

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-ninth Session
May 17, 2017**

The joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Education and the Assembly Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Moises Denis at 4:07 p.m. on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Vice Chair
Senator Tick Segerblom
Senator Pat Spearman
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Becky Harris

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chair
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Keith Pickard
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 2

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Counsel
Ben Mendez-Plancarte, Legislative Assistant
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District
Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Tracy Davis, Superintendent, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents; Nevada Association of School Administrators
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now
Nancy Brune, Director, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities
Lisa Morris Hibbler, Director, Youth Development and Social Innovation, City of Las Vegas
Tiffany Tyler, Ph.D., CEO, Communities in Schools of Nevada
Anna Slighting, HOPE, Honoring Our Public Education
Jessica Ferrato, Nevada Association of School Boards
DeeAnn Roberts, Nevada PTA
Brent Husson, President, Nevada Succeeds
Jonas Peterson, CEO, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Guillermo Vazquez, Executive Director, Educational Support Employees Association
Steven Conger, City of Mesquite
Phillip Kaiser, Washoe Education Association
Edgar Patino, Latin Chamber of Commerce, Nevada, Inc.
Felicia Ortiz, State Board of Education; Vice Chair, Community Implementation Council

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 3

Lou Markouzis, Principal, Mary and Zel Lowman Elementary School
Anthony Nunez, Principal, Orr Middle School
Richard Derrick, Chief Financial Officer/Assistant Manager, City of Henderson
Lindsey Dalley, Moapa Community Educational Advisory Board
David Gardner
Stephen Silberkraus
Alicia Contreras, Mi Familia Vota

VICE CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will open the joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Education and the Assembly Committee on Education with Senate Bill (S.B.) 178.

SENATE BILL 178: Revises provisions relating to the funding formula for K-12 public education. (BDR 34-792)

SENATOR MOISES DENIS (Senatorial District No. 2):

This bill, S.B. 178, modifies provisions related to the funding formula for K–12 public education. Assemblywoman Diaz will address the Zoom school program and Assemblyman Thompson will talk about the Victory schools. Both these programs play a big part in our discussion on S.B. 178.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN OLIVIA DIAZ (Assembly District No. 11):

We have been able to do groundbreaking work, along with the leadership of our Governor, for the state of education in Nevada. The Zoom Schools came out of the 2013 Legislative Session. Every session, we have a finite amount of funds to allocate, and we have to figure out where we can make the most strategic, targeted investment to ensure that our students are thriving in our schools.

In 2013, Senator Denis, Senator Woodhouse, Assemblyman Eisen, Assemblywoman Dondero-Loop and I formed the cadre that basically, along with the State Department of Education (NDE) and the Office of the Governor, put heads together to think about how we can put our English Language Learners (ELL) on a path to make these students college and career ready by the time they exited our system. We came up with a prescriptive Zoom school model where we would ensure there was access to prekindergarten education at underachieving schools with high ELL populations. We also discussed the fact that in large kindergarten classes with students at different language proficiency levels, it would make sense to ensure that the kindergarten class sizes were

manageable for the teachers. We also wanted to ensure that, per the Zoom schools bill, we had reading centers because ELL kids would likely not have that support in their homes, and we wanted to ensure they had that support when they were in school.

In my own teaching experience with high ELL populations, I saw the value of extending the school year for these kids. When I worked in a year-round model versus the nine-month model, I saw that the students were able to keep up their growth and achievement versus having that summer gap when they were not in school.

We put all four of these practices into the Zoom school program. It has been a successful addition to our school districts, and according to the NDE external auditor, it is a good model that we should continue. Some of the numbers on where our Hispanic and African-American students are in terms of reading on grade level are not where we want them to be. We want to see that all Hispanic and African-American students are on a path to graduate from high school and go on to higher education. We need to stay the course with the Zoom schools, and the weighted funding formula in S.B. 178 will allow us to expand that program to other schools.

ASSEMBLYMAN TYRONE THOMPSON (Assembly District No. 17):

I echo the comments made so far, and I want to reiterate that the working group has worked diligently in the past two months on this issue. We wanted to carefully consider the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to look at ways to align children from the lowest performing quartile throughout the State. The ESSA was signed into law in December 2015, and places a major emphasis on reducing the achievement gaps between subgroups of students, which can be very subjective, depending on the community.

Victory schools have only been in existence for around 2 years, with the initial aim to look at the 20 poorest zip codes in the State and focus on the students who were not achieving well because poverty and poor student achievement can be connected. In the Clark County School District (CCSD), I am pleased with the progress of sister schools, Jacob E. Manch Elementary School and Mary and Zel Lowman Elementary School in my Assembly District in North Las Vegas.

These schools are close together, housing more than 1,000 students. With the close to \$1 million each school received, the principals decided to join forces in developing their community plan, because they know that community is important. At the Victory schools, the social needs of students needs to be addressed in order to educate the children. It is important to take a holistic approach of what is going on with students in the home and the community to help them succeed at school. This past weekend, we planted a community garden for those school communities, incorporating help from the Nellis Air Force Base and both schools' parents. It always disheartens me when I hear people say that parents are not engaged because they really were engaged with us and this garden.

We want input from our two Committees today and from the community. We know we need to make this right. The Nevada Plan, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 387.121, which was the mechanism to finance elementary and secondary public education in the State, was created in 1967, the same year I was born. Now, 50 years later, we need to make it better.

SENATOR DENIS:

One of the significant and crosscutting efforts we have undertaken in recent years, particularly during the last Session, has been modernizing the State's funding formula for kindergarten through Grade 12 (K-12) education so more money is allocated for students with greater needs. This includes students from lower-income families, are ELL, have disabilities, or who are gifted and talented.

The historical funding formula, referred to as the Nevada Plan, was created by the 1967 Legislature, as Assemblyman Thompson mentioned earlier. I was a first grader at Robert E. Lake Elementary School in the CCSD at that time. In 1967, it was understood that a new funding formula was desperately needed, but would be unsuccessful if it simply set out to "rearrange the furniture." The Legislature supplemented the new funding formula with a new source of revenue—the Local School Support Tax.

The Nevada Plan was designed to yield equity among Nevada's increasingly diverse school districts. Washoe County and Clark County were quickly becoming urban and very different from other school districts in the State. There was not any real consideration given to the diversity of Nevada's student population because at that time, it was not diverse. Fast-forward 50 years, and

Nevada is an entirely different place. Clark County now has twice as many K-12 students as it had people in 1967. Only 1 percent of the State's residents were Hispanic back then, and now it is 28 percent of the CCSD total student population and 50 percent of students in kindergarten through third grade, which is a trend that will likely continue through the ranks of CCSD students.

Nevada was a middle-class State 50 years ago. Now, nearly half our students qualify for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch (FRL). Clearly, Nevada now needs a school funding formula that provides equity, not only among its diverse school districts, but also among its diverse student body. We also need to be sure the funding we provide is adequate, which brings us to recent efforts to revise the Nevada Plan. As a result of Interim studies and discussions in previous Legislative Sessions, a plan was established to provide additional services to the four groups of students I mentioned earlier. This was to be done through a multiplier or through additional weighted funding as a flat dollar amount. Stakeholders are in general agreement that weighted funding may be preferable to a multiplier, so S.B. 178 uses weighted funding.

As decided during the 2015 Session, the first group moving to the new weighted funding formula has been students with disabilities. Beginning in the current fiscal year, students with disabilities are funded at 150 percent of the standard rate per pupil. Weighted funding for gifted and talented students is approximately \$500 per student beyond the basic support guarantee, and the impacts of this funding for Gifted and Talented Education students are being studied. For the two other subgroups of students who require weighted funding—low-income and ELL students—the 2015 Legislature appropriated a substantial down payment to serve them through expanded categorical programs and has been monitoring the costs of educating these students.

The successful Zoom schools program, which provides literacy and other supports for ELL students, was doubled in size to \$100 million over the current biennium. An additional \$50 million was appropriated for the new Victory schools program, supporting extra literacy instruction and other supports at 35 of Nevada's poorest and underperforming schools.

The money invested in these programs is not only moving the needle on academic progress, it is making it possible, over the long term, for ELL and lower-income students to be more equitably funded in the Nevada Plan. After

hours of discussion with many stakeholders including Legislators and educators, and with the assistance of staff, we have developed a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) to S.B. 178 that represents a significant step forward in our collective, long-term goal of adequately and equitably serving the special populations of students in our State who require additional resources to meet their needs.

With the proposed conceptual amendment, S.B. 178 continues funding for existing Victory and Zoom schools. The kids in these schools are thriving, and this work must continue. This bill also builds a policy bridge to the future, by establishing a strategy for increasing supports for those ELL and FRL students who do not currently benefit from weighted funding.

In my presentation ([Exhibit D](#)), the scale on page 2 represents the performance of Nevada's higher-risk students a few years ago. For too long, many of these students found themselves on the left side of the scale, performing below proficiency, so their schools needed additional, targeted resources to meet their additional academic needs. A significant portion of those students were, and are, ELL, represented by the red blocks, and students eligible for FRL, represented by the green blocks.

On page 3, [Exhibit D](#), you can see that we have made big investments in the Zoom and Victory programs to serve ELL and FRL students, and they have paid dividends. Many of the targeted students have already moved to proficiency and more are getting close. However, some of those ELL and FRL students are not getting the additional help they need because they do not attend a Zoom or Victory school. Thus, it will be difficult for them to move to the other side of the scale. Senate Bill 178 proposes to address this issue.

The premise of the stakeholder conversation around the funding formula was that in order to have the greatest impact on student achievement with the new money available this Session, we would need to prioritize the lowest performing students first. The reason for this is that there is not enough funding available to serve all the students in these categories and also because some of these students are already performing well.

With the proposed amendment, S.B. 178 calls for identifying and providing weighted funding for those ELL and FRL students who score in the bottom

quartile on statewide assessments, but who do not attend a Zoom or Victory school, [Exhibit D](#), page 4. This ensures the new funding we appropriate gets to those students who need it most. The weighted funding is \$1,200 per student and is funded only once if a student falls into both the ELL and FRL categories.

Funding for these students will be further prioritized according to the school they attend. It will go first to those at 1-Star schools, then 2-Star schools, then 3-Star schools and so on. If we do not have enough funding to serve an entire tier of schools, we will fund those schools with the greatest number of ELL and FRL students performing in the bottom 25 percent. This funding will build capacity at schools that are struggling to meet the needs of underperforming students. Hopefully, it will also help those schools to attract more teachers that are effective. The services provided with this money will largely be based upon the successful Zoom and Victory models. The statute will broadly outline service options with further detail provided in regulation. They will have to pick from services that are available.

As you can review in the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), schools will have some limited flexibility in choosing their service mix, and the statewide evaluation process will measure and monitor the effectiveness of each approach. We will also ensure alignment between the services provided and any school or district achievement plans such as the ELL master plans. In those instances where a school may not have enough qualifying students to reach necessary economies of scale, as may often be the case in very rural areas, the bill encourages coordinating services between multiple schools to maximize the benefit to students.

For example, if a school wanted to do a reading center and did not have enough students, in some areas, several schools could be combined to provide that service, depending on how much money they have available. We will measure the impact and effectiveness of these programs through performance targets and annual measurable objectives aligned with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). An external evaluator will be contracted to analyze the outcomes and report back to the Legislature.

After the implementation of [S.B. 178](#), this is where we believe we will be, [Exhibit D](#), page 5, though it may take a few years. A few additional red and green blocks have moved to the right side, representing the new students

funded through the bill. There may be some additional students, represented by the blue and purple blocks that have moved to the right who also achieve proficiency as an ancillary benefit to having the new services, such as a reading center, in their school. The new funds committed this Session will serve students and schools that have not received additional support thus far. Some might be served through a few new Zoom and Victory schools, but most students will be in lower performing schools with lower concentrations of ELL and FRL students. Senate Bill 178 provides a structural bridge between the progress made over the past three years, and our long-term objective of higher achievement for these special groups of students.

Page 6, [Exhibit D](#), shows what we hope the future looks like—where students living in challenging circumstances and performing below proficiency are the exception rather than the rule. To ensure our success, there is continued policy work to be done. We need to further refine the definitions of the students to be served, and to further clarify the costs of providing appropriate services. To this end, the bill also calls for an important Interim study to proceed with these tasks. The study will update the information contained in the 2012 “Study of a New Method of Funding for Public Schools in Nevada” and it will establish an appropriate definition of pupils at risk and recommend funding to serve these students. Currently, we use FRL as a proxy for identifying students who are at risk, but we want to see if there is a better measure to use.

The Interim study will also review the weighted funding needed for students with disabilities, establish an appropriate definition of gifted and talented and provide the Legislature with information needed to ensure that ongoing resources are used for the most effective interventions and that in the future, new resources are targeted to students with the greatest need.

Administratively, S.B. 178 also requires a few important measures, including requiring that the State Board of Education adopt regulations requiring districts and charter schools to report the number of students enrolled who are identified as ELL or FRL. Second, the bill requires the NDE to prescribe annual measurable objectives and performance targets to track school performance in supporting these students. Finally, districts and charter schools must submit an annual report to the NDE detailing their results against the prescribed annual objectives and performance targets, and they must submit a plan for meeting the objectives and targets in the ensuing school year.

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 10

PAT SKORKOWSKY (Superintendent, Clark County School District):

The CCSD fully supports S.B. 178. Over the past several weeks, my staff and I have worked with the sponsors of this bill and with stakeholders on a transition plan to what we hope will ultimately be the foundation for the weighted funding formula. The conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), represents what we believe to be the best approach to serving our English language learners and our most at-risk students with limited funds as the State transitions to a weighted funding formula.

While this bill does not provide the additional money needed to fully fund individual student weights, it is a critical first step to establishing in law this new approach to meeting student needs by utilizing the resources available to us today. This categorical funding will serve more than 25,000 CCSD students who are not currently in Zoom or Victory schools. We have identified nonproficient students that require additional services to improve their academic achievement, according to State standardized assessments.

By focusing on performance for our ELL students and our at-risk students, we can utilize the additional funds within the framework of our ELL Master Plan and individual school performance plans to provide meaningful services that will raise student achievement across the District. We have modeled the potential impact of these funds in schools with small and large populations in these categories to ensure that the money amounts to enough in a single building or across a group of campuses to provide quality services. Our numbers show that this approach will work, and we still contend that the weights must be fully funded, and we commit to working with legislators and stakeholders in the coming years to see the weighted funding formula implemented.

It is important to note that this also complies with the recently signed Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469, which allows us to move forward with weighted funding in the capacity of the areas identified for ELL and FRL and to be able to move forward in the implementation of the reorganization of the CCSD.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 469](#): Provides for the reorganization of large school districts in this State. (BDR 34-986)

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 11

I would like to thank Senator Denis, Senator Woodhouse, Assemblywoman Diaz and Assemblyman Thompson for their effort to work through the issues and make S.B. 178 the foundation on which to build our new funding formula.

STEVE CANAVERO, PH.D. (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

I appreciate Assemblywoman Diaz's opening reflection on the tremendous progress we have made under the Governor's leadership in addressing issues related to underperformance, specifically issues and matters of equity across our State. More than 70,000 students attend one of our 62 Zoom schools in Washoe County or Clark County and we have more than 47 Zoom grant schools in the rural school districts serving ELL students. Since 2015, we have 35 Victory schools across the State serving children in poverty.

From a policy perspective, the problem was how do we as a State transition from the whole-school models of Zoom and Victory to address ELL students and academic achievement and students in poverty and academic achievement? How do we move to a per pupil investment that follows the student to the school site and is tied to specific evidence-based work? The intention of Zoom and Victory schools is what I call an invest-evaluate-reinvest model where we identify those programs that yield results for students, and we can appreciate the costs of those programs and their return so we can make reinvestments. In 2015, we doubled the Zoom schools and established the Victory schools. This has given us a tremendous platform to learn from.

Senate Bill 178 takes us a few additional steps. In January, I presented the Governor's recommended budget that expanded the Victory program but had contemplated the expansion of Zoom services, not necessarily Zoom schools, to ELL students across our State. Here, after all our hard work, we have an opportunity to take a few additional steps down that path to serve more pupils who would otherwise not attend a Zoom school or Victory school.

In the first section of the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), it continues to maintain these dollars as categorical, ensuring that we can identify these dollars that are being invested and follow and trace those dollars as they move their way to students and to effective services. We learned a lot from the Zoom and Victory school initiatives to now have an appreciation for what works. In some cases, there is built-in flexibility to have leveraged the economies of scale. All of

that is aligned around services that we know can work. There are accountability provisions within the bill that ensure we maintain a focus on closing the achievement gap and serving the bottom quartile of students who are receiving the benefit of these services through the dollars.

I know we have more work to do on our numbers, but I wanted to give you a frame. I have not reconciled this specifically to the language, but I think we are aligned in spirit and working with the school districts to ascertain the number of pupils in the bottom quartile who are not being served in Zoom schools or Victory schools. We should be proud that there are many students in the State who would otherwise be in 1-Star or 2-Star schools that are being served with the Zoom or Victory programs.

Across Nevada, students in 1-Star, 2-Star and 3-Star schools, up to 35,000 pupils would benefit from S.B. 178. In total, across all the schools in the bottom quartile that are non-Zoom and non-Victory, with students in poverty or ELL, up to 54,000 pupils across the State would be affected. We are making significant headway in providing additional services to those students who need it the most.

TRACY DAVIS (Superintendent, Washoe County School District):

We support S.B. 178, and we believe this funding formula directs resources to our students who need the most help. Weighted student funding is one way to address those needs. While the priority of the Washoe County School District (WCSD) is to address the needs of all students and stand strong that adequately funding all students is our priority, we understand that when resources are limited, targeting the students struggling the most is the pragmatic path forward.

These additional resources will go to provide proven services to our struggling, poor and ELL students who are currently not being served under Zoom and Victory programs. In the WCSD, 50 percent of our ELL students are not in Zoom schools and 94 percent of our FRL students are not in Victory schools. Some of the examples of additional services we expect to provide with this money will include early learning, extended learning times through summer school and intersessions and ensuring our teachers are especially trained in teaching our students struggling with language or living in poverty.

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 13

We appreciate the Governor's request that additional revenues go to weighted funding. While we have been unable to validate the eligible students in Washoe County, we will continue to work with the NDE so those numbers are validated to ensure that eligible students in Washoe County are clearly funded. Providing this extra support for these students is critical to ensure we achieve our WCSD goal of a 90 percent graduation rate by 2020. For me, being a Nevadan raised in the CCSD, this will ensure that all kids are being served so we can get the very best and brightest out of our students in Nevada.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents; Nevada Association of School Administrators):

Today I am representing Jeff Zander, the Elko County Superintendent of Schools who participated in all the meetings over the past month in preparation for this important topic of weighted funding formula. Mr. Zander represented rural school districts and wanted me to share a few thoughts with you, including the discussion about the equity of whether funding should be differentiated between rural school districts and more metropolitan areas. The cost of most services in rural districts are higher per pupil because of the inability in many cases to consolidate services. This bill provides additional resources that will reduce the application process and help the rural districts. It is an opportunity during the next biennium to study the process, the distribution and programming, and see what kind of results we can generate with our students, and hopefully come up with a plan to help all the students in the State. We support S.B. 178.

STEPHEN AUGSPURGER (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):

We are in strong support of S.B. 178 and thank the sponsors of the bill for their leadership in pushing this idea forward. We had a good work group that met late at night and early in the morning, and it was truly a collective effort.

This is a unique bill because it does something we have talked about doing for a long time—making sure that the money proposed by this bill gets to the children who need it the most. The policy is sound, because it recognizes that not all children cost the same to educate. This bill preserves the Zoom and Victory programs and makes use of money that is outside of the Distributive School Account (DSA), so no one will have less money. That is important. In the current Zoom and Victory programs, money follows to the school designated as

Zoom or Victory. These programs have had great success, but they only serve the students who attend the Zoom or Victory schools. Thousands of other students need those services but do not receive them.

Senate Bill 178 will provide targeted funding to those students in the bottom quartile who are not currently attending a Zoom or Victory school. The money will follow the student, and it is not discretionary. It will provide choice and flexibility with programming, but only from a menu of prescriptive options.

JOHN VELLARDITA (Executive Director, Clark County Education Association):
We support this bill. There has been lengthy discussion over several Legislative Sessions about how to adequately fund our school systems. In 2009, after the economy tanked, there were significant cuts of more than \$1 billion to education in the State. Since then, we have been on this path to try to restore that funding and to figure out how we can increase funding.

In 2013, we had a watershed moment with the introduction of a different model called the Zoom program to address the needs of a particular student population. In 2015, we expanded that model to the Victory schools. This model was building-centric, zip code-centric and tried to put as many resources that were very prescriptive with designated outcomes to students in need. The results are Starting to come in that show significant progress.

At a certain point, and this is the bridge to the weight concept, you cannot do a building model or a zip code model; you have to figure out how much money you need per pupil, where does that money follow that pupil, and what kind of service and outcomes can come with that. Even if we were talking today about a \$1 billion solution on the weights, which is what S.B. 178 was when it was introduced, we would still be discussing what we are talking about today, which is how much money do you provide for each kid, and what kind of service does it buy for intervention that proves successful outcomes to educate a kid?

What is significant about this process is that we dug down on the lowest proficient student in the State. Superintendent Canavero indicated there are about 54,000 students in the lowest quartile, and what is important about that number is that 84 percent of those students are in the CCSD, which is an urban school district. It has challenges that are unique to any other district in the State. Of the 357 schools in the CCSD, 248 of those schools have low

proficient kids who are part of this target population. Figuring out a model with intervention to teach these kids with the appropriate mechanisms they need to raise their proficiency is what the challenge has been around this issue.

We support this bill because it is prescriptive and not discretionary on the part of a school district. There is a menu of intervention strategies, and it is outside of the DSA, so it cannot be used except for those purposes, and the money goes specifically to those target populations. It is a flat value, not a multiplier, which is important, because it can demonstrate how much money we need. What is proposed in the bill is \$1,200 per kid per year in each year of the biennium. That is \$119 million. There is \$72 million that has been put into S.B. 178 that the Governor proposed, and we need another \$46 million to cover all 54,000 kids. Otherwise, we will take the approach where we do the 1-Star schools, then the 2-Star schools and so on until we run out of money. We think this is a transitional concept and a bridge to the weights. It is a good policy discussion and an acknowledgement of our political reality. There is limited funding, and there is only so far you can go to try and address the public education needs in Nevada.

This will be good for the CCSD because it is an urban school district, and the current Nevada Plan has not been successful for it. This is a step in the right direction. Our educators will like this because it will give them the appropriate tools and resources to do what they do best, which is to have intervention strategies so they can teach these kids and raise their proficiency levels. Kudos to everyone who worked on this, particularly those who worked on the reorganization in the CCSD, which required a bipartisan approach that recommended and advocated a weighted funding formula.

CHRIS DALY (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association, on behalf of our 31 local affiliates, supports S.B. 178 with the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#). I have submitted a letter of support that includes my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

SYLVIA LAZOS (Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now):

I represent Educate Nevada Now (ENN), powered by the Rogers Foundation, and we support S.B. 178 with gratitude to everyone who open-mindedly made this bill happen. This is the right policy, and it will preserve the return on investment (ROI) of our original Zoom and Victory programs so we can maintain the strong

link between investment and results. We will have accountability and transparency, and we will continue that third party evaluation. This bill may not be the full package that some people wanted, but it gets us going in the right direction, and we are grateful for the bipartisan support. I have submitted ENN's letter of support that includes my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

NANCY BRUNE (Director, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities):

The Guinn Center for Policy Priorities supports the efforts to move toward a weighted funding formula in [S.B. 178](#), and supports the articulation of a model as outlined in the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#). Our support is informed, in part, by feedback and testimony from Local Education Agencies (LEA) that are weary of unfunded mandates by the State Legislature.

The Guinn Center believes that if the Legislature partially funds a weighted funding formula without infusing or targeting sufficient resources needed to enable that progress, then the LEA will be in an unfair position of providing accountability. Further, the Guinn Center believes this is an equity approach versus an equality approach to the funding formula for K-12 public education.

To ensure that the implementation of the transition to a fully funded weighted funding model enables student success, the amount of investment must be sufficient to enable services and interventions that are required for the targeted students to improve academic performance. Otherwise, this will turn into another unfunded mandate and undermine any confidence in our State's ability to manage and leverage additional investments to have that positive ROI.

We believe the success of Zoom and Victory schools provides the appropriate research-based proof of concept for the types of interventions, services and incentives that lead to student progress and that we should use these programs to inform the per pupil allocation. At Victory and Zoom schools, the allocation for all students is roughly \$1,200 to \$1,300 per pupil. As such, we believe the per pupil allocation of \$1,200 echoes the resourcing of Zoom and Victory programming, where we have seen early signs of success.

Additionally, we support the decision model for prioritizing the distribution of limited funds so they reach the students at our highest need schools. Specifically, we support prioritizing the distribution of funds targeting the least proficient students in our highest need schools, characterized by the lowest

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 17

ranking on the NEPF, which are the 1-Star and 2-Star schools. In short, we believe this approach in S.B. 178 and the conceptual amendments is more aligned to the equity versus an equality approach.

LISA MORRIS HIBBLER (Director, Youth Development and Social Innovation, City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas has 4 1-Star schools, 33 2-Star schools and 46 3-Star schools. This means that 73 percent of our schools would potentially benefit from the proposed weighted funding formula in S.B. 178. We believe that improving academic outcomes for our students in poverty or ELL programs requires comprehensive, academic, social and health services that respond to the needs of our students. To achieve this goal, adequate funding is necessary. We support this bill because it will move us in the direction of an equity model that supports our most vulnerable students.

TIFFANY TYLER, PH.D. (CEO, Communities in Schools of Nevada):

I support S.B. 178 because anything we can do to ensure that these students have a safety net to address the whole child is worthwhile. We also support the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LISA KRASNER (Assembly District No. 26):

I see that the money is going for ELL students and at-risk students, but I do not see a definition of "at risk." Can you clarify? Also, what will the money be spent on?

MR. CANAVERO:

For purposes of the discussion on this bill, "at risk" is defined as pertaining to students in the lowest quartile of academic proficiency or FRL students also in poverty.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER:

Will the money be spent for learning materials? I know we do not have any text books, online books or learning materials in our schools right now, so where will the money be spent?

SENATOR DENIS:

On page 3 in the proposed amendment, [Exhibit C](#), under authorized services, it lists the different services that could be used for the plan the school would

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 18

come up with. It is specific to what the school can do, and then the school would have to show how it was done. For example, a reading center would require certain materials so those materials would be purchased with the money to get it up and running.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER:

I am glad there is going to be a reading center.

SENATOR DENIS:

If that is what that school chooses to do, and many of them will.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER:

If there is a reading center, will children from the general school population also be able to use those books?

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes, the whole school gets the benefit of the reading center.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER:

That is wonderful.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

We have schools that receive additional funding, either through Title I, Zoom or Victory, and then we have schools with high parental involvement that do a lot of fund-raising, and then we have schools that are what we call the bubble schools, where they do not get the extra resources. In Washoe County, that is about 40 percent of the schools, and I appreciate how this addresses those schools.

How does this tie in with a school where students might be receiving extra resources, particularly in the FRL and at-risk category in the Title I schools? Would that be on top of the additional resources they are getting federally?

MR. CANAVERO:

The federal funds follow the students and are funded through the school district to the schools. This would be under the supplement, not supplant federal rules; these would be additional dollars that would be in service to students at the

school site. They should lay on top of the State appropriation, the local, the federal and then the weight.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

I suppose the only concern then would be the bubble schools. Those students who are ELL or FRL would be getting that additional funding, but if we were to be concerned about spreading this a little farther, is the doubling up problematic?

SENATOR DENIS:

To have the success with Zoom and Victory, it had to be prescriptive. With the federal funds, they have to be used a certain way, and without that you do not have a concentrated plan. Those are funds that were being used for certain things before Zoom and Victory, but they need additional funds on top of that. While \$1,200 is not necessarily the perfect number for what they need, because they actually need more than that, we do not want to take away from whatever successes they have had there.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

Can you elaborate on how this bill will help the kids represented by the blue and purple blocks from your presentation, [Exhibit D](#); the students who do not fall into the ELL or FRL categories, but who are still in that 25 percent of low proficiency?

SENATOR DENIS:

While the money does follow the student, because those services are available at the school the student attends, the other students will also benefit. For example, in Zoom schools, there is a reading center, so anyone in the school can go there for help. They are not screened for their status. Additionally, these schools, because they have these services, they also have expertise there that all the teachers in that school can use. Hopefully, as the kids move up in grades, we can move further on the scale of the tiered schools in the future.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER:

In the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), on page 1 it states that you are using the final count from the previous school year, and you are counting those students in the four categories of need. It also refers to the lowest rating categories being the schools that will receive the resources first. I want to

ensure that we are using current data. If we are using the Star system, I know that is not updated very often. Why not just get the data, find out what schools have the most students in need and then create a category instead of the Star system? As students grow out of these need categories, will the data be recent enough so we can quickly recategorize the schools as the students improve?

SENATOR DENIS:

The only reason for the tiered system was because we do not have unlimited funds to go across the board. The students are first identified for their achievement and need levels and then the Star system is based on that.

MR. CANAVERO:

That is exactly what we started with, last year's data file. It was agnostic to Star ratings, we looked at the bottom quartile of performance, and as we added a dimension of priority related to Stars, then we looked at where those students were enrolled and the school Star rating as a way to begin to identify which tier or school we would hit first.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER:

I am still not clear why you would take old data from our Star system and use it to categorize the previous year's data? Why not create a new categorizing system of the most needy schools at that moment? Also, as the students improve, would you change the categories every year?

MR. CANAVERO:

We would love to use the most recent data. I do not know if the numbers of the actual pupils we identified in the bottom quartile would change with regard to the Star status of the school. The difference between just running the file and then running the file against the Star rating of the school was around 3,600 students out of 51,000 students. Under the division of the weight, as the dollars invested grow and the students are supported by the weight, it could continue through time. The student would not lose the weight if he or she went into a 4-Star school. The vision for the weight is that it grows and continues to follow those students

SENATOR HAMMOND:

You will not find a disagreement from me when it comes to some of the statements you have made. You mentioned that every student learns differently

and that the amount of money it takes to educate a person is different for everyone. I want to look at how you are determining what students receive this money. There is a formula for determining who is ELL in the bill. You also determine that students on the FRL list will also receive money. I want to know more about that process. How do we know for sure that someone is FRL? If the money follows the child, what happens if that child is no longer FRL? If they get off that program, will the money stop following them? I am asking that because not every student on FRL absolutely needs the extra help and not every student is impoverished to the point where he or she needs extra help.

There may be some who need it more, so there has to be a mechanism to make sure students are able to get off that list so we can get money into the hands of students who really need that extra help. How do they get off, and what do you do to reallocate that money? What if there are more ELL students who are taking more of the money. Do you have a preference in the bill for them? Do you weight it more toward the ELL students or to the FRL students? We want to have enough money for all the students.

MR. CANAVERO:

That is one reason we looked at the bottom quartile of performance as a way to identify those students who needed the first lift. Depending on the analysis, we created a new dimension based on the Star rating of the schools in order to distribute the funds. We set the first criteria around the bottom quartile performance, and then we added to it in the order in which the funds would be distributed on the off chance that as we get deeper into these data sets, we see these numbers grow. We are using last year's proficiency data and the October count, which is our official snapshot of our State with ELL or FRL status within the bottom quartile.

The in and out of a student in the program is something that should be considered, and we should learn about how many students come in and out of FRL status and how frequently that happens.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

What happens if you take the bottom quartile and put the money into the school and it improves? Do you reevaluate and say those students do not get the money because now the school is performing as is should be? Is there a reverse incentive to not perform that well?

MR. CANAVERO:

Interestingly, when we reviewed our data, the majority of students in the bottom quartile are in our 3-Star schools. When you begin to exclude students who are Zoom and Victory, we suddenly see fewer and fewer students in 1-Star schools who are not being supported, and we see more in the 3-Star schools. Having students progress through the Star rating and then out of service is an interesting bridge that, when we ran the data, provided additional supports to students in those schools. It also picked up a group of students that were not usually covered by tremendous intervention, the so-called bubble school kids, as Assemblywoman Tolles referenced.

Senator DENIS:

This first part is the bridge. What we are trying to get to is a weight, and if we get to that weight in the future, it will be able to answer some of these other questions. When you have limited funds you have to target a specific group. We do not want to punish schools that were 1-Star and 2-Star that are now 3-Star through 5-Star schools, but if we have to make a choice, we are going to target the ones that need it the most and then as they move up, we hope to come back in 2 years to be able to implement some kind of a weight.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

That bridge you are talking about is the part where an independent consultant will come in. Any idea how much that will cost?

MR. CANAVERO:

I want to say it was between \$120,000 and \$200,000 when we reviewed the last similar study during the prior biennium.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER:

The conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), seems to make it so the money follows the school, not the student. While going off a Star rating, I see there are many examples of 4-Star and 5-Star schools with very high FRL and ELL numbers and students with identified special needs. Because of the higher Star ratings of those schools, does that mean those students will not receive the weighted funding? Some of the 1-Star and 2-Star schools on the list have even lower FRL numbers.

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 23

SENATOR DENIS:

The money does follow the student, because that is the qualifier. It is the student before the school. Because of the school prioritization, there is the possibility that those kids in the higher Star rated schools will run out of funding if we run out of money.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER:

So they would not get the funding in the 4-Star and 5-Star schools?

SENATOR DENIS:

Correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER:

In the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), on page 2, it requires an independent consultant to evaluate the program. Will it be a measurement of proficiency or growth?

MR. CANAVERO:

Both.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER:

When there is a menu of evidence-based strategies the schools can choose from, if the school or a School Organizational Team (SOT) comes up with an evidence-based strategy that is not on the list, can they petition to employ that strategy?

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes, that is in there

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I think what we are looking at here is a paradigm for equity versus equality, which is meeting the students where they are and trying to get them where they should be.

ASSEMBLYMAN MCCURDY II:

I am excited about where we are headed. When this was initially done, it was with S.B. No. 432 of the 78th Session, the Victory bill, which allowed for roughly \$1,137 per pupil to go toward the Victory schools. That included

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 24

49 percent that could also go to a list of wraparound services to help with social and emotional support, food and securities, and unstable homes.

As I look through the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), we are up to \$1,200, which is great, but how are we going to allow for students to still receive those extra wraparound services when we are decreasing what can be allocated toward those services by saying no less than 30 percent can go to the list of items on the bottom of page 3? I know we are still trying to flesh out the definition of at-risk students or schools, but could you clarify how this will work? Coming from my district with eight schools on the Victory school list, I want to know how we will cater to those schools and students in desperate need of those services.

SENATOR DENIS:

You are right, the language here is pretty much the same language coming out of the Victory bill, except for the percentage. When we, as a group, discussed what kind of services we should include, we talked about it being a little more prescriptive than the current Victory law. Schools will still be able to do those services, but we are asking that they do some other things in addition to that.

ASSEMBLYMAN MCCURDY II:

Why did the allocation go down from the previous bill, which was that no less than 49 percent to be allocated toward services, including the wraparound services? Now we are going down to not more than 30 percent. This is not to say a school should spend 50 percent of its allocation on wraparound services, but not all schools are alike. Can we look more closely at this percentage to help with emotional support, food and securities that many students suffer from because of their home situations?

CHAIR THOMPSON:

In our Assembly Committee on Education, we recently voted for the Victory school bill to move the wraparound, evidence-based practices into the upper percent of what a Victory school plan could be. I believe that could be where Assemblyman McCurdy is trying to go with this, not seeing it in the secondary category, but bumped up to 70 percent.

SENATOR HARRIS:

What happens if your school qualifies for the extra money, but it does show measurable improvement based on the objectives determined? In the next school year, will money be pulled from that school, particularly if there is not enough money to go to all the students? Based on what I see and hear from the money committees, we are unlikely to have enough money to fund every child who will qualify under the definition of FRL and ELL students. How do we equitably distribute this funding and get schools to buy in to help these kids perform and not have them worry that they are at risk of losing their funding?

MR. CANAVERO:

I believe it is in the Victory schools where the NDE Superintendent has the authority to make corrective action plans for a variety of reasons. This could be one of those reasons. It would not mean withdrawing the funds; it would mean being more prescriptive and increased monitoring. One thing we were discussing is aligning the accountability in the schools toward the targets and metrics in our new school performance index; the Star rating system so we could track this, not only on a school's progress, but also accrue to the Star rating system, which has built-in provisions for both federal and State accountability. This provides both immediate corrective action and long-term focus on improving outcomes for students.

SENATOR HARRIS:

I would like to see more detail. I am hearing you say that once you get the money, you will continue to get the money, even if you are not showing a measurable improvement. How many times are you going to be able to not move the needle before those limited funds will be moved to a place where the needle can be moved?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ:

It is important to remember that we all supported A.B. 469, pertaining to the reorganization of large school districts, specifically the CCSD. If we are going to be successful with that effort, we cannot just say we are reorganizing the school district; we need to give the schools the resources they need. It is not about what the children want; it is about what the children need. If we are going to get to that perfect empowerment model, this is the Start. We need to make sure the funding follows the kids so the parents involved in the SOTs can have a voice to request programs their kids need.

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 26

CHAIR THOMPSON:

We have to be careful that we do not look collectively at a school Star rating. We are looking at the individual student to move the needle. It mixes our message when we talk about looking at 1-Star, 2-Star and 3-Star schools, because that is the way we are trying to look at allocation of dollars. We have to come back to each of the 50,000 to 60,000 kids to look at whether we are seeing some progress and some upward mobility. We need to see the scale balance a bit more. We do not want to get caught up in a school moving from 1-Star to 2-Stars; it is not collectively looked at that; it is the student achievement.

VICE CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will take supporting testimony for S.B. 178.

ANNA SLIGHTING (HOPE, Honoring Our Public Education):

I represent Hope for Nevada, and weighted funding has been one of our platform issues since last Session. We are confident that the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), is a great first step. We realize there is so much more to do, but we are in full support of S.B. 178. We like the guidelines that supports, among other things, the SOTs.

JESSICA FERRATO (Nevada Association of School Boards):

We support this bill. It is part of iNVEST, which stands for Investing in Nevada's Education, Students and Teachers which all our districts and boards have voted to support.

DEEANN ROBERTS (Nevada PTA):

We fully support S.B. 178, and we feel it is critical that we have equitable funding for all students.

BRENT HUSSON (President, Nevada Succeeds):

I represent a K-12 policy organization funded by the business community. The beginning of Zoom schools and Victory schools was a conversation that was had at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) back in 2012. We were at a lunch with some UNLV professors talking about the reading skills development centers they were developing there. That conversation lead to the 2013 Legislative Session where Zoom schools were created and expanded in the 2015 Session. Now we are looking to the next iteration. This is an iterative

process and we have not figured it out completely. This is the next step, and not the final step.

One of the critical pieces to consider is whether students who are funded and they increase their achievement, do they lose their funding and then that ultimately hurts the school they attend? This bill will get us where we need to be to serve the children who need it the most, and to fund the structure that is going to be placed on all school districts by 2022. If we Start weighted funding now and are given the opportunity to do it in small doses, they can figure out what works and what does not work and over time we can get it right.

JONAS PETERSON (CEO, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):

We support S.B. 178, because it is a powerful step in the right direction to ultimately move us to a weighted funding formula. This approach demonstrates to companies considering moving or expanding to Nevada that we really are committed to improving our education system.

GUILLERMO VAZQUEZ (Executive Director, Educational Support Employees Association):

My organization represents the 11,000 support staff, and we support S.B. 178. Our employees deal with students every day in various settings, and we see the need for the at-risk and ELL students to have the additional services. They are the most vulnerable students, and they deserve the extra support. We go the extra mile for these students, and we are asking you to do the same.

STEVEN CONGER (City of Mesquite):

The City of Mesquite is in support of S.B. 178. The Virgin Valley has a sizeable Hispanic population. Joseph L. Bowler Sr. Elementary School in Bunkerville, Nevada has a 30 percent ELL population that is not being affected by the current funding model, with a total of 300 students in the entire Virgin Valley also not being included. The weighted funding formula would fill in those gaps.

PHILLIP KAISER (Washoe Education Association):

I am speaking as a parent and a teacher in the public schools. I have three children who went through public school; one with special needs. I support the weighted formula and think it creates greater equity. My concern is that we take measures to make sure it goes outside Zoom and Victory schools and outside the 1-Star and 2-Star schools and the bubble schools, as

Assemblywoman Tolles mentioned. It may seem expensive—education always seems expensive—but ignorance is more expensive. If we want to look for money, keep all the public funding in the public schools and not divert it to private and religious schools.

EDGAR PATINO (Latin Chamber of Commerce, Nevada, Inc.):

We support S.B. 178 because this will ensure that our most at-risk students receive additional funding to address their academic needs. We also support the conceptual amendment that focuses funding on the proficiency of at-risk and ELL students, providing needed services to more than 50,000 students in Nevada. We believe more funding is needed to address all students. The weighted funding formula should be fully funded. We look forward to following the upcoming Interim study to ensure Nevada continues to progress. We understand the nexus between educational success and economic prosperity for families and business in the State.

FELICIA ORTIZ (State Board of Education; Vice Chair, Community Implementation Council):

I support S.B. 178. We have come a long way since 2013, and we need to recognize the success we have had with Zoom and Victory schools and continue those programs. They have done some amazing things for the most needy students in our communities, whether it is the reading club from Zoom, or the wraparound services that are providing things like food or clothing pantries for our students, and other necessary services to help these students be comfortable and willing to come to school. The fact that we are going to be able to continue that is huge. This is a step in the right direction, but it is just one more step for us to achieve those goals of moving our entire State to be the fastest improving state in the Nation. We need to fully fund the weights by the time we get to 2022. This is a great opportunity to change the trajectory of our State and our educational system.

LOU MARKOUZIS (Principal, Mary and Zel Lowman Elementary School):

I am the principal at Mary and Zel Lowman Elementary School where we are in our second year of being a Victory school. We Started by teaming up with nearby J.E. Manch Elementary School, surveying our communities and doing a needs assessment. We found there were three areas of need—wraparound services, which includes the social and emotional support, then instructional components and last was teacher retention.

One of the biggest things we did with wraparound services was to partner with Communities in Schools (CIS). We have three CIS counselors in both campuses. There is a litany of services that come with this organization in terms of food, clothing and addressing major social and emotional issues. We were able to purchase the services of a full-time social worker at each school, dealing with some of the major, adult-based issues that go on in these children's lives. By addressing the wraparound component, in both our campuses, we have seen a large decrease in behavioral incidences; a 67 percent drop at my school alone.

ANTHONY NUNEZ (Principal, Orr Middle School):

As principal, I have had the opportunity to work in both a Victory school and a Zoom school. I am the former principal of J.E. Manch Elementary School. At the Victory school I was principal of, because of the tools, programming and people that we were able to purchase as a result of that funding, we were able to strategically monitor our students and predict their proficiency in the middle of the year. We then orchestrated mid-year course corrections when we noticed we were not on track to make our growth goals. Because we had already built those relationships with the community and the teachers, we were able to do some aggressive changes in the classroom. In 3 months, we saw a 19 percent increase in math proficiency, a 14 percent increase in ELL proficiency. That speaks to the quick changes we can make for the benefit of the students within that 180 days.

For the past 2 years, both our schools have had a staff retention rate of between 80 percent and 90 percent. This is significant, and it means we are not losing our ROI of staff. As a Zoom school, because we can market ourselves as a school that can support its students, in the 7 weeks I have been at Orr, we have been able to take our vacancies for the next year from 14 to 2 vacancies. We have interviews set up and I anticipate being fully staffed before the end of this school year.

RICHARD DERRICK (Chief Financial Officer/Assistant Manager, City of Henderson):
The City of Henderson is in strong support of S.B. 178 and the proposed conceptual amendment. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

LINDSEY DALLEY (Moapa Community Educational Advisory Board):

I represent a parent board that fights for our rural CCSD schools in Moapa Valley, which is 60 miles from Las Vegas. We have four schools, and this bill

would help them all. We support the funds going directly to the schools to be used most effectively. This begins the weighted student journey for the reorganization of the CCSD. Rural schools never have access to the Zoom and Victory schools available in Las Vegas. We ask that rural schools be exempt from the school Star prohibition, so if their school is higher than two Stars, they will not get lost. Second, I have talked to two of our SOT teams, and because of the new transparency from the reorganization, they now see and understand what the CCSD is planning to do. They fear that CCSD could add expenses on the other end to negate the additional funds brought to the school, even though the funds in this bill would be categorical. If CCSD plays these financial shell games, this can strangle the school and additional funds will not be as effective. Safeguards and oversight need to be in place to prevent this.

DAVID GARDNER:

I am a parent of two children in the CCSD with one more coming on next year. This is a giant leap forward. The reorganization gave parents, teachers and frontline staffers a voice they need and the tools to do something with that voice. I support S.B. 178 and how it is targeted to our most vulnerable students.

STEPHEN SILBERKRAUS:

I support S.B. 178 with the proposed conceptual amendment. It is clear that a weighted funding formula is a key piece to truly move the needle in our State's education system. Zoom and Victory schools are working well, but they do not cover all our needy students. Speaking of bubble schools, it is tragic so many students at Robert Taylor Elementary are not receiving the extra services they need. Make sure all our students get an equitable shot at having a successful future.

ALICIA CONTRERAS (Mi Familia Vota):

We support S.B. 178 and appreciate this as a good step forward toward equity for our students and an opportunity to lift those students whose voices may not be heard. Community involvement should continue, and we appreciate being included in the planning for this. We should continue reaching out to community organizations such as Mi Familia Vota and others to really connect with those parents who may not be here. I appreciate the amendments, but they are coming late for us to encourage community involvement.

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 31

SENATOR DENIS:

This bill can make a difference, and I appreciate the work the Governor is doing to make education better in Nevada. I got involved in this process to make education better, and I know we all want to make education better. More than 70,000 Zoom and Victory kids are being helped today, and this would add another 30,000 kids, which amounts to 25 percent of the kids in the State. This can provide the help they need that we have talked about for so long. It can provide the bridge, so we can get to the ultimate weighted funding that would help all the kids in the State.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

To all involved, it is never really easy to go to bat and try to do what we can for public education. It is difficult enough when you do not have enough money, but it is increasingly more difficult when some of the parameters that are against you seem to be emboldened. It will be imperative that we fully engage our friends and families so we have more support for endeavors like this. Teamwork makes the dream work; we are stronger together.

We have a letter of support from Margaret Cullinane to submit ([Exhibit H](#)). I will now close the hearing on S.B. 178.

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

Senate Committee on Education
Assembly Committee on Education
May 17, 2017
Page 32

CHAIR DENIS:

I will open public comment. Seeing no one coming forward, I will close the meeting of the Senate Committee on Education at 6:07 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Moises Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	10		Attendance Roster
S.B. 178	C	3	Senator Moises Denis	Proposed Conceptual Amendment for Senate Bill No. 178
S.B. 178	D	6	Senator Moises Denis	Presentation Before Zoom and Victory
S.B. 178	E	1	Chris Daly / Nevada State Education Association	Letter of Support
S.B. 178	F	2	Sylvia Lazos / Educate Nevada Now	Written Testimony
S.B. 178	G	2	Richard Derrick / City of Henderson	Written Testimony
S.B. 178	H	1	Margaret Cullinane	Letter of Support