

MINUTES

EDUCATION COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 9, 1977

Members Present: Mrs. Gomes
 Mr. Goodman
 Mr. Horn
 Mr. Kissam
 Mr. Rhoads
 Mr. Schofield
 Mr. Vergiels

Guests Present: See list attached

Mr. Vergiels called the meeting to order in Room 214 at 4:06 p.m. for a hearing on AB 9.

Mr. Dreyer, the prime sponsor of the bill, read a prepared statement saying he drafted such a bill because 60% of the state budget goes for education and students can't handle the 3 Rs; therefore, the State Board of Education should require high school graduates to show minimum academic requirements. His statement is attached as Exhibit A.

Mr. Goodman, author of a similar bill introduced as AB 293, said he is in basic agreement with Mr. Dreyer but he feels there are two differences or refinements in his bill: testing at various levels does not put such a burden on a senior and points out weaknesses early enough that they can be helped and, secondly, his bill has a grandfather clause to protect present students.

Mr. James P. Costa, Deputy Superintendent of the State Department of Education, said he did not come to speak on AB 9, but rather to let the committee know what the State is doing about competency-based education. He introduced the members of the State Board of Education who were present: George Harris, president, Shirley Wedow, Joan Kenney, George Earnhart and David Hansen.

He then introduced the chairman of the advisory committee formed of educators, businessmen, parents and others to consider competency-based education, Bob O'Connell. Mr. O'Connell, manager of J.C. Penney, heads the committee composed of school superintendents Dr. Kenny Guinn, Robert Scott and Marvin Picollo; businessmen Frank Johnson, Lee Dewey and Daniel Hickey; Mary Lou Moser of the Nevada Parent-Teacher Association; Joseph Newlin, NSEA; Roy Smith, Nevada Association of School Administrators; Dr. Jack Selbig, university system; Warren Scott, Nevada State School Boards Assoc.; Dr. John Vergiels, Richard Bryan and Nancy Gomes, legislators; and John R. Gamble, ex officio.

Assembly

Mr. O'Connell introduced two members of the State Department to explain the work of the committee: Ed Howard and Jim Kiley.

Mr. Howard showed transparencies explaining the work of the committee in developing a competency-based high school diploma program. The first considered areas of feasibility:

1. Legal - an analysis of Nevada Revised Statutes which showed that the Board has legal authorization to proceed.
2. Political - A survey of 4,000 Nevada residents, with 2,690 respondents, composed of two questions:
 - a. Does the respondent perceive that a high school diploma guarantees that the holder can read, write and figure at basic proficiency levels?
2/3 answered "No."
 - b. Does the respondent think it should?
81% answered "Yes."
3. Developmental - A review of what others are doing in this field.
4. Implemental - The conclusion that a competency-based high school diploma program can be developed in Nevada.

By July, 1976, the initial work had been completed and the Board asked for a recommendation to develop such a program.

Mr. Kiley continued explaining the program. Task Force I, composed of 35 teachers from around the state, gathered in October to define minimum competencies in the three content areas and to begin to identify specific skills in those areas to determine what a high school graduate should be able to perform before receiving a diploma.

Task Force II will then use the products of Task Force I to make recommendations about procedures and methods that can be followed to measure minimum competency of students before they graduate. The timetable is as follows:

- 1/76 - Conduct feasibility study
- 7/76 - Report delivered
- 10/76 - Action plan developed
- 11/76 - Advisory committee appointed
- 1/77 - Task Force I completed
- 3/77 - Task Force II appointed
- 5/77 - Task Force II work completed
- 6/77 - Action plan reported to Board

ASSEMBLY EDUCATION
February 9, 1977
Page Three

Cleo La Fleur, Officer Manager of Nevada PTA, stated the PTA has a representative on the committee and feels the committee is doing an excellent job and hopes no action will be taken until the committee has finished its job.

Mr. Harris observed that the State Board had been aware of the need for investigating standards for high school graduates and is glad to see the bill follows the study the Board has been making.

Mr. Hansen asked questions which he feels advocates of competency-based education must answer. A copy is attached as Exhibit B.

Joe Newlin, NSEA, stated that teachers have been wanting to teach the basic skills and would like to testify more later.

Sandy McCormick, school trustee from Lyons County, called attention to the fact that a written test only measures the ability of the child to take a test. See Exhibit C attached.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36.

Respectfully submitted

Harriet M. Knauff

Harriet M. Knauff
Assembly Attache

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

GUEST REGISTER

DATE: Feb. 9, 1977

NAME, ADDRESS & PHONE NO.	REPRESENTING	TESTIFYING ON BILL NO.
David W Baker Carson City 882-8727		
Jerry Nielsen Carson City		
Craig Blackham Lyon Co School Dist.		
Jed Carlisle Lyon County School Dist.		
Harriet Barber Lyon County School Dist.		
(Mrs) Mildred Sciarani Lyon Co School Dist.		
Charles B Robinson Lyon Co Sc. District		
Howard Johnson Advisory Commission		
Erving Hender E. R. A. Education Commission for Advancing the Curriculum		
Bonnie Parnell Carson P.T.A.		
Jack B Selbig UNR 784-6810		
Edward H. Howard Dept of Ed.		✓

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

GUEST REGISTER

DATE: Feb. 9, 1977

NAME, ADDRESS & PHONE NO.	REPRESENTING	TESTIFYING ON BILL NO.
Jim Kiley	Dept of Educ	✓
Jim Costa	Dept. of Educ.	✓
SUSAN HAASE	Nev. Assoc. for Retarded	
Neola Fleur	Nevada PTA	✓
David Hansen	St. Bd. of Edg.	
Marvin Moss	Washoe County School District	
V. Rowley	Cannon City School Dist	
E. S. Dodson	NEV. ASSN OF SCHOOL ADMIN.	
Bob Scott	Humb. Co. Sch. Dist	
Warren Scott	Nev State School Board	
Bob Best	Nev State Sch. Board Assoc	
Joe Newlin	Nev. State Ed. Assoc.	✓ ABS

ASSEMBLY BILL 9

MR. CHAIRMAN...MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE..THE BILL AS IT READS, I BELIEVE IS SELF EXPLANATORY...IT SIMPLY STATES THAT A PUPIL SHALL NOT RECEIVE A DIPLOMA OF GRADUATION FROM A PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL WHO HAS NOT COMPLETED A COURSE OF STUDY AS PRESCRIBED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION. YOU WILL NOTE THAT IT READS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION..NOT COURSES OF STUDY PRESCRIBED BY THE LEGISLATURE..OR THIS LEGISLATOR. TOO MANY OF OUR STUDENTS ARE GRADUATING..OR SHOULD I SAY BEING PUSHED OUT OF SCHOOL.. UNABLE TO DO THE OLD BASIC THREE R's...THIS FACT BECOMES ALARMING WHEN YOU TALK TO UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AND BUSINESSMEN. A NUMBER OF THOSE GRADUATING TODAY CAN'T SPELL. NOW THIS ISN'T SOMETHING NEW..UNFORTUNATELY IT HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR YEARS. AND THE TIME HAS COME TO PUT TO AN END THE GRADUATING OF STUDENTS WHO LACK THESE CAPABILITIES . THE BILL CALLS FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO ADOPT MINIMUM ACADEMIC STANDARDS FOR GRADUATION... NOW THIS BILL DOES NOT CALL FOR ANY FISCAL IMPACT...PERHAPS IT SHOULD.. THAT IS UP TO THE COMMITTEE...BUT I FEEL IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OUR STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO FACE UP TO THE FACT THAT WHILE OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM IS ONE OF THE FINEST IN THE COUNTRY, IT HAS FALLEN PREY TO WHAT IS CALLED PROGRESSIVE STYLE OF TEACHING. TEACH THE YOUNGSTERS IN THE LOWER GRADES FOREIGN LANGUAGES....SURE THEY MAY ASSIMILATE IT A BIT FASTER..BUT SCHOOL TESTS SHOW THEY HAVEN'T EVEN ASSIMILATED THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.....ITS GREAT TO ADVANCE IN MATH TO ALGEBRA..TRIGONOMETRY . WHATEVER..YES..EVEN THE SO CALLED NEW MATH...BUT HOW CAN ONE EXPECT A STUDENT TO UNDERSTAND THESE WHEN HE HAS PROBLEMS^{WITH} SIMPLE ADDITION OR MULTIPLICATION. I THINK ONE OF THE MORE IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF THE BILL IS SECTION FOUR WHICH SAYS THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF A SCHOOL DISTRICT SHALL ENSURE THAT PUPILS PROGRESS TOWARD ~~MEETING~~ PROFECIENCY IN BASIC SKILLS AND SHALL ASSESS THEIR PROGRESS.....AND SUBSECTION TWO WHICH SAYS THAT IF A PUPIL IS NOT MEETING THE PRESCRIBED STANDARDS A SCHOOL OFFICIAL SHALL ARRANGE A CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE PUPIL..PRINCIPLA^{AL} AND PARENT TO DISCUSS THE PUPIL'S PROGRESS. MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I FEEL THAT IT IS INCUMBENT UPON ~~E~~ YOU AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE TO PASS THIS BILL FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL. OUR STATE SPENDS NEARLY 60 PERCENT OF ITS BUDGET ON EDUCATION...AND IT APPEARS THAT WE ARE NOT GETTING OUR MONIES WORTH WHEN WE ALLOW THE GRADUATION OF STUDENTS WHO LACK THE BASIC SKILLS. WHAT THIS BILL DOES MR CHAIRMAN IS TO LET THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION KNOW THAT AS LEGISLATORS...AND PARENTS..WE ARE TIRED OF HAVING OUR CHILDREN RUSHED THROUGH THEIR SCHOOLING WITHOUT HAVING ACQUIRED THE BASIC REQUIREMENTS AND SKILLS THAT WILL ENABLE THEM TO LIVE A BETTER AND MORE USEFUL LIFE. OUR STATE LAW REQUIRES THAT SCHOOLS MAINTAIN STANDARDS REGARDING WHICH COURSES MUST BE COMPLETED FOR GRADUATION..BUT NOTHING IN IN THE LAW THAT SAYS STUDENTS HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE THEY LEARNED ANYTHING. AB 9 TAKES CARE OF THIS FLAW. AND IN CLOSING, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT CALIFORNIA PASSED A ~~XXXX~~ BILL SIMILAR TO THIS AND GOVERNOR EDMUND BROWN SAID IT WAS ONE OF THE MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE. I'M SURE GOVERNOR O'CALLAGHAN WOULD LIKE TO PASS SUCH COMMENDATIONS ONTO THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE WITH THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL. THANK YOU.

Questions developed by David HANSEN - ST. Bd. of Educ.

1. Is a basic skills test the only way to demonstrate competency?
2. What happens to the students that fail the test?
3. Is there a special test for the culturally and economically deprived? For non-English speaking students? For special ed students? Should gifted students be asked for only minimal performance or should they have to show competency on a more challenging test?
4. When a student fails, who is at fault--the student, the teacher or the system?
5. Who will establish standards--colleges, employers, parents, teachers, students, the legislature? What score is acceptable on the test?
6. If the "basics" are sufficient for survival, does this imply that other courses are of little or no value and are not necessary, leading to the assumption that taxpayers should no longer support the comprehensive curriculum as we know it today. If a full curriculum is offered, shouldn't competency in all areas be demonstrated?
7. By implementing a basic skills test, are we reducing a high school diploma to recognition of a student's accumulation of facts?
8. Will we now ignore the affective domain, the socialization of the student, the civilization of the student? Are not the human aspects of education ignored? Does the educational system have the charge of developing an individual with useable social skills?
9. Can students challenge the basic skills test, and upon passage be allowed an early out? Will the diploma be issued only on the basis of satisfactory passage of "the test".
10. Will teachers be evaluated on the basis of how their students score on "the test"? Will student performance on "the test" be the basis of salary and continued employment for teachers? Will teachers teach anything but the facts?
11. What is the disposition of a school with a large number of transient, minority or impoverished students? (We know that a family's economic status correlates with the student's academic success). Will these schools receive additional funds?
12. We have many transients in Nevada. To what degree is the Nevada educational system responsible for making up deficiencies in their education? Will reciprocal agreements still be maintained with other states even if a student cannot demonstrate competency on "the test"?

13. What is the taxpayers obligation to a student in terms of the number of years over 12 that he may require in order to successfully pass "the test"?

Some Things Competency Based Education Does Not Assume

To maintain a balanced perspective on CBE at least six limitations must be confronted:

1. The cost of schooling will not decrease.
2. The process of schooling will not be simplified.
3. The work demanded of students will not be less.
4. Differences between students will not be diminished.
5. Students who graduate from a competency based program will not be equally competent.
6. Students who graduate from a CBE program will not be assured of success in later life.

"Alternative Models of Competency Based Education"
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Portland, Oregon,
December 31, 1975, p. 39.

Sandy McCormick
School Trustee
Leon County

1. test only tests ability to take tests
2. what about job availability.
a resume might show
an inability to take tests
3. teachers are from a scholarly
generation. The generation
in school is not
4. I am microscopically observing
a child who is $\frac{1}{2}$ way through
with her education who is
not a good written test
taker.