

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
June 4, 2017**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 11:22 a.m. on Sunday, June 4, 2017, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Anderson
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5
Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2
Senator Patricia Spearman, Senate District No. 1



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Anne Bowen, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

Following the call of the roll, Chair Carlton called for public comment and, seeing none, opened the hearing on Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint): Establishes for the 2017-2019 biennium the subsidies to be paid to the Public Employees' Benefits Program for insurance for certain active and retired public officers and employees. (BDR S-1242)

Cathy Crocket, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 551 (1st Reprint).

Ms. Crocket stated this bill established the state's contribution and support of group insurance for state employees and retirees. Section 1 of the bill established the state's share of the cost of monthly contributions or premiums for group insurance for each active state officer and employee who elected to participate in the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP). For fiscal year (FY) 2018, the monthly state contribution was \$743 and for FY 2019, the monthly contribution was \$740.92.

Section 2 of the bill established the state's share of the cost of monthly contributions for retirees who were not eligible for Medicare. For FY 2018, the contribution was \$445.03 and for FY 2019 the amount was \$451.23 per month. Section 2 also established the contribution for Medicare-eligible state retirees of \$180 per month in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium for employees who retired prior to January 1, 1994. For those who retired on or after January 1, 1994, the monthly state contribution was up to a maximum of \$240 per month based on years of service.

Section 2.5 of the bill allowed for an exception to the requirement that the Fiscal Analysis Division obtain and prepare fiscal notes from state agencies and local governments prior to a committee taking a vote on S.B. 551 (R1). Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 218D, a fiscal note had to be obtained and prepared by the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, before a vote was taken by a committee on any bill which might have a fiscal effect on state or local governments. However, as this bill was introduced on June 1, 2017, there was insufficient time to allow agencies and local governmental entities to respond and for the Fiscal Analysis Division to prepare the fiscal notes.

Section 3 specified effective dates and the bill was effective July 1, 2017, with the exception of the provision that would allow the Committee to take a vote prior to the receipt of fiscal notes, which was effective retroactive to June 1, 2017.

Regarding the fiscal effect, Ms. Crocket said this bill implemented The Executive Budget. State contributions were \$276 million in FY 2018 and \$283 million in FY 2019, or \$559.9 million over the upcoming biennium.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions for Ms. Crocket regarding S.B. 551 (R1).

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 551 (R1).

Priscilla Maloney, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, testified in support of S.B. 551 (R1). Ms. Maloney stated that she and her organization hoped the bill was passed.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 551 (R1) and, seeing none, closed the hearing on S.B. 551 (R1) and opened the hearing regarding Senate Bill (S.B.) 552 (R1).

Senate Bill 552 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the cost of certain coverage under the Public Employees' Benefits Program. (BDR 23-1226)

Cathy Crocket, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 552 (1st Reprint). This bill aligned the monthly premiums paid by a nonstate, non-Medicare retiree who participated in the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP) with a similarly participating plan and tier as a state non-Medicare retiree effective July 1, 2017. This would have the effect of lowering premiums for nonstate, non-Medicare retirees and requiring local governments to contribute additional funding in support of their retirees. The statutory changes to affect this were included in section 1 of the bill. Currently, local government employers contributed the same percentage of the cost of coverage in support of their retirees, which resulted in the nonstate retiree participants paying a higher premium than the state retiree participants do because the cost of their coverage was more expensive than for state participants.

Section 2 authorized a one-time exception to the requirement that 30-day written notice be provided to local governments and PEBP participants for a proposed change in rates or premiums, and specified that PEBP be not required to hold a supplemental open enrollment period for the plan year beginning July 1, 2017. Ms. Crocket said the open enrollment period for PEBP ran from May 1 to May 31, so participants had already made their plan selections for the upcoming biennium.

Section 3 specified a four-year phase-in period for increased local government contributions to allow local governments time to allocate additional funding for their retiree health-care costs. The state would provide State General Fund appropriations to cover a portion of increased local governments' contributions, including 100 percent of the increased

contribution in fiscal year (FY) 2018, 75 percent of the increased contribution in FY 2019, 50 percent of the increased contribution in FY 2020, and 25 percent of the increased contribution in FY 2021. According to Ms. Crocket, local governments would provide 100 percent of the increased contribution for FY 2022 and beyond.

Ms. Crocket explained that section 3.5 contained a similar exception to the requirement that the Fiscal Analysis Division obtain and prepare fiscal notes from state agencies and local governments as was discussed in relation to Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint). There was not sufficient time to obtain and prepare the fiscal notes for this bill.

Section 4 specified that provisions of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 354.599 did not apply to any additional expenses of a local government related to this act.

Sections 2 and 3.5 of this bill were effective upon passage and approval, and sections 1, 3, and 4 were effective July 1, 2017.

Ms. Crocket noted that with regard to fiscal effects and closing the PEBP budgets, the money committees approved \$2.4 million in State General Funds for FY 2018 to fund 100 percent of the increased local government contribution, and \$1.8 million in FY 2019 to fund 75 percent of the local government contribution. Those funds were included in the Appropriations Act. In FY 2018, local governments would bear no additional costs associated with this bill. In FY 2019, Fiscal Analysis Division staff estimated the total effect on local governments in the aggregate would be \$602,434, which was 25 percent of the total local government increased costs. However, that amount could vary based on enrollment productions and cost of coverage as well as tiers of enrollment by plan participants.

Chair Carlton stated that the bill addressed the issue of local government retiree "orphans," which had been before this body for a long time. Assemblywoman Swank and Assemblywoman Diaz worked very hard on this problem, and Chair Carlton thanked them for all their hard work.

Assemblywoman Swank thanked the Fiscal Analysis Division staff who worked with Assemblywoman Diaz and her on this project. She said she had been hearing about this problem since her freshman session, so in many ways it was rewarding to get it resolved.

Assemblywoman Diaz echoed Assemblywoman Swank's sentiments and said it was a pleasure working with Assemblywoman Swank to come up with a solution to adequately address many local government employees who were caught in a bad situation.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing to testimony in support of S.B. 552 (R1).

Marlene Lockard, representing the Retired Public Employees of Nevada (RPEN), testified in support of S.B. 552 (R1). Ms. Lockard commented that this had been an issue for RPEN and for local government employees for many years. She offered gratitude and thanks to everyone who worked so hard to find a resolution.

Priscilla Maloney, representing American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, testified in support of S.B. 552 (R1).

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 552 (R1). Mr. Daly thanked the Assembly members who worked on this along with their colleagues in the Senate. For the hundreds of former educators and retired educators who were stuck with higher premiums and ultimately higher co-pays, this was very welcome relief and a long time coming.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 552 (R1) and, seeing none, closed the hearing on S.B. 522 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 548.

Senate Bill 548: Provides for the establishment of the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation. (BDR 34-1232)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 548. Senator Woodhouse said she was excited to introduce this bill, which established the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation. With her was Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, who would provide details about this new institute. However, before she turned the time over to Mr. Canavero, she wanted to offer some considerations.

Senator Woodhouse said this idea was truly exciting, and about ten days ago she had a visit from Mr. Canavero and representatives from the Governor's Office asking whether she would be willing to help move this plan along. When they laid out the plan for the Institute, she said yes, she wanted to work on this one. Senator Woodhouse read the following statement into the record:

It is no secret that Nevada suffers from an acute shortage of teachers in our classrooms, and this shortage has grown in recent years as enrollments in teachers' colleges have declined dramatically; 40 percent in some reports. As a result, our school districts have been forced to hire an army of substitute teachers and to sometimes compromise on the education and experience that we desire from our teachers. As more of the state's baby boomers retire, our need for new teachers will only grow and that makes our teaching core even younger and less experienced.

A problem separate from our need for more teachers is a need for teachers who are better prepared for the rigors of the classroom when they arrive to begin their teaching careers. The growing complexity of our world and the increasing diversity of our communities necessitate that teachers possess knowledge and skills that would have seemed totally unnecessary back when I began my teaching career. Think about this: when our high school seniors walk across the stage in the next couple of weeks, many will be walking off to careers in industries that did not exist when they started kindergarten in 2004.

Things like coding for mobile applications, autonomous vehicles, drones, virtual reality, advanced robotics, and so many others. But that is the same for our kids who will enter kindergarten this fall. What new industries will spring up before they graduate? Our schools will need to be nimble enough to prepare those children for whatever may come in the next 13 years. Our schools must also provide a depth of education that is sufficient to the challenge of those unknown opportunities.

On top of this spiraling complexity, our teachers need to deliver rigorous and technical academic content to all comers, all students, many of whom enter school unable to speak English. Imagine the challenge of the Clark County School District, for example, where nearly one in five students speak a foreign language. That is not just Spanish, but literally dozens of other different languages.

We also have a large fraction of our kids who come from challenging economic circumstances, or whose parents have not been educated beyond high school. These students bring an additional set of challenges and we want to make sure those students have all the opportunities that we can provide for them.

How do we educate these children and prepare them for a life of opportunity? The answer is not easy, but it is simple. We need excellent teachers. A teacher who is well prepared, adequately resourced, properly supported, and appropriately compensated can achieve wonders. And how do we get those teachers? Nevada already invests millions of dollars in professional development programs to enhance our teachers' knowledge and skills. Such programs, however, can be costly for school districts. In 2015, the nonprofit New Teacher Project reported that school districts spend an average of \$18,000 per teacher on professional development, yet only 30 percent of those teachers who participated in those programs reported substantial improvement in their classroom performance. That is one of the things we must change. A more cost-effective approach to recruiting and retaining the best educators is to effectively prepare them right from the beginning. That is why I am urging your support for Senate Bill [S.B.] 548. This measure creates an elite institute designed to attract the most promising future educators from throughout Nevada and the nation. The program will provide thorough and rigorous preparation and essential clinical skill to our future educators. Further, the program will emphasize professional autonomy and responsibility so teachers learn to be responsive to the dynamics in each unique and diverse classroom.

We need to be proactive. We need to recruit and attract the best and the brightest to the profession of teaching, and we need to provide them with education and the preparation that is second to none. Nevada's future leaders, innovators, and job creators are counting on it.

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, I thank you for your consideration on this bill and your time this morning. I would now like to turn the presentation over to Steve Canavero to discuss the details of this highly selective program and to address the related appropriation.

Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, thanked Senator Woodhouse for her opening remarks. Mr. Canavero said that a number of months ago he was sitting with the Governor and working through and providing an update to the various initiatives passed in the 2015 Legislative Session related to teachers, such as the Great Teaching and Leading Fund, the Teach Nevada Scholarships and Incentives, along with efforts to expand the pipeline and the number of teachers in our most necessary schools.

The Governor shared an idea and a vision he had akin to a school within a school. An institute, within a teaching college, to be highly selective to provide what he called the "top gun" of teaching. The institute would be designed to both elevate the teaching profession and provide a nimble environment in which our teacher preparation programs could attract from within the state and across the nation some of the best and brightest students and build toward a wonderful teachers' college in the West. Mr. Canavero said he had hoped to have the puzzle pieces together a little earlier, but recently the pieces all fell into place. An anonymous donation of nearly \$5 million toward this effort had been made through the Governor's relationships. At that point, it did not take long to convince Senator Woodhouse of the worthiness of this project. Mr. Canavero proceeded to highlight a few items within the bill.

Section 2 of S.B. 548 provided an outline of what the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation would be. There were three main areas related to selectivity, research, and evaluation throughout the program. Mr. Canavero said the final pillar was to disseminate those approaches across the state for teachers to appreciate, expand, and innovate.

Specifically, section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a), subparagraphs (1) through (6) of the bill provided important details related to the vision for the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation. Mr. Canavero stated that subsection related to preparing teaching professionals for the autonomy and responsibility that they would be facing and also providing practical experiences and developing skills and knowledge consistent with the diversity of this state. In many cases, not only were the demographics of the teaching profession beginning to change, but teachers needed to be prepared to address the challenges of a changing Nevada.

Mr. Canavero addressed the process by which the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation would be founded. A college or university within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) was eligible. The State Board of Education was responsible for identifying an application, and applicants had to be able to meet the parameters of the bill in section 1, subsections 1 and 2, and also provide additional money to meet the state's commitment. The state was committing \$500,000 in each year of the biennium and the college or university would be required to match that funding. Finally, the college or university had to demonstrate that it was able to sustain or expand the Institute over time.

Assemblywoman Diaz said Clark County had a serious shortage of teachers in classrooms, which had an effect on students' ability to have successful school years. She wondered how this program fit and how the recruitment of potential teachers was going to happen. Assemblywoman Diaz referred to section 1, subsection 2, subparagraph 2, where it said upon completion of the program, the student would be eligible to obtain a license to teach kindergarten, and she was concerned that pre-Kindergarten (pre-K) was not included in the program.

Mr. Canavero responded that regarding teacher recruitment, in conversations with various individuals from within the system, it was his understanding that there were specific tools that could be used from other degree areas to find students in high school. There was a particular SAT score that the program could begin to target and identify those students to recruit them to the universities. Mr. Canavero hoped that the program would also recruit individuals within the universities as well. This program was open to undergraduate and graduate degrees. He asked Senator Woodhouse to address the pre-K question.

Senator Woodhouse apologized and said she should have caught the lack of pre-K involvement in the bill. Depending on the time available, Senator Woodhouse said she would like to have an amendment that would add pre-K to this bill because early childhood was critical.

Chair Carlton remarked that Fiscal Analysis Division staff would have to be consulted about how quickly an amendment could be submitted. Further, she said she would like to move this to the floor as quickly as possible, so Fiscal staff would work with the Legal Division to see what was possible to get done today.

Assemblywoman Titus was curious about whether S.B. 548 mirrored anything that NSHE was doing. She said she was concerned that the bill was spending \$1 million for a program that seemed to be directing the university what to teach. She asked for information about where the university stood on the program.

Mr. Canavero stated there were a number of teacher preparation programs across the state, and the State Board of Education certified those preparation programs, preparing teachers all across the state for service in Nevada's schools and even outside of the state. The idea behind the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation was to incubate new ideas from the ground up and to be consistent with some of the research to work on elevating the

teaching profession by creating a highly selective institute with direct application experience in schools. Mr. Canavero said he envisioned an opportunity where successful applicants engaged directly in some of our schools.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether there were other states that had similar programs designed on this template.

Mr. Canavero said there were a number of other states, and even some existing programs that had increased over time.

Senator Woodhouse commented that one of the things that broke her heart, as a 40-year educator in Nevada was when she heard young people dismiss education as a profession to enter. She believed this program could be an incentive or an encouragement that education was a profession to be proud to enter and the proposed institute would provide a good start to making some inroads in that effort.

Assemblyman Sprinkle referred to the appropriation, and said his understanding was that the \$1 million was a onetime appropriation for those two years to get the program up and running and to help with matching funds. Mr. Canavero said that was correct.

Assemblyman Sprinkle inquired about future funding for this program should it be successful.

Senator Woodhouse said that if the program was accomplishing its goals, she would probably be back asking for more funding. The teacher pipeline problem would not be solved in two years; it would be an ongoing issue.

Assemblyman Sprinkle commented that a teachers' institute seemed like a good idea and he was sure that this body would look favorably upon the bill.

Assemblywoman Diaz stated she was reviewing the bill and did not see a reporting requirement. She said she would like to see the data that showed how many students enrolled, and the demographics of those students, to see the success of the program over the biennium. While she did not see any language about a reporting requirement, she thought it important that data be collected.

Senator Woodhouse replied that Assemblywoman Diaz was correct and apparently, that was what happened when a bill was crafted in a short period of time. Along with the pre-K, she believed a reporting requirement was a good addition, and as indicated, she would work with Fiscal Analysis Division staff and see how quickly changes could be made.

Chair Carlton asked Assemblywoman Diaz when she would want reporting to be provided and to whom. She believed the pre-K addition would be an easy fix, but the reporting requirement might not be as easy.

Assemblywoman Diaz said the institution that was applying for the grant money could report back to the State Board of Education, which could in turn report to the Legislature.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, said one concept that Fiscal staff would put forth for the Committee's consideration was to request the Department of Education, within its grant application process, to include a reporting requirement. That avenue would replace attempting to iron out a reporting requirement in the bill at this late date if the members, the Department of Education, and the bill's sponsor were amenable.

Senator Woodhouse said she was absolutely amenable to that idea.

Mr. Canavero said yes, and to clarify, the application process would include that the State Board of Education would run a reporting requirement to provide the data back to the Legislature.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 548.

Ed Gonzalez, Lobbyist and Policy Analyst, Clark County Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 548. Mr. Gonzalez said anything that could help with the teacher pipeline problem and aid the teaching profession had the full support of the Clark County Education Association. In addition, the Association remained committed to trying to get as many teachers as possible serving at-risk students.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association, and representing the Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 548. She noted there were two items in particular that she wanted to point out. The first was subsection 2(a)(2), where special education was specifically included. Nevada had a disadvantage when it came to getting people to work in special education, and to have a program with this emphasis was wonderful. Ms. Anderson said the second was that she was a senior English teacher, many of her students would be great educators, and she knew they had the heart, the brain, and the will, but did not see the professionalism of teaching. To have a program like this would help bring forward the professionalism of being an educator.

Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District, testified in support of S.B. 548. Ms. Rourke said it had been well documented and thoroughly discussed in this Committee and many others about the teacher shortage in Clark County. Ms. Rourke said this was another avenue for getting not only more teachers into the Clark County School District, but also highly qualified teachers.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents and Nevada Association of School Administrators, testified in support of S.B. 548. Ms. Pierczynski stated this was a great bill and thanked Senator Woodhouse for bringing it forward.

Luis F. Valera, Vice President, Government Affairs and Compliance, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), testified in support of S.B. 548. Mr. Valera said UNLV's College of Education was always looking for innovative ideas to embrace, and if there were any place for UNLV to help with data reporting or analysis, he would welcome that opportunity.

Gary W. Olsen, speaking through an interpreter for the hearing-impaired, testified in support of S.B. 548. Mr. Olsen wanted to make the point that the bill addressed the training for special-needs children and he was speaking specifically about deaf and hard-of-hearing children, and this bill would be beneficial for them.

Constance J. Brooks, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education, testified in support of S.B. 548. Ms. Brooks expressed her appreciation to Senator Woodhouse, to the Office of the Governor, and to the Legislature for making a commitment toward supporting a pipeline for teachers in Nevada. Everyone had discussed how critical this idea was for the future of the state.

Brent Husson, representing Nevada Succeeds, testified in support of S.B. 548. Mr. Husson noted there were several bills that were dedicated to extending the teacher pipeline and also expanding the efficacy for teachers in general: bills that were designed to help support teachers to be the best they could be. Mr. Husson believed an institute that was considered elite would help with the culture around education and attract individuals into the profession. He did not think the importance of having an elite institution tied to one of the universities could be underestimated.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 548 and, seeing none, closed the hearing on the bill. Fiscal Analysis Division staff had consulted with the Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, regarding the amendment for this bill, and it appeared it would be fairly easy to amend the bill.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 444.

Senate Bill 444: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Veterans Services to provide assistance and support for the Adopt a Vet Dental Program. (BDR S-147)

Linda J. Haigh, Founder and Director, Adopt A Vet Dental Program, testified in support of Senate Bill (S.B.) 444 and read the following statement into the record:

We have an epidemic of oral health disease among our veterans. A shocking 95 percent of our veterans do not qualify for dental care at the Veterans Administration [VA] because the requirements are so restrictive. Adopt A Vet Dental Program targets just the very low-income veterans that cannot afford to see a dentist. They live every day with oral decay, abscesses, and infection, and this really affects their overall health. Unlike the University of Nevada, Las Vegas [UNLV], the University of Nevada, Reno [UNR] does not

have a school of dental medicine where veterans can go for no cost or low-cost dental care. Adopt a Vet has been able to provide for that gap for the past seven years. We provide a full restoration or emergency dental care to over 870 veterans in 10 counties. We have 114 dentists and specialists that have stepped forward to help us provide dental care to our veterans, and they have donated \$4.2 million in services. However, Adopt a Vet Dental is responsible for the dentures, the partials, the crowns, our dental clinic, and our program operation. We have a small staff that needs to expand to accommodate a waiting list of 200 veterans waiting up to two years for dental care. The requested funds of \$124,981 per year for two years will allow us to take care of an additional 54 veterans for each year. Adopt a Vet Dental has become part of the solution to an overwhelming challenge to address this, but we cannot keep up with the demand and are requesting support from the state to help us. To our knowledge, there is no program like ours in the United States and we have received national recognition for our efforts to provide dental care to our low-income veterans. It has been an honor to serve these veterans. Thank you for your consideration in this request.

Jim Snyder, Veteran Advocate, Adopt a Vet Dental Program, testified in support of S.B. 444. Mr. Snyder stated he performed all the intakes of the veterans and he had also gone through the program. The program did not care what color a veteran was, what race, what religion, what gender: if a veteran qualified for the program, the veteran went through the program. It was very nice to be part of a program where the veterans came first. Mr. Snyder said he waited 18 months to enter the program; he had a nerve disorder that went through his jaw causing him to severely grind his teeth and he began to self-medicate. He said he had to find whatever drugs were available until he found the Adopt A Vet Dental Program after about six years of self-medicating. Mr. Snyder informed the Committee that the program spent approximately \$11,000 on his dental work, and the average veteran who entered the program received about \$7,500 worth of dental work.

Mr. Snyder said he had dealt with two suicide attempts because of veterans with dental problems and S.B. 444 addressed this need. Mr. Snyder commended and thanked the Legislature regarding how veterans had been treated this session.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Adopt A Vet Dental Program currently had a waiting list.

Ms. Haigh replied that the waiting list contained over 200 veterans. For every veteran who completed the program, four more were calling requesting help. There was no help in Northern Nevada other than the Adopt A Vet Dental Program.

Chair Carlton was curious about how the program arrived at the requested amount, because it was a small amount for such an important program.

Ms. Haigh agreed that the amount was small, but the program was short two staff persons. She emphasized that the program engaged in fundraising and, additionally, had a large grant

from the Irene W. and C.B. Pennington Foundation, which would subsidize the care for 210 veterans for two years. Ms. Haigh said one of the reasons for asking for help from the state was to reduce the waitlist.

Mr. Snyder commented that veterans often thought the program was part of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). The VA referred everyone to the program and it also received calls from many veterans from out of state. California veterans, especially, called often and sometimes were upset when told this was a Nevada program. Mr. Snyder said the VA did great work, but on this, they did nothing.

Chair Carlton clarified that these dollars basically helped the program fund the administrative side because the services were donated.

Ms. Haigh said that was correct, and added that 98 percent of the referrals came from every department of the VA.

Assemblyman Edwards wanted to add that he had seen a lot of need in the veteran community, especially in Southern Nevada. He commended the Adopt A Vet Dental Program for the great job it was doing and thanked Ms. Haigh and Mr. Snyder.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 444.

Brandi Planet, representing the Nevada Dental Association, testified in support of S.B. 444. Ms. Planet joined in the comments made by the representatives of the Adopt A Vet Dental Program and stated that the Nevada Dental Association fully supported the bill.

Autumn Tampa, private citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, testified in support of S.B. 444.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 444 and, seeing none, she closed the hearing on S.B. 444.

Chair Carlton recessed the meeting at 12:16 p.m. and reconvened at 12:27 p.m.

Chair Carlton asked the Committee to reconsider S.B. 444. She proposed an amendment to increase the amounts that were listed in section 1 of the bill by \$50,000 in each year of the biennium. The amendment would increase the request to \$174,981 in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium.

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 444 TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE ADOPT A VET
DENTAL PROGRAM BY \$50,000, TOTALING THE APPROPRIATION
TO \$174,981 IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2017-2019 BIENNIUM.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblyman Sprinkle take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint): Establishes for the 2017-2019 biennium the subsidies to be paid to the Public Employees' Benefits Program for insurance for certain active and retired public officers and employees. (BDR S-1242)

Chair Carlton asked Assemblyman Oscarson whether he had any comments or questions before the bill was processed and, hearing none, said she would accept a motion to do pass on Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 551 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblyman Araujo take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 552 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the cost of certain coverage under the Public Employees' Benefits Program. (BDR 23-1226)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 552 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblywoman Swank take the floor statement.

Chair Carlton stated that Senate Bill 548 would be passed with the conceptual amendment of adding kindergarten (pre-K) to keep it moving toward the floor. When the amendment arrived, it could be signed off and sent to the floor.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Fiscal Analysis Division staff requested clarification as to whether the change was pre-K, or pre-K and early childhood education. She said that question was from the Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, regarding the amendment.

Assemblywoman Diaz said she would consult with the Legal Division, but her intent was whatever a pre-K teacher would be licensed with, and she believed sometimes they were licensed with an early childhood license. She wanted to ensure that pre-K was covered.

Senate Bill 548: Provides for the establishment of the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation. (BDR 34-1232)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 548.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblywoman Diaz take the floor statement.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 443 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 443 (1st Reprint): Requires the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services to employ sign language interpreters. (BDR 38-145)

Gary W. Olsen, speaking through an interpreter for the hearing-impaired, testified in support of Senate Bill (S.B.) 443 (1st Reprint) with the following statement:

Good afternoon. This amendment to the S.B. 443 is excellent. I am happy with the amendment. I believe this is fantastic and long overdue. Because it enables the opportunity for the Commission and the Aging and Disability Services Division [ADSD] of the Department of Health and Human Services and other service groups to work together to enhance the lives of the deaf people. It hits every category, especially education. Acquisition of the language is the critical part.

Another part we were pushing for was the employment piece. Health and social services is also something that is needed and something this bill will allow to happen. An excellent part of the change is it allows for flexibility with technology. We cannot forget the interpreters—I wish we had them for this session, but I am looking forward to having them in the future. This whole bill will contribute to greater involvement for the deaf community and will enhance our lives so we can broaden our communication.

I want to applaud ADSD for working together over the years and the Legislature again for working on this bill. Thank you, again.

Assemblyman Sprinkle noted that at the beginning, Mr. Olsen said the appropriation for these positions had been amended out. He asked whether it was correct that interpreters would be provided if the Department of Health and Human Services could find the funds.

Chair Carlton quoted page 2, line 20 of S.B. 443 (R1), "The Division shall, to the extent money is available, employ one or more interpreters in the unclassified service of the State for the purposes of this paragraph." Chair Carlton assumed that if there was a vacancy, or dollars available in other ways, that those dollars would be used toward this provision. She asked for someone to confirm that for the record.

Jill Berntson, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, stated that the positions were currently funded through a telephone surcharge received through the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada. If this bill was approved, that funding would still be available and it would be used to fund these positions.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 443 (R1) and, seeing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 443 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 443 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblyman Oscarson take the floor statement, and she closed the hearing on S.B. 443 (R1).

Chair Carlton recessed the hearing at 12:41 p.m. and reconvened the hearing at 3:59 p.m.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 155 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 155 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for educational leadership training programs. (BDR S-1)

Alex Bybee, representing the Public Education Foundation, read a statement from Senator Patricia Farley, Senate District No. 8, into the record:

The issue of school leadership has been a major topic of conversation in recent months because of the plan to reorganize the Clark County School District (CCSD). This plan transfers a great deal of CCSD's management

from the district to the school level. With this massive shift in responsibilities, it is essential we take all necessary steps to prepare school leaders to be successful in their expanded management duties.

But the CCSD reorganization is not the only reason we need educational leadership training, and CCSD is not the only school district that needs it. Whether the goal is to enhance instruction, to create a culture of excellence, or to deepen parental involvement, it is nearly impossible to improve schools without strong leaders. This is hardly news: research has shown the importance of effective school principals for decades.

Congress recognized this truth when it passed the Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA] in December 2015 with an expanded emphasis on school leadership development. Experts say the new emphasis in ESSA can be a game changer if states are strategic about how they meet the leadership challenges.

Senate Bill 155 [1st Reprint] is one piece of Nevada's larger strategy to do exactly this. In addition to the training efforts already underway within CCSD, Senate Bill 497 [1st Reprint], that is being carried by Chair Woodhouse for the Legislative Committee on Education proposes to create an interim task force on school leader management. It seeks to link and align Nevada's systems of school leader recruitment, preparation, certification, compensation, evaluation, and professional development.

This bill supplements those efforts by appropriating \$1 million in funding over the new biennium to provide educational leadership training programs. The funding will be provided by contract to the Clark County Education Foundation, which is required to match the state funding dollar for dollar, thus doubling the available resources for this important work. The Foundation must and will work with all of the state's 17 school districts, other public education foundations, and other partners to design and implement the program. Funding may be used for:

- program personnel.
- resources to facilitate in-person and virtual instruction.
- research into the design and impact of related curricula.
- communication with education leaders throughout the state.
- data systems for the reporting of participation and results.

During the course of the biennium, two expenditure reports must be submitted to the Interim Finance Committee, and any unspent money reverts to the State General Fund.

Madam Chair, with greater management responsibilities placed at the school level, and consequently greater demands assumed by school principals, more needs to be done to prepare, equip, and develop those leaders.

Senate Bill 155 (R1) is a key part of Nevada's overall strategy to build strong educational leaders. As the Rice University Education Entrepreneurship Program says, today's schools are complex, dynamic organizations in which school leaders face many challenges. They must master finance, operation, curriculum, and discipline. They need to create a vision, foster a culture of achievement, build relationships among diverse groups, and use data to make decisions. They must be great educators and effective business leaders. Indeed, effective leadership in schools is the second most impactful variable behind effective teachers when it comes to student achievement.

Finally, policy is a foundation that takes many hands to implement the vision we share to move education forward in this state, and that is what the Leadership Institute aims to do: ensure those on the front lines have the capacity and skills necessary to successfully implement the historic investments and reforms this building has made in recent years.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 155 (R1).

Chris Daly, representing Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), testified in support of S.B. 155 (R1). The NSEA supported this bill to deliver quality professional development programs to support and grow education professionals and leaders. The Public Education Foundation's Leadership Institute of Nevada brought nationally recognized educational leaders to the state to facilitate seminars on advocacy, innovation, community and family engagement, technology, policy, and strategic decision-making. By cultivating and retaining top talent, the Institute and its three academies were aligned with NSEA's broader policy objectives, including high-quality teaching and education and facilitating the success of school site-based empowerment counsels. Mr. Daly said an investment by the state in the Leadership Institute of Nevada was an investment in quality education leadership, a critical component to the success of Nevada's public schools.

Natha C. Anderson, representing the Washoe Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 155 (R1). Ms. Anderson said that in Washoe County and across the state, many times teachers were lost, not just because of the workload, but because leaders in our schools needed that help. Expanding this program into ways that would retain principals and allow them to have different leadership elements would also allow educators and teachers in the classroom to figure out some different ways to help children. Ms. Anderson believed this program would help educators across the state.

Vikki Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 155 (R1). Ms. Courtney said it had been an exciting project to watch and her organization fully supported the bill.

Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Affairs, Clark County School District, testified in support of S.B. 155 (R1). Ms. Rourke said that as a member of the inaugural class of the Executive Leadership Academy, she could say first-hand that the quality of the training was of the highest level.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, testified in support of S.B. 155 (R1). Mr. Moradkhan said many business leaders in the community were engaged with the Public Education Foundation and the Leadership Institute of Nevada and were in full support of this bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether there was anyone in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 155 (R1) and, seeing none, closed the hearing on S.B. 155 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 445 (1st Reprint).

Chair Carlton noted that the agenda would be revised to add the bills that were just received in the floor session earlier in the afternoon. Those bills would be processed as time permitted.

Senate Bill 445 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Eighth Judicial District Court for a Veterans Court Coordinator. (BDR S-148)

Andres Moses, Staff Attorney, Eighth Judicial District Court, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 445 (1st Reprint). Mr. Moses said he was present to speak in support of this bill, which made an appropriation for a Veterans Court coordinator for the Eight Judicial District Court. This bill was brought on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs. Mr. Moses wanted to give special thanks to the Chair of that committee, which was Senator Joseph P. (Joe) Hardy, and the vice chair, Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman.

Mr. Moses said that, in general, the specialty courts program was built to address the root causes of criminal behavior, which stemmed from substance abuse and mental illness. The Veterans Court was unique in that it focused on individuals who had served in the military and who had problems resulting from that service. The program was established by the Legislature in 2009 and was codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 176A.280. Currently, there were 45 active participants in the Veterans Court program in the Eighth Judicial District Court.

The Court brought together a private and public team that included the judge; the public defender; the district attorney; the Department of Veterans Affairs; the Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety; and specialty court staff, all focused on assisting the veteran with completion of the program. The coordinator was a critical member of the team who supervised and monitored the participants, assisted the judge by providing information and making recommendations, and served as a liaison between the court and various resources and services that were available.

Senate Bill 445 (1st Reprint) ensured full funding for the court coordinator through the biennium. Mr. Moses said funds that were requested in the original bill draft request had been reduced by half because the district court received Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) funds that affected the need for State General Funds. The request was now for \$98,356.

Assemblyman Oscarson asked whether the Clark County coordinator position would be able to reach out to rural counties without specialty courts and help them establish those programs for veterans.

Mr. Moses replied that coordinators and staff were always happy to help with any guidance or assistance they could provide to other judicial districts in Nevada. As far as services, Mr. Moses believed veterans would have to be referred to district court in Clark County for the program to enroll them. However, the Eighth Judicial District Court could assist veterans in connecting with other community partners and services.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 445 (R1).

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County District Attorney's Office, testified in support of S.B. 445 (R1). Mr. Jones stated that Veterans Court was one of the most successful specialty courts. This funding would help with coordination between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Eighth Judicial District Court to ensure the defendants had what was needed to not recidivate.

John Piro, representing the Clark County Public Defender, testified in support of S.B. 445 (R1). He said he echoed the sentiments of Mr. Jones that Veterans Court was one of the most successful programs, and it was important to have a coordinator because it was a program that had wraparound services. That coordinator also coordinated with the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that some of the funds used to treat veterans in the court did not have to come out of state funds; federal money could be used to fund those programs. Mr. Piro said the coordinator was a highly important position that led to a less likely chance of veterans recidivating. He urged support of the bill.

Chair Carlton called for testimony from anyone in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 445 (R1), and, seeing none, closed the hearing.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for a program of peer assistance and review of teachers. (BDR S-4)

Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 300 (1st Reprint). Senator Denis read the following statement into the record:

I appreciate the opportunity to present this bill for your consideration. The origins of this bill date back to the 2011 Session when we passed three bills addressing performance evaluations for educational personnel. The legislation that followed in 2013 with Senate Bill 407 of the 77th Session further refined the evaluation statute and more significantly added a component of pure evaluation. In response, the Clark County School District began a pilot project to test the limited rollout of this model. The Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program is evidence-based and was developed in consultation with Montgomery County, Maryland, which had successfully used this model for 15 years. The PAR program is a partnership between the Clark County School District [CCSD] and the Clark County Education Association [CCEA], so it has the Board buy-in that is so essential for a successful initiative. The program leverages the expertise and excellence of the District's best teachers, referred to as consulting teachers, who help their peers in need of support, perhaps because they are new to the profession or are teaching in a challenging classroom. The PAR is guided by a 10-member panel made up of five CCEA teachers and five CCSD administrators. The panel selects consulting teachers who make a three-year commitment to help 10 to 15 of their peers. I am sure you will hear more about the program today from individuals with the CCSD and CCEA.

Though the program is relatively new to Clark County, there is a ton of evidence that it works. Over the years, various organizations have reported data on the relative performance of national education systems around the world. Observers have asked about what sets apart top performers from countries that are struggling like the United States. In response, a great deal of research has been undertaken to find answers. There are several reasons for the educational growth and success of other nations, but one reason stands apart. High-performing countries have professionalized the job of teaching. They do not view the teachers as mere employees to deliver a standardized product according to a predetermined formula; they are professionals with deep subject knowledge who are empowered to customize education according to the needs of each student in the topic being taught. Teachers in high-performing jurisdictions have acquired the expertise necessary to deliver this high-quality education through a system of job-embedded professional development. Teachers are in constant communication with other teachers who observe their classwork, share productive critiques, and collaborate on strategies to improve their craft. This system of peer interaction and accountability along with other public policy measures has led to continuous improvement in teaching quality and has made teaching a true profession like medicine and the law.

It is good that we are asking our teachers to interact in a meaningful way toward mutual improvement and to hold one another accountable as peers and as professionals. The CCSD and CCEA have partnered to lay the groundwork

for this paradigm shift in education development. Last session we made a serious investment in PAR with the passage of Senate Bill 332 of the 78th Session, which appropriated \$1 million in each year of the current biennium for the CCSD program. Senate Bill 300 [R1] continues the evolution and ramp-up of the program and commitment to PAR. It appropriates \$1.2 million in each year of the upcoming biennium with \$1 million going to Clark County School District and \$200,000 going to Washoe County School District.

Theodore Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association (CCEA), continued the presentation of S.B. 300 (R1). Mr. Small said he was the PAR co-chair along with the president of the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASAPE). As Senator Denis mentioned, this work was a collaboration among CCSD, CCEA, and CCASAPE, where the issues of supporting first-year teachers to the profession were addressed. Currently, PAR was working in the highest-need schools and started in the original 19 turnaround schools last year in the CCSD. Mr. Small said that in Las Vegas, one of a consulting teacher's mentees was named New Teacher of the Year in the Clark County School District. In 2017, PAR was serving another 210 new teachers in 25 schools. With the same amount of funds as last year, PAR was able to go from 19 schools to 25 schools because of the teacher retention rates in those schools. Mr. Small noted that PAR was also able to expand: if a teacher did not quite get to the level needed, that teacher would be kept in the district and offered a second year of support. This year almost 40 second-year teachers were supported and next year about 26 teachers would be supported. The panel members who went through this process heard about the progress of every new teacher and then made the determination as to whether that teacher would continue in the Clark County School District and receive second-year support, or would not have his or her contract renewed. Mr. Small said that was PAR's commitment to ensure that CCSD had great teachers in its schools.

Mr. Small continued and said the retention rate was important and CCSD was involved in a three-year study with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). All of that data and information was available to the Legislature.

Tracy Wilking, Consulting Teacher, Peer Assistance and Review (PAR), read the following statement into the record:

Programs such as Alternate Route to Licensure, Teach for America, and the Great Teaching and Reading Fund, facilitate recruiting teachers into the schools. Peer Assistance and Review [PAR] helps keep these teachers in the classroom. The PAR consulting teacher's role is to increase retention of new teachers. Over the past two years, we have worked with 500 brand new teachers in 25 of Clark County School District's most at-risk schools and we are looking to increase it to 29 schools this fall.

Because of the fact that many of our brand new teachers are from out of state, Alternate Route to Licensure, Teach for America, or Business and Industry License, they are not usually familiar with the student population they serve. As consulting teachers, we work with them, one on one. We have up to 25 new teachers on our caseload and we help them learn and implement the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) standards in their instruction. We also help them overcome the challenges of learning to teach, learning to work with the student population they know little about, and manage a classroom with the limited experience they bring into education. We also work cooperatively with administrators to support them in helping the new teachers.

Monica Cortez, principal of Western High School, Las Vegas, and David Kirkhart, assistant principal, asked that I share their thoughts on the impact PAR consulting teachers have had on their school. I quote, "Western has a population of nearly 2,700 students. Western is a Title 1 school serving an urban diverse population. Our student transiency rate is over 47 percent. Our graduation rate has risen from 39 percent in 2012 to over 72 percent in 2016. We have 130 licensed positions and nearly 50 first-to third-year probationary teachers on our campus. This is our second formal year working with PAR consultants. The PAR consulting teachers work directly with teachers who are new to the profession. At Western, two PAR consulting teachers are working with 22 teachers this academic year. They provide weekly and often daily ongoing support, strategies, and assistance that directly impact student learning. Prior to PAR working with Western High School, our school retained less than 30 percent of first-year teachers. This year, only one teacher being supported by PAR will be leaving the teaching profession. This puts Western High School's first-year, new to the profession of teaching, retention rate at 95 percent. The PAR consulting teachers are changing the overall transiency rate of educators at Western High School. Student learning and student outcomes ultimately are positively impacted by the retention of teachers: teachers who are reflected and teachers who work collaboratively within their schools to plan and implement highly effective lessons. Peer Assistance and Review consulting teachers foster the needed support for teachers new to the profession to effectively grow and develop into effective educators."

As consulting teachers, we are still classroom teachers. We have professional conversations with our mentees based on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework and best practices. Our work is supportive, not evaluative, and we are able to encourage our mentees to reflect on their growth. We work with some new teachers who are able to pick up their craft quickly and help them become more skilled, and other teachers who would most likely quit or be nonrenewed without our support. On my particular caseload, I nominated one

of my mentees for the Clark County School District New Educator of the Year award. Near and dear to my heart, she was the only high school teacher in Clark County School District to win that prestigious award. She believes so strongly in the support of PAR that she came here on a Sunday to speak to you. Unfortunately, she was unable to come back this afternoon, but she emailed a letter earlier this morning in support of PAR.

On the other end of the spectrum, I was able to save the job of a struggling Alternate Route to Licensure teacher. Her administrator told me that because of my feedback and work with this new teacher, she would not seek nonrenewal. She said she would give her another chance because she knows the teacher will receive another year of PAR support.

As a product of the Clark County School District and a longtime educator with Clark County, I have seen the attrition rate of teachers increase, and with that, additional funds needed every year to train new teachers. Peer Assistance and Review's role in retaining teachers will save the District and the state the need to continually fund new teacher training in such large amounts. We ask for your support in helping us to continue to support and retain new teachers in our most at-risk schools in Clark County School District through Peer Assistance and Review.

Assemblywoman Swank asked how many teachers were receiving this support.

Mr. Small said this year there were 220 teachers new to the profession and there were 40 who were second-year teachers. Last year, 250 teachers in total were served.

Assemblywoman Swank said she knew the program was based on mentoring, but there were still ways that could measure what was working in the program and what needed improvement. While she knew it was still early, she wondered what rubrics were in place to measure the success of the program.

Mr. Small responded that there were a couple of ways to address that question. As Ms. Wilking mentioned, the success of the new teachers was measured with the standards of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). Also, UNLV, which was a partner, was conducting a three-year study and performing the research around those standards. A survey was taken of all new teachers in Clark County at the beginning of each year and also at the end. Mr. Small said that besides the PAR panel work, feedback on the progress of the 250 teachers was supplied to the Clark County School District three times a year. Another group met twice a year and was called the PAR Advisory, the group that created the system. The PAR Advisory program was made up of Clark County School Board members and community individuals.

Mr. Small recognized the Washoe County School District as helping CCSD to create the PAR Advisory program. This year PAR Advisory talked about supporting all the brand-new special-education teachers in as many schools as possible.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether there were brand-new teachers in rural areas who might need some peer support.

Senator Denis acknowledged there were, but this was a pilot program that was started in Clark County and was now expanding to Washoe County.

Assemblywoman Titus commented that it would be interesting to see statistically how many new teachers in a rural area found they could have used some support. She said she would like to see the program succeed. Assemblywoman Titus said her second question was in regard to section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (b), "May be used for expenses relating to conducting a program of peer assistance and review of teachers, which may include, without limitation, salaries and benefits of teachers...." But then it said in paragraph (d), "May not be used to adjust the district-wide schedules of salaries and benefits of the employees...." She wondered whether that language meant that this money could be used toward salaries or negotiating salaries. She said she understood the need for peer support not just for new teachers, but all teachers, and she needed some clarification on the salary question.

Mr. Small stated that the majority of the monies awarded in 2015 went for the salaries of the consulting teachers. What that did was to expand the work. When the PAR panel met, for example, there would be teachers on that panel who would need a substitute. The consulting teachers were currently supporting up to 20 new teachers in different schools, and they also received mileage as they traveled between schools. Mr. Small said those were some examples of where this money was being spent.

Assemblywoman Titus clarified that the salaries went to the consulting teachers who were teaching the program, not the teachers in the classroom. Mr. Small stated that was correct.

Assemblyman Sprinkle commented that the policy and what was being accomplished made a lot of sense and he applauded the Clark County School District. His question was specifically about the allocation request of \$1.2 million per year, and he wondered why the significant difference in funding between the Clark County School District and the Washoe County School District.

Mr. Small said the \$1 million that went to Clark County was spent on about a quarter of the new teachers who were hired. To provide the program to every new teacher in Clark County would cost \$8 million to \$10 million for the biennium. That was why the original request was to try to cover about half of the new teachers. Mr. Small said that Washoe County's PAR program covered all brand-new teachers, and it was part of its Teacher On Board program. The next phase of PAR that the Clark County School District wanted to implement was for those teachers who were veteran postprobationary teachers and needed that extra support.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association, said Washoe County's system was set up a bit differently from Clark County. The Washoe County School District had the program for a number of years but had not received any funding from the state. The decision about the funding amount of \$200,000 was based on the number of students in the Washoe County School District. Ms. Anderson remarked that it would have been great for Washoe County to have about \$400,000 based on the number of consulting teachers in the program.

Assemblywoman Diaz commented that she had not read anything in S.B. 300 (R1) that requested data be submitted to the Department of Education. She believed that action was important to ensure the growth, movement, and return on investment to ensure that teachers were being retained. That was part of the teacher pipeline issue of making sure teachers were happy and they liked what they were doing. She requested that the Department of Education also keep data regarding the PAR program.

Assemblyman Oscarson said he was aware of the need for and benefit to these programs, but his concern was that there were 15 other school districts in Nevada and CCSD covered two of them. The rural school districts were struggling with hiring teachers as well, and this program did not include any of them. Assemblyman Oscarson said there should have been some money allocated for the rural schools and without that, he would have difficulty supporting the bill.

Mr. Small pointed out that the Clark County School District included rural, suburban, and urban schools, and the hope was that the PAR program would expand. He said he understood there was a need for the PAR program, and when it was started in Clark County three years ago, it was a conversation around retention of new teachers in the toughest schools.

Mr. Small said he would be thrilled for other districts to have the PAR program, and he would welcome and support any programs in the other 15 districts.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 300 (R1).

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 300 (R1). Ms. Anderson thanked Senator Moises Denis and Senator Joyce Woodhouse for adding the amount for the Washoe County School District. Initially, funding for Washoe County was not part of the bill. The Washoe Education Association (WEA) and Washoe County School District started discussing the PAR program in 2012 and it was installed in 2013. Ms. Anderson said that with the budget cuts coming forward in Washoe County, the Washoe County School District had requested funding to be part of the bill. Washoe County conducted its PAR program a little differently with a consulting teacher for every new teacher, but also a consulting teacher for teachers who struggled or for underperforming teachers. Ms. Anderson said these were the teachers who were good but might have lost their way. Perhaps this was their 17th or 18th year of teaching and they had forgotten what it was to be a teacher. The PAR program had a consulting teacher who met with them and provided suggestions for classes to take, classrooms to visit, and other

recommendations for getting back on track. Ms. Anderson said it was more about the investment for veteran teachers. While new teachers were helped, Washoe County was also helping those who had invested many years in the school district.

Ms. Anderson noted for Assemblyman Sprinkle that the \$200,000 funding was proportional to the number of students, and it also would pay for three or four consulting teachers.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), stated that NSEA supported S.B. 300 (R1). Mr. Daly said NSEA agreed with the presentations from Senator Denis and from local affiliates, CCEA and WEA, on the merits of the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program. He pointed out that one of NSEA's legislative priorities was the statewide expansion of the PAR program, and while this was a half-step, he believed that a half-step to include Washoe County was a step in the right direction.

Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees, testified in support of S.B. 300 (R1). Mr. Augspurger said he supported this program for three reasons: (1) the personal and professional growth that it fostered on the part of participating principals, (2) the collaborative effort between principals and teachers, and (3) the great effort to ensure that an investment in new teachers was made to keep them in the profession.

Anna Slighting, representing H.O.P.E. (Honoring Our Public Education), testified in support of S.B. 300 (R1), and read the following statement into the record:

We are a nonprofit group representing nearly 1,000 families in support of public education. In addition to being a mom, I am also a teacher. I currently serve on one of the Department of Education's teacher preparation committees and we unanimously agree that teacher preparation, whether alternative or traditional licensure, is only one piece of a new teacher's success. The other piece is a new teacher having a good mentor in at least his or her first year. From my own experience, I had an excellent mentor in my first year of teaching. It was in Utah and my principal ensured that my classroom was next to my mentor's classroom and that I had ample opportunity to collaborate with my mentor. Having a good mentor solidified my desire to not only be a good educator, but also to stay in education. At H.O.P.E. we believe that Peer Assistance Review (PAR) provides an excellent mentorship program for new teachers. We have seen successes with those new teachers who have had the opportunity to participate thus far. We would love to see PAR eventually expanded to include all new teachers in all the state. We are in favor of S.B. 300 (R1). Thank you for your time.

Brent Husson, representing Nevada Succeeds, testified in support of S.B. 300 (R1). Mr. Husson said that Nevada Succeeds had been a part of the PAR program since 2012 when it was initially doing the investigation in Montgomery County, Maryland.

Mr. Husson supported it for all of the reasons heard in previous testimony. He also wanted to highlight the collaboration between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) in this bill.

Assemblywoman Titus asked Mr. Husson whether a teacher had to be a union member to be part of the PAR panel and whether there were any nonunion school teachers who were part of the program.

Mr. Husson replied that it was his understanding that it was not required that a teacher be a member of the CCEA to be on the panel or to be a teacher involved in the work.

Natha C. Anderson, Washoe Education Association, stated that consulting teachers in Washoe County did not need to be members of the union because they were employees of the Washoe County School District. The five teachers who sat on Washoe County's PAR panel were members of the Association and the principals were also members of their professional association.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 300 (R1) and, seeing none, she closed the hearing on S.B. 300 (R1). The Chair then opened the hearing on Senate Bill 482 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 482 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to health care facilities.
(BDR 40-605)**

Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman, Senate District No. 1, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 482 (1st Reprint). Senator Spearman stated there were no monumental changes in the bill, with the exception of increasing transparency using a star rating. Many of the states had gone to the star rating so that consumers had more information about the quality of care they were going to receive at hospitals. After many discussions and examining several rating systems, the hospitals suggested the rating system used by the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) because it was universal and already accessible on the CMS website. Senator Spearman said S.B. 482 (R1) would require hospitals to place a link on the front page of their websites so that consumers could click on that link and immediately see the CMS rating. This bill also required hospitals to make available the star rating for the nurse-to-patient ratio. Senator Spearman said the star rating increased transparency and made certain that consumers had the information needed to make informed choices.

Assemblyman Sprinkle said he was not seeing it in the bill, but he asked about ramifications should the hospitals not do what the bill was trying to accomplish. He was specifically thinking of a poor rating for a hospital.

Senator Spearman stated that the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) had been assigned to install regulations as to how it would be administered. The DHHS had assured her that it had the capacity and the authority to ensure that compliance was met.

Cody L. Phinney, Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that the way the current plan was laid out, the Division would be allowed to incorporate regulation compliance with other work being done by the Division.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 482 (R1).

Marlene Lockard, representing the Service Employees International Union, testified in support of S.B. 482 (R1). Ms. Lockard said the bill went a long way to outline and specify what items must be included in a nurse staffing plan. She thanked Senator Spearman, who had spent hours on this legislation, for bringing all of the different parties together to find something that worked for everyone, and she asked for the Committee's support for S.B. 482 (R1).

Susan L. Fisher, representing the Ambulatory Surgery Center Association (ASCA), testified in support of S.B. 482 (R1).

Bill M. Welch, President/CEO, Nevada Hospital Association, testified in support of S.B. 482 (R1) and also thanked Senator Spearman for working on the legislation.

Chair Carlton asked Mr. Welch about ramifications if the hospitals did not comply with the regulations.

Mr. Welch said he was not an expert on the authority of DHHS, but he did know the Department had the authority to impose a fine on a hospital if it was in noncompliance with the regulations. Hospitals could be sanctioned or lose their Medicaid certification if not in compliance with the regulations required to meet licensure and other reporting standards.

Chair Carlton asked Mr. Welch whether he was aware of what hospitals were rated at what levels.

Mr. Welch said all hospitals in Nevada were reporting data to CMS, and CMS had its own methodology for developing its scoring system, which was posted on the CMS website. That information was also posted on the Nevada Hospital Association website, and most hospitals in the state were posting scores on the individual hospital websites.

Chair Carlton asked how the CMS star rating worked, and Mr. Welch responded that the rating took patient outcome, patient satisfaction, and other factors into consideration.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked how the information that patients were providing to CMS could be accessed.

Mr. Welch explained that data was collected by CMS after hospitals submitted certain information. Mr. Welch believed all the data was compiled from individual responses by CMS and then distributed.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked how a consumer could look at a hospital rating system and then correlate that with the responses that were being made to ascertain whether the published rating was accurate.

Mr. Welch said he would be happy to provide a detailed report on that information. The report was quite extensive, but Mr. Welch said he would provide that information to Committee members.

Ms. Phinney commented that it might be helpful for the Committee to look at the CMS.gov Five-Star Quality Rating System at some point in the future. The overall rating system included data on billing from the various hospitals as well as patient satisfaction surveys, and there was extensive data available at the federal website that could be helpful.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 482 (R1) and, seeing none, closed the hearing on S.B. 482 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 549.

Senate Bill 549: Makes an appropriation to the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records of the Department of Administration for certain projects, services and technology. (BDR S-1240)

Sena Loyd, Carson City Library Director and Nevada Library Association, read the following statement into the record:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of Senate Bill 549. Nevada libraries have seen over 9.7 million visits in 2016. Funding an additional \$500,000 over the biennium will allow libraries to enhance current services, develop today in tomorrow's workforce, and continue to decrease the digital divide. In collection development, more than 20 million items have circulated in Nevada public libraries in 2016. Funding collection development through the State Library puts dollars directly into the hand of public libraries through a distribution formula. This allows the funding to be spent on focused community needs. The State Library offers 47 unique research databases to Nevada libraries, including K-12 public schools. These databases cover a wide variety of topics, including scholarly journals, magazine articles, and full access to World Book. I would like to recognize the joint Subcommittee on General Government for recommending restoration of the funding for World Book. The State Library leverages this database funding with federal funding to increase access.

Nevada bookmobiles are the critical lifeline to our rural citizens who have limited access to literacy and technology resources. Bookmobiles provide fair and equal access to materials, technology, learning, and social opportunities to rural and isolated communities. More than 22,000 books were circulated through bookmobiles in five rural Nevada counties in 2016.

Since S.B. 549 does not specify amounts that are to be expended on each of the purposes named in the bill, the Nevada Library Association would like to respectfully suggest that \$190,000 go to collection development, \$20,000 to bookmobiles, \$30,000 to statewide databases, and at least \$10,000 to be allocated for emerging technologies per year of the biennium.

The Nevada Library Association would like to acknowledge the tremendous support for libraries from both the Senate and the Assembly this legislative session and thank you for recognizing Nevada libraries as vital community resources.

Chair Carlton said because the Nevada Library Association was suggesting how the dollars would be divided and in the bill was a general appropriation of \$500,000, she asked for clarification that it was not being suggested that the bill be amended.

Ms. Loyd stated that the Nevada Library Association wanted to have its suggestion about dividing the funding on the record: it was not suggesting an amendment.

Chair Carlton asked Ms. Loyd to repeat the division of the amounts and Ms. Loyd said the breakdown was \$190,000 for collection development, \$20,000 for the bookmobiles, \$30,000 for statewide databases, and \$10,000 for emerging technologies each year of the biennium.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, commented that the funding was being appropriated for the first year of the biennium and any remaining balance would be balanced forward. She wanted to make it clear that this was a onetime appropriation and not split between the two fiscal years; however, the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records could split it equally between the two fiscal years.

Joan Dalusung, Government Relations Co-Chair, Nevada Library Association, testified in support of S.B. 549, and read the following statement into the record:

On behalf of the Nevada Library Association, I would like to express my support for S.B. 549, which would put \$500,000 into the Nevada State Library, Archives, and Public Record budget over the biennium for statewide collection development, bookmobiles, databases, and emerging technologies.

Public libraries directly support Nevada's strategic priority of an educated and healthy citizenry. Statewide collection development funding goes toward those items, which can be checked out by our patrons, including children's books, adult books, books on CD, and downloadable ebooks and audiobooks. Families are using our library collections to ensure that their children are ready for school as they participate in the Thousand Books Before Kindergarten initiative. With increased funding for collection development

we can continue to offer a diverse array of materials that support early literacy. Once in school, the public library is available to our children as an extension of their classroom day. Students frequently come to the public library for books on their reading lists and for supporting materials for research projects. Increased funding for collection development will aid libraries in offering accurate and robust collections to support our students.

I have emphasized children's collections, but the flexibility of this funding allows libraries to purchase those materials that best fit their communities' needs. Libraries have long been and will continue to be centers for lifelong learning. In order to create a healthy and educated Nevada citizenry, we ask that you support the creation of diverse, accurate, and timely collections by increasing statewide collection development funding.

Our bookmobiles in Elko, Lander, Eureka, and Humboldt Counties reach our citizens in our most remote areas of the state. We strive to ensure that these residents have access to the same resources as those living in urban or suburban areas of Nevada. By collaborating on statewide database funding, all our libraries benefit. By negotiating statewide contracts, we are able to obtain better pricing. Few, if any, of our libraries would be able to afford the same databases we access through statewide funding contracts.

These databases provide our students with access to vetted online resources, which can be cited with confidence. Finally, patrons of all ages are learning to code at library coding camps. They have space to create and innovate at our library maker spaces. These skills can be applied directly as our residents find careers in today's high-tech work environment.

Thank you for hearing this proposal. All Nevada's citizens, rural, suburban, and urban, will thrive as a result of this funding as they access timely resources for recreational reading, research, and development of skills to aid their future career dreams. Please support S.B. 549.

Nancy Cummings Schmidt, representing the Nevada State Council on Libraries and Literacy, testified in support of S.B. 549 and read the following statement into the record:

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, my name is Nancy Cummings Schmidt and I am the vice-chairperson for the Nevada State Council on Libraries and Literacy, as well as the retired director of the Washoe County Library System. I am here in support of S.B. 549. As one who has been associated with a Nevada library since 1969, I know how significant this funding, which supports collection development, technology, and bookmobiles, is for the libraries throughout our state. There is no question that this funding benefits library users of all ages in every nook and cranny of our state.

Diane Baker, Business Management Director, Carson City Library, testified in support of S.B. 549. Ms. Baker specifically emphasized that the funding requested in the bill directly benefited the libraries throughout the state. In Carson City the collection development funding currently received was in the \$4,000 range and with this increase, the library would receive almost double that funding. Ms. Baker said the funding increase would have a direct effect on all users of the Carson City Library. Also, the funding for the statewide electronic databases provided a basic suite for every public library in Nevada, which allowed each library to purchase electronic databases to respond to the needs in each community.

Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, testified in support of S.B. 549. Senator Denis stated that his first public service had been as a library trustee and one of his very first bills when he was a freshman in the Nevada Assembly had been for library collection development. In 2005, \$1.2 million had been appropriated just for collection development. With the demonstration from the state that funding was available for collection development, it made it possible to acquire federal funds. The concern today was that those funds could be eliminated by the federal government. Senator Denis said it was critically important that collection development money, which was distributed throughout the whole state, be forthcoming.

Chair Carlton called for anyone to testify in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 549 and, seeing none, closed the hearing on S.B. 549.

Chair Carlton stated several bills would be voted on, and she read the list of bills to be processed: S.B. 155 (R1), S.B. 445 (R1), S.B. 482 (R1), and S.B. 549. She noted that S.B. 300 (R1) would be held for the vote until the next day.

Senate Bill 155 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for educational leadership training programs. (BDR S-1)

Chair Carlton called for a vote on Senate Bill 155 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 155 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblyman Hambrick take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 445 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Eighth Judicial District Court for a Veterans Court Coordinator. (BDR S-148)

Chair Carlton called for a motion on Senate Bill 445 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 445 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblyman Araujo take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 482 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to health care facilities. (BDR 40-605)

Chair Carlton called for a motion on Senate Bill 482 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 482 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblyman Sprinkle take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 549: Makes an appropriation to the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records of the Department of Administration for certain projects, services and technology. (BDR S-1240)

Chair Carlton called for a motion on Senate Bill 549.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 549.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Benitez-Thompson, and Frierson were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton requested that Assemblywoman Swank take the floor statement.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 553.

Senate Bill 553: Authorizes and provides funding for the advance planning of the College of Engineering, Academic and Research Building at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (BDR S-1244)

Luis F. Valera, Vice President, Government Affairs and Compliance, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 553. Mr. Valera stated this bill would make an appropriation for planning money for the Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering at UNLV. The College of Engineering was the fastest-growing college at UNLV, as well as the top grant recipient. According to Mr. Valera, this bill would provide for some badly needed space for teaching and research. Some of the college's partners included Lockheed Martin and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Rama Venkat, Dean, Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), testified in support of S.B. 553. Mr. Venkat pointed out that the UNLV College of Engineering was the fastest-growing college in terms of student growth. The College currently enrolled 2,800 students. He said while the UNLV College of Engineering had grown very quickly, the space infrastructure had not kept pace with the growth. The College of Engineering was at capacity and bursting at the seams. In fact, 15 percent of the college's current space was in temporary space, a trailer, or part of a 99 Cents Only store complex. The College's world famous Robotics Laboratory, the Drexel Autonomous Systems Lab, was part of the 99 Cents Only store complex. Given adequate and appropriate space, Mr. Venkat was confident that the UNLV College of Engineering would reach the top tier in five to ten years, and would help UNLV to reach its strategic goal of a top-tier university.

Chair Carlton noted that S.B. 553 was discussed when the CIP budgets were closed.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of S.B. 553.

Constance J. Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education, (NSHE), expressed the support of both herself and NSHE for S.B. 553. Ms. Brooks said she appreciated the support of the Legislature for capital improvement projects. The Board of Regents had a lengthy list of projects, and she was pleased at the last-minute measure to include the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in the projects that had been up for deliberation for the past four months.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, testified in support of S.B. 553.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 553 and, seeing none, closed the hearing on the bill. Chair Carlton held S.B. 553 until more members were available to vote.

Senate Bill 49 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to funding for pupils with disabilities. (BDR 34-405)

Senate Bill 49 (2nd Reprint) was agendized but not heard.

Senate Bill 167 (2nd Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the creation and maintenance of school gardens. (BDR S-834)

Senate Bill 167 (2nd Reprint) was agendized but not heard.

Senate Bill 391 (2nd Reprint): Provides for awards of scholarships by community colleges in the Nevada System of Higher Education. (BDR 34-815)

Senate Bill 391 (2nd Reprint) was agendized but not heard.

Senate Bill 418 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to air pollution. (BDR 40-970)

Senate Bill 418 (2nd Reprint) was agendized but not heard.

Senate Bill 547 (1st Reprint): Requires certain large school districts to establish, through negotiations with an employee organization, a salary incentive program for professional growth. (BDR 34-1241)

Senate Bill 547 (1st Reprint) was agendized but not heard.

Senate Bill 550: Makes an appropriation to a disbursement account for costs relating to a human resource management information system for the Clark County School District. (BDR S-1231)

Senate Bill 550 was agendized but not heard.

Chair Carlton recessed the meeting at 5:27 p.m. The meeting was adjourned behind the bar at 8:36 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anne Bowen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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