money comes public accountability. I too have been around longer than the charters. This statement has nothing to do with this bill. I could be sitting on the fence and tell you the same thing that when charters first came into being in Nevada, the whole concept was—which was not a bad concept—that they would help failing schools or schools that were struggling to meet the needs of their children. Those schools have now been built in my district and other districts in this State that are not failing other public-school children. Whether

this bill passes or not, I think it is important for us to put on the record that with public school money comes public accountability, so if that is the choice that is made, then it does not matter whether it is private, charter or public, there are choices that are made by all those entities, and money is given by the public through the taxpayers to fund our public education.

SENATOR DALY:
You're right. That was well said. I said it the same way, but a little bit differently. With public dollars comes public responsibility and the original intent of charter schools were well-intentioned. I think there are some good charter schools that are doing good work, but it was never meant to be adversarial or view traditional public schools as the enemy or a competitor. That is kind of where we have gone to. We have tried some experiences that worked and some that did not. I think the for-profit element has run its course and it is not working.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
That's a really good segue to my question. Are you aware of any EMO that is not for-profit, either here or other places?

SENATOR DALY:
The EMO, by definition in the statute, which would be repealed under this bill, says that they are for-profit. I am not aware of a not-for-profit EMO. I know CMOs take a different path on that. They actually have their own charter, and they are not for-profit, so we have the two elements. I know the EMO for-profit statute was added sometime after the CMO one, and it has been in place for some time. When I look at the results of that element in the system and the adversarial view that a lot of people have, I am not aware of any EMOs that are not for-profit.

GREG ESPOSITO (Nevada State Pipe Trades):
For the record, I actually sat on the board of a charter school that was opened and designed to help women. It was actually the only all-girls school in a very economically depressed area. I have seen firsthand the benefit the charter schools can have when done as the Senator talked about—going into an area where an educational improvement needs to happen. When I was on the board, they were actually doing a remodel, and I worked to make sure that the contractors on that school were paying prevailing wage and going through the bidding process that is laid out as a public work.

The reason it is important is because it is a matter of quality, not a matter of money grabbing. We are sending students to these schools for six to eight hours a day and there are life-safety systems that, if not installed properly, could be putting students at a bit of a health risk—whether it is the air conditioning systems that can carry Legionnaire's disease, whether it is the fire safety systems, fire alert, plumbing, electrical and all those things. It is important to have the traditional NRS 338 public bidding process in order to ensure that the public is getting the best contractors and having the most highly skilled trained workers on those projects to protect our kids.

If you have substandard construction, that [life-safety system] can easily get hidden as you put up your drywall and ceiling. You do not know that you are actually poisoning your kids or hurting them—then it is not a union or nonunion thing. It is a matter of quality of construction and quality of contractor. Usually, only quality contractors bid on public works projects and usually only quality contractors hire people for public works contracts. We are in full support of the bill because our kids need those sort of safety protections when it comes to the construction and remodel of those schools. Briefly, I do believe the Treasurer has a fund for charter schools to tap into when they need to do remodels and such, so there is a form of public funding that could be tapped into through the Treasurer's office.

ALEXANDER MARKS (Nevada State Education Association):
I am tempted to say ditto to Senator Daly's entire presentation but for nearly a decade, we have been asking for greater controls and oversight of charter schools, especially given the separate and unequal dynamics between charter schools and neighborhood public schools. Charter schools were initially promoted by educators who sought to innovate within the local public school system to better meet the needs of their students. We called them incubators of innovation. However, over the last three decades, charters have grown dramatically to include a large number of charters that are privately managed by for-profit EMOs. These EMOs are largely unaccountable and not transparent in terms of their operations or performance.

The explosive growth of charters has been driven by billionaire investment and deliberate efforts to ensure that charters are exempt from the basic safeguards and standards that apply to public schools. We are not against charter schools. We're against the profit motive that drives the current charter industry, and

S.B. 318 addresses this issue. *Chartered For-Profit*, a report by the Network of Public Education, highlights significant issues with for-profit EMOs.

While technically prohibited from directly running charter schools, EMOs exploit legal loopholes that were discussed here today. This arrangement prioritizes profit over student outcomes, leading to cost-cutting measures that can result in lower teacher salaries, higher turnover rates and reduced student services. Again, for years, we have been working for greater controls and oversight for charter schools. Of particular note was the 2019 proposed moratorium on charter schools. In a political compromise, the Legislature amended the bill to require the Charter School Authority to develop and implement a growth management plan. However, with supercharged growth in the charter schools since its passage, it is clear that bill failed to manage the charter growth.

To provide some perspective, since the spring of 2019, charter schools have grown by over 25,000 students or 57 percent. In that same time, district schools have lost over 40,000 students—about 9 percent. The State Public Charter School Authority is now the second largest school district in the State. This body has recognized many issues with charter schools, whether it is not requiring 100 percent licensure or this EMO issue. All schools that receive public funds should be held to the same excellence, equity and transparency standards as our neighborhood public schools. We fully support S.B. 318.

ROBERT MUNSON (Nevada State Education Association):
We support S.B. 318 in order to address the for-profit components of Nevada's charter school industry. As a current classroom teacher in Northern Nevada, I am witnessing the impact of building a K-12 charter school that is currently being built adjacent to a district elementary school. It is just down the road from a district high school and only a couple of miles from a newly built middle school. We support innovative charter schools that are not contributing to private for-profit management companies that take money out of the State.

When a student leaves a neighborhood school for a charter school, the public funding for that school goes with them, but the neighborhood school's overhead costs remain the same. Charter schools can exacerbate existing inequalities and inequities by creating barriers to entry for vulnerable students. This could be as simple as students with the greatest support self-selecting into charters—effectively siphoning away students with the most engaged parents, leaving the students with greater needs and fewer resources. Also, charter schools are

much quicker to expel students with behavior problems and other issues, sending these students back to their neighborhood public schools. This has created a two-tiered system of public education. While the Charter School Authority has worked on these inequities in their student population, charters educate a significantly lower percentage of students with IEPs and students who are low-income and English-language learners (ELL). These are some of the reasons why we are opposed to the expansion of Academica's Mater Academy in the North Valleys of Reno. We fully support S.B. 318.

KALY KRENTZ:
I am representing myself in this personal comment. I am here today expressing my strong support for S.B. 318 as both a public-school teacher and a parent of students in both the traditional public school and the public charter school system—one of which was one of the students Mr. Munson mentioned that was denied for behavioral concerns.

Nevada is a state unlike any other. Our diversity ranges from one town to the next, and at times, even from block to block. Our students reflect this diversity in educational ability, socioeconomic status, culture, ethnicity and so many other ways. For instance, the school I teach at that Mr. Munson was mentioning down the street has over 50 languages spoken at it alone. I think it is around 64. This type of diversity should be mirrored in our State policies to ensure that every public school, including charter schools, is held to high standards of equity and financial responsibility.

As I mentioned, I do have children in the charter school system as well. My beautiful son struggles with sensory-processing difficulties and fine motor skill development, but benefits from a specialized learning environment that caters to his unique kinesthetic learning modalities through the methods of Montessori education. This niche program caters to his learning style and has allowed him to thrive and excel academically, even allowing him to be half-a-grade level ahead. This is what our diverse student population deserves. This is the way charter schools should operate—by filling a unique need that the local public system may not have the capacity or ability to offer. Charter schools must be held to the same standards as all public schools, especially when it comes to serving our students with equity and financial responsibility. Charter schools, like the one my son attends, are setting the standards and making it possible to provide parents with options. His school is not run by an EMO, as you would probably assume.

Senate Bill 318 strengthens oversight while preserving high-quality charter options. It ensures that public education funds, which are already alarmingly lower than the national average, remain focused on serving students and not lining the pockets of those seeking to profit from the State's educational system. Strong public oversight, responsibility and charter school management are critical to students. I urge you to support S.B. 318 to ensure financial accountability and equal educational opportunities for all students.

SHELBIE SWARTZ (Battle Born Progress):
As a Carson City School District graduate and now a parent, I believe every child deserves a quality education and a system that puts students first, not corporate profits. Charter schools were supposed to innovate within public education but instead for-profit EMOs have hijacked the system, siphoning public funds away from our neighborhood schools while facing little accountability. I have seen firsthand how this impacts our kids. While public schools struggle with overcrowding and underfunding, EMOs cut corners, pay their teachers less and cherry pick students, leaving our most vulnerable children behind. It is not fair, and it is not right. Senate Bill 318 is a necessary step to rein in these for-profit operators and restore fairness to our students. Our tax dollars should support students not corporate bank accounts. As a parent, I urge you to stay with the State's families and schools and support S.B. 318.

KAYLEE EDINGER:
I just wanted to say that as a mom, I support this bill.

BRIANNE INTRAPAIROTE:
I am a mother in the State, and I will keep it brief. I support this bill.

EDWARD ABLESER (Academica Nevada):
I would love to answer any questions you might have because we have been working on this for a year with the stakeholders. But generally, when we come to the table, we are here to try to fix failing schools—children that are stuck in schools that are not providing adequate education. How do we help them? What this bill does is quite the opposite, right? It takes the best and highest performing schools in the entire State and says, "How do we shut them down?" It takes the ability for those schools to use their very limited funds to engage in their services collectively from a company, and it removes that ability and tries to force them to bring it all in-house on a very slim budget which they simply

cannot do. This will shut down the highest performing schools in the State. Again, I am not quite sure this is the type of legislation this body should be looking at.

Many of you know, I was a former Democratic state legislator in Arizona. I was sent to DC multiple times with People for the American Way, which the Nevada Education Association is a member of. At those meetings, they'd give us model policy and model legislation. We'd bring those back. I remember working on issues around high-stakes testing that I brought back to Arizona, which we worked on, that came from that model legislation. I also remember that they started creeping into how to get rid of public charter schools in the country. This is templated model legislation by the NEA [Nevada Education Association] given to their state chapter to try to shut down public charter schools in the State. I think it is poor policy.

There was a mention about EMOs being fired. There were two EMOs fired in 2020, like two! Their boards fired their EMOs because they were not able to do their work.

NICOLE ROURKE (City of Henderson):
We're here in opposition to S.B. 318 because EMOs provide essential financial, operational and academic management support that allows charter schools to focus on student success. Without EMOs, charter school leaders must shift focus from student learning to administrative and operational tasks. Schools will need to hire additional in-house staff, leading to higher administrative expenses and potential legal challenges for schools with existing contracts. We feel that instead, you should look for alternative solutions where, instead of a ban, you could create greater oversight and transparency measures to ensure responsible EMO partnerships while preserving operational efficiencies.

In regard to the construction facility reporting mandates, many schools lease their facilities from private landlords, foundations or nonprofit organizations. The law should specify whether it intends to regulate these private entities or just schools acting on their own. As a public entity, we certainly pay a public prevailing wage on all public works. If a charter school is actually contracting for that work, we would support the payment of prevailing wage, but they do often not have capital up front. And so, we are certainly put in a different position than a traditional public school. With that, we're here in opposition to S.B. 318.

NICK SCHNEIDER (Vegas Chamber):
We are here today in opposition to S.B. 318, as it seeks to prevent schools from being able to make decisions regarding school operations and efficiencies and prevents charters from being able to contract with organizations that help with professional capacities—as you heard, things like staff services, compliance, et cetera—which creates an additional barrier for these schools to operate efficiently. In comparison to your larger school districts, those school districts have the ability to operate at scale whereas charter schools do not have that single central entity to serve a lot of these capacities. As such, we are concerned that that additional strain would have negative impacts on the academic services provided by our top performing charter schools.

SARAH ADLER (Coalition of Independent Public Charter Schools of Northern Nevada):
I am proud to represent six small, long-standing independent self-managed charter schools here in Northern Nevada. And before I get to our objection, which is in the form of a needed clarification, I just want to share some information relative to what the sponsor and testifiers have shared with all due respect.

These schools are on spring break right now, but four of them were able to respond to my question, "How many of your students have IEPs?" That percentage is 8 percent, but that is a school with 40 percent ELLs and 95 percent Hispanic students. The four schools responded: 8 percent, 15 percent, 18 percent and 22 percent are the volume of IEPs each has. I just wanted to share that information. Also, charter school expulsion information is publicly available, and charter schools do not expel more students than district schools.

Our concern is that these schools want to be assured that they may enter contracts with specific small businesses or licensed professionals for specific services. The concern is in section 11, subsection 2, paragraph (a) which defines what it means to be a corporation. We feel the term licensed professional should be added; for example, an occupational therapist, a physical therapist and social worker with whom these small schools contract. Also after educational, add the term health care. We look forward to working with the sponsor on that clarification.

ZACH BUCHER (City of North Las Vegas):
I would like to thank Senator Daly. I think we had a very robust conversation with him about this bill, and we do appreciate his time. Unfortunately, sometimes, we can't come to an agreement before we get to the committee.

Our concern is mainly—we have no problem with prevailing wage—about the liability that is in section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (j). The City of North Las Vegas would be the sponsor. We would be liable if prevailing wage was not adhered to without really any mechanism for us to enforce that. We have a concern with that, and we are also concerned about excluding EMOs. We really do appreciate the sponsor's time, but we are here today in opposition.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
It is my understanding that under NRS 388A, the EMOs are already required to give some level of financial disclosures for specific financial information. Does that financial disclosure that is already required under that chapter of NRS include the profit margins of what the EMOs are making? If not, is that something that you can commit to at least providing publicly for disclosure?

MR. ABLESER:
I think the question that you have asked is a very important principle to this conversation. The term EMO was just a name that was made up to say, "All of these private services can be sorted together to create an economy of scale that is very inexpensive."

In prior sessions, Senators, I have spoken with some of you regarding how much these EMOs take as a percentage or as a fee. It is extraordinarily low. One of the reasons why some of the EMOs have been fired is because their prices were really high, and it took money from the classroom and from students. When you compare back-office services between many of our public charter schools and what they do with their contracts with a company that can bundle all of these management services together to some of our school districts—it is extraordinarily competitive. But if you compare it to stand-alone schools, the costs are really high to get all of those services.

Regarding the point that you are making, the bill removes that bundled service under an EMO from statute, which takes away all the accountability, transparency and reporting elements that are in the bill and that public charter schools have been living up to and excelling and performing in. Public charter

schools are held to a standard that our district schools are not; they can get shut down and closed.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
Mr. Ableser, please stay on the response to the question.

MR. ABLESER:
Because of those stringent reporting guidelines, we are committed to revealing all of the information that the statute has outlined. I will tell you that we do have experts in Vegas that could specifically address that. I am sure they can talk about that as well but that is sort of the problem with the basis of the bill.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
So, what I am hearing is that there is no opposition if we were to revise the financial disclosures that are coming forward to reveal the profit margins that the EMOs are making off of charter schools. There is no opposition to that, if that was what the bill was rewritten towards.

MR. ABLESER:
For the record, I do not want to overstep my ability to answer that question, but I will tell you that I believe that the profits that are received are part of the public financial transparency documents that the Authority has and that the school district gets. This was brought up when I went to Washoe County School District and met with their trustees about it. I was at a meeting where they had $7 million of private contracts on their agenda in one meeting. We want to work together. I do not know what the purpose of this bill is. If it is more information, I am sure we can go that direction and try to solve that problem.

ANN BARNETT (Nevada Contractors Association):
I would like to first just quickly appreciate the dialogue with Senator Daly on the topic of prevailing wage and acknowledge that we will not always agree on what triggers prevailing wage requirements. Now, we do have a history of supporting prevailing wage on school construction when public funds are used. This support has included working alongside labor to bring the prevailing wage on school construction back to the full amount—after the 78th Session, when they wanted to reduce the amount of prevailing wage required on school construction by 10 percent.

From a construction standpoint, the key difference between traditional public schools and public charter schools is that charter schools do not receive public money to support facilities construction. Due to this fact, we oppose prevailing wage requirements on charter school construction, as those projects are funded through private resources. We understand that payment of prevailing wage is a current requirement, but S.B. 318 adds to an already existing law by requiring charter schools to now report to their sponsor how they would be complying with public works law and prevailing wage on projects that, again, are paid for with non-public money. This is an additional burden on education partners and so with that, we oppose.

RYAN REEVES (Academica Nevada):
I moved to Nevada in 2004 in order to attend UNLV's Boyd School of Law. I came here with my wife and three young daughters. I almost returned to the state that I was from after completing law school because we could not find the educational opportunities we needed for my kids. We could not afford private school, and we were seeking a good public option. It was then that I learned of charter schools and the services that an outside provider can bring. I jumped at the opportunity to use my business degree and law degree to help boards of community members, teachers and other professionals to have the support they need to run a multimillion-dollar government agency, which is what charter schools are.

The ability to bring all that expertise together in one spot is the only thing that management companies are. I heard the sponsor of the bill say he does not want to interfere with the ability to contract with an accounting firm or with a law firm. That's what we are—we are accountants, lawyers, software specialists and all of these various separate entities combined into one. Over the past 15 years, I have had the privilege of joining with 70 other Nevadans to bring 34,000 high-quality public school seats to this State, so that other people could remain in Nevada the same way that I did.

I am incredibly proud of the work that we do. I have done the math—our fee, which equates to less than 5 percent of what a public school receives, is less than the percentage—according to the cumulative annual financial reports of the two major districts in the State—that goes to their central offices to do the same services. We are providing a less expensive option for the best schools in the State. I was recently thrilled to see the State Public Charter School Authority's presentation on how the schools in their portfolio are performing in

the State, and proficiency rates are outperforming Connecticut. To finally see in Nevada a public education sector where we are outpacing Connecticut and the second largest district in this State, that should be something to be celebrated, promoted and expanded.

RICKY GOURRIER (Academica Nevada):
I am here today to express my strong opposition to S.B. 318. The bill is a significant overreach that directly undermines the very purpose of charter schools and threatens the future of our education system, particularly for the students who need it most. Public charter schools were established to be a beacon of innovation and flexibility. They were designed to break free from the constraints of traditional public school systems to foster new ideas and offer parents and students alternatives.

Banning partnerships with EMOs is an attempt to chain these schools to unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape, extinguishing the freedom that allows charter schools to flourish. Our State already ranks near the bottom in terms of educational outcomes. Why then will we sabotage one of the few lifelines we have left? Educational management organizations bring invaluable resources and specialized expertise to help struggling schools improve. This bill will pull those critical resources away from schools that need them most, undermining the very progress we have worked so hard to achieve.

Finally, EMOs are not just helpful, they are efficient. They streamline operations, reduce waste and save taxpayer dollars, all while boosting educational outcomes. Why, at a time when efficiency and fiscal responsibility are more important than ever, would we outlaw a model that works? Banning EMOs is a wasteful policy that ignores both the economic and educational benefits of these partnerships.

Data is verifiable. Expulsion rates, ELL rates and special education rates are verifiable. People are inaccurate. I will just say that. I urge you to reject S.B. 318.

GIL LOPEZ (Charter School Association of Nevada):
We strongly oppose S.B. 318 because it does nothing to improve student outcomes and instead places unnecessary restrictions on public charter schools that hinders their ability to serve students effectively. Nevada's public charter schools serve 72,000 students statewide—providing families with high-quality,

innovative and flexible education. At this time, we should be focusing on improving student achievement. Senate Bill 318 shifts the conversation away from what truly matters—better educational outcomes for all students. Charter schools in Nevada consistently meet and exceed academic benchmarks and families choose them because they deliver results. I have submitted my written testimony to the committee (Exhibit L contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.).

Academica has 30 schools in its portfolio, most of them being four- and five-star schools. For schools with EMOs, the average star rating is a 3.77. For schools without EMOs, the average star rating is 3.07, with the State average being 2.51.

Young Women's Leadership Academy is another school that has the same models as [unintelligible] where they support women in that school. Finally, charters are required to accept every student. We hear a lot of opposition, but we heard a lot of support last time saying that we [unintelligible] the students. Parents are bringing their students. There's a high percentage of IEPs that are served in charter schools, and all that is data that we can readily provide.

Finally, I urge you to reject S.B. 318 and prioritize policies that improve student learning and success.

GIOVANNI LAZZAROTTO:
I am here to testify against S.B. 318 and the notion that charter schools are not student-oriented or student-first. I spent the last 19 years serving underprivileged students in Las Vegas, most notably on the east side of Las Vegas. I have worked with Mater Academy East Campus since it opened. In those short four years, we have a three-star middle school and a four-star elementary school. Our proficiency is double, and triple in some cases, of every surrounding school minus the magnet schools. Our seniors, 35 of the 216 seniors at our school, will graduate in our CTE programs with an AA degree. These are all opportunities provided to us because of our EMO. In short, we are a success story in an unsuccessful area of the city, and to support S.B. 318 is telling us that those kids do not matter.

GABE SHIREY (Signature Preparatory):
I am the founder and executive director of Signature Preparatory, a K-8 Title I charter school that serves a higher percentage of IEP, ELL and

free-or-reduced-lunch students than the Clark County School District as a whole. We are located in Henderson, Nevada, right across the street from the CCSD one-star school, which we also outperform academically. All three of my children attend the school. I am here today to strongly oppose S.B. 318, a bill that threatens the success of Nevada charter schools and limits educational opportunities for students across our state.

First, this bill eliminates EMO partnerships, stripping schools of essential leadership as well as operational, financial and academic support. For the record, our school EMO operates very little like the for-profit EMOs explained earlier in the summary of S.B. 318 by Senator Skip Daly. Our EMO does not own the school's brand and does not own or lease our building back to the school, and it never has. The school pays debt directly to the lending bank each month.

To illustrate one of the critical roles of an EMO, ours transformed an 80,000 square foot, 40-year-old Walmart in an underserved area into a thriving academic institution—enrolling 1,000 students and hiring 100 staff members. This achievement, along with assistance in securing initial funding for the school with a lender, navigating complex school budgeting and ensuring operational success, would not have been possible without the expertise and support of an EMO that had already assisted in starting 20-plus schools, especially considering the stringent construction timelines with which charter schools must operate to save on costs.

Rather than being burdened by a mountain of administrative complexities, EMOs allow school leaders to focus on student success. Eliminating EMOs would force schools to hire additional staff, significantly increasing costs and diverting resources away from the classroom—all without improving student outcomes. I strongly urge this committee to reject S.B. 318.

ASHLEY PERKINS (Principal, Elko Institute for Academic Achievement):
I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in strong opposition to S.B. 318. Our State is struggling across the board when it comes to education. Charters and districts are overwhelmed with the number of regulations, laws and reporting we are required to do that continues to make education more difficult. I urge you to ask yourself, for this bill and all bills, how does this bill improve student success in academics? It does not.

We just finished a project remodeling a school that took us seven years to make happen. Through this project, we learned that our State is one of the toughest states to remodel or build facilities for schools—both charter and district. In all neighboring states, schools either pay prevailing wage because we are nonprofit, but do not pay taxes on materials, et cetera or they pay taxes on materials but not prevailing wage. Here, we are stuck paying for both. Both charters and districts are overwhelmed with the amount of reporting we have to do. We report on everything from submitting our evidence-based policy on providing tampons in the bathroom to the roll call sheet [showing] 100 percent of our staff attending our gender identity policy training. To date for the 2024-2025 school year, we have had to submit 176 reporting items in Epicenter, and we just celebrated the 100th day of school.

With the EMOs, you're saying that you would rather schools have a failing central office than let them hire an EMO to help students grow. Outcomes should be the focus. Mr. Daly, perhaps an EMO should take control of education across the State, as legislating schools to death is not working. This bill along with other bills are not strengthening education, but creating more obstacles and wasting additional taxpayer funds. Most importantly, it pulls from the focus of academics and education. Rather than restricting charter schools, or any schools, you should support policies that strengthen all public education for our students and continue to ask yourself, how does this bill improve student success and academic achievement? Accountability is one thing, but obstructing and creating hurdles helps nobody, especially not the students. On behalf of the students in the State, I urge you to oppose S.B. 318 and any bill that does not improve student success with academics.

CHRISTINE WHETTEN:
I am a mother, volunteer and a community member of Elko. I appreciate the opportunity to testify in opposition to S.B. 318. For our local charter schools, these mandates will increase operating costs by over $1 million per year, delay repairs and add hurdles that do not apply to traditional school districts. You may not be aware, but our area schools are already facing a dangerous increase in their insurance premiums as well, and this is only going to stack on top of that.

These burdens will only make it harder for charter schools to provide a high-quality learning environment. And as just introduced, Ashley Perkins is the principal at EIAA [Elko Institute for Academic Achievement], and I encourage you to look at the proficiency ratings in Elko. The EIAA leads the way in

demonstrating academic success, student achievement and community partnerships. They have approximately 400 students enrolled, and we have a waitlist of 800 because they are doing things right. This bill will devastate our children's opportunities for education. I urge you to look at the portal and look at the proficiency ratings in Elko County before moving forward, because this bill will kill that school. Rather than restricting charter schools, I encourage you to come to the table and support policies that strengthen all public education options. Let's work on focusing on education, reducing our reporting and regulation of things that are not essential to education.

IGNACIO PRADO (Futuro Academy Charter School):
I am a board member of the Charter School Association of Nevada, which represents the second largest public K-12 system in our State. Futuro Academy Charter School is a single-site nonprofit public charter school in East Las Vegas. We do not engage a management organization of any kind; we're just an in-house organization. What we do is contract services that no one single school could potentially be expected to contract on their own. So, I want to express my strong opposition. I know some mention has been made already clarifying the language, but as of now, the bill contains concerning language regarding contracting. It may potentially preclude the use of several contractors that are critically necessary for us to provide related services for special education students, payroll services, accounting and so on and so forth—some which are partially bundled.

I want to focus more specifically though on the prevailing wage question since there was a blanket statement made around what public funds are used in the form of a lease. I think in a very technical sense, it is not true. For us to enter into this capacity [as a charter school], private capital had to be deployed. The building was developed by a private landlord whom we then leased the building from. From just a chronological and legal perspective, there's some really huge legal, constitutional and logistical questions regarding the prevailing wage question, which are not as easily swept aside—to say that because eventually a public school will lease the building, that simply means that it is easily enforceable. I think because of these several concerns, as a member of the Charter School Association, I will gladly pick up the bill sponsor on that invitation.

BRIGHID FRONAPFEL:
I had a different opposition statement prepared, however, after hearing this presentation, as a charter school parent, I will mention two students who are on IEPs and a charter school employee. I encourage Senator Daly to obtain accurate information, data and opinions from all constituents involved in this proposed legislation. The presentation and report today are faulty on so many levels and as an elected official, he is required to do his due diligence for his constituents in the State. It is very evident that that did not transpire in relation to this legislation.

SENATOR TITUS:
Earlier during the testimony, Senator Doñate had a question, and the presenter had some pretty strong statements about your organization, and I am just wondering about profit margins and transparency. I think all of us want that. Could you address that? Could you address where that disconnect and maybe misunderstanding is [coming from]? Maybe Senator Doñate can clarify where he was going with that.

MR. REEVES:
The current requirement for EMOs in the State is that we submit a revenue and expenditure report every year and that our contract be posted, and our revenue expenditure report be posted on the website of the school. We have a third revenue report that we are required to submit every two years—by a separate piece of legislation. There is already a report that calls out for a regulatory determined category of expenditures that we have, including our building leases, the service contracts that we enter into, the salaries that we expend and the rest. There are expenses that a private entity has that do not appear on those reports, so it is not a 100 percent accurate view of a profit margin, depending upon whether you compute that as an EBITA [earnings before interest and taxes] or other things because interest and taxes and other stuff is not there, but it gives a pretty fair and accurate accounting of what we do.

BRETT HARRIS (Nevada Labor Commissioner):
The Office of the Labor Commissioner is tasked with compliance for NRS 338, and specifically the range of statutes that are referenced throughout this bill in regard to the public works compliance. I just wanted to be present. We are neutral on the bill, but we do get some confusion when a charter school does a public works project—because that does occur—as to who is Office of the Labor Commissioner's public sponsor in performing that compliance.

CYRUS HOJJATTY:
I am calling and concerned about this bill.

SENATOR DALY:
I just have a couple of comments on some of the testimony that came in. This is by no means anybody's model legislation. If you have anyone to blame, shoot arrows at me, I did it. I meant to look up—and I neglected to—on when EMOs were put into the law. I am not exactly sure how long ago it was, but I think it is relatively recent, 10-12 years, somewhere in there. Regarding that, charter schools were able to provide all those services without the EMO before and I am sure they'll be able to do it again. You can bundle services and various things. It is about the for-profit "seeing people as competitors" attitude and then the targeting of students in areas where they do not need the charter school services nearly as much. It is all about profit.

I do think we need to probably look at the contractor language and make sure that's hitting the mark and addressing some of those concerns. I think we can tighten up that part of it a little bit as well. A lot of discussion went into how good charter schools are and various things, and we had all of those arguments. That's not what this bill is about. I have heard them back and forth. We had it at the Sunset Subcommittee and tried to dig into those things. That's not what this bill is. There are a lot of not-exact comparisons, and "This school's got this rating, et cetera, et cetera." Those things are not exactly comparable with the other schools they are measuring themselves against. The figures do not lie but, you know, liars can figure.

When we look at this, people keep saying I am attacking charter schools. This is not attacking charter schools, this is directly targeted at the EMOs, compliance with prevailing wage and the direction which the for-profit entities have taken the charter school management. It is not beneficial to the students of the State or charter schools in general, if you ask me.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I will now close the hearing on S.B. 318 and introduce public comment.

MR. HOJJATTY:
I just wanted to talk about a random topic on education which is SATs, and I just want you all to think—is this system really working? When people are taking the test and making themselves qualified, especially to get accepted into

university, is this the most effective way? I know a lot of people who are bright and smart, but did not do well on the SAT, and they've had their goals put into jeopardy. This is just food for thought and maybe we can have some different types of policy in the times ahead.

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

CHAIR TAYLOR:
Seeing no more public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Timothy Gibbs,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Senator Angela D. Taylor, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 38	C	3	Jen Sturm-Gahner	Work Session Document
S.B. 45	D	4	Jen Sturm-Gahner	Work Session Document
S.B. 52	E	5	Jen Sturm-Gahner	Work Session Document
S.B. 176	F	5	Jen Sturm-Gahner	Work Session Document
S.B. 229	G	8	Jen Sturm-Gahner	Work Session Document
S.B. 245	H	9	Jen Sturm-Gahner	Work Session Document
S.B. 322	I	10	Senator Angela Taylor	PowerPoint Presentation
S.B. 322	J	11	Fiona Perreault	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 322	K	16	Kent Ervin/ Nevada Faculty Alliance	Testimony in Support
S.B. 318	L	40	Gil Lopez/ Charter School Association of Nevada	Testimony in Opposition