

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-ninth Session
June 1, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:25 a.m. on Thursday, June 1, 2017, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 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.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator David R. Parks, Vice Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Becky Harris

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Brody Leiser, Senior Program Analyst
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst
Cathy Crocket, Program Analyst
Jaimarie Dagdagan, Program Analyst
Adam Drost, Program Analyst
Felicia Archer, Committee Secretary
Barbara Williams, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

John Borrowman, Deputy Director of Support Services, Nevada Department of Corrections
Sally Elloyan, Chief, Administrative Division, Nevada Gaming Control Board
John O'Rourke, Lieutenant Colonel, Assistant Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety

Julie Butler, Administrator, General Services Division, Department of Public Safety
Shannon M. Chambers, Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry
William Stanley, Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council
Shelley Hendren, Administrator, Rehabilitation Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
John Vellardita, Clark County Education Association
Theo Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association
Stephen Augspurger, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Brenda Pearson, Professional Learning Director, Clark County Education Association
Betsy Giles, Director of National Board Certification, Clark County Education Association
Vicki Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association
Chelli Smith, Director, Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program
Ron Dreher, Washoe Schools Principals' Association
Meredith Smith, Director of Policy, Nevada Succeeds
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now
John Guedry, Immediate Past Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Virginia M. Mills, President, Education Support Employees Association
Gabriel Leither
Nancy E. Brune, Ph.D., Executive Director, Guinn Center for Policy Priorities
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Natha Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association
Brian McAnallen, City of Las Vegas
Carter Bundy, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International
Marlene Lockard, Retired Public Employees of Nevada
Jeff Fontaine, Nevada Association of Counties
Michael Cathcart, City of Henderson
Peggy Lear Bowen

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will begin today with hearing Assembly Bill (A.B.) 505.

ASSEMBLY BILL 505 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for a new telephone system and certain information systems projects. (BDR S-1200)

JOHN BORROWMAN (Deputy Director of Support Services, Nevada Department of Corrections):

Assembly Bill 505 is a technology investment request. The first item on the bill is for an electronic medical records system. An electronic medical records system will enable the Department of Corrections (DOC) to move away from paper records and ensure accurate medical information is being shared with our community providers. This is important when inmates enter the system and when they return to the community.

The second request is a General Fund appropriation for the continuation of the transition from the Nevada Offender Tracking Information System (NOTIS) to a new internal system. This system is our central database on inmates. It includes the data gathered prior to the inmate arriving at the DOC such as their criminal history and conviction. It also includes all data gathered while they are within the DOC, such as location, credits, eligibility dates, visitation rights and disciplinary infractions. Finally, when the inmate leaves our facility, this information is shared with Parole and Probation and other community providers. The system interfaces with other entities, such as the FBI, courts and Victim's Notification. The platform this system uses will no longer be supported in 2020. This request will allow us to research the options available to us, ensure that we find the right program to continue our business and that will coordinate with our partners.

The third request is for a new telephone system. We have worked with Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS), Department of Administration to determine if the DOC could use its telephone system. The consensus was that, based on our needs, we are unable to use the EITS system, and they fully endorsed us purchasing a separate system.

The final item on the bill is a General Fund appropriation for replacement of the Nevada Staffing Information System used to schedule correctional officers. For evidentiary value, we have to maintain the data on which officer was in which

post, for how long. If there is a claim, we are able to provide that information. We are currently using an Access database. The new system would allow us to schedule officers more efficiently and provide administrative reports in order to maximize our resources.

SENATOR DENIS:

Are all the products off-the-shelf products that are customized individually for your needs?

MR. BORROWMAN:

It is not quite that simple. In general, the information and bids that we are considering at this point are developed products. The electronic medical records system will have to be tailored to the correctional processes. As regards the replacement for NOTIS, there are options to continue to use our current vendor, but we are also looking at other vendors. However, none of this would be custom built just for us. The telephone system would not have to be customized at all. As regards the scheduling software, there are several options, but all of them are predeveloped.

SENATOR PARKS:

Regarding the NOTIS system, is there a timeline for new system implementation?

MR. BORROWMAN:

In the upcoming biennium, we will be reviewing options and determining criteria. Depending on what we choose, we may upgrade our current system. We will have to evaluate all our options critically. When our current system becomes unsupported in 2020, it does not mean we cannot use it. It just becomes subject to risk because it is unsupported. We believe that even after 2020, there is a certain window where it will be viable to use. Therefore, we think we will be able to have an alternative rolled out before we are in any compromised position.

SENATOR PARKS:

Would you be having two parallel operations going at the same time?

MR. BORROWMAN:

That is a possibility. It would be an outcome of what we discover, using these funds to do a feasibility study in the upcoming biennium.

Senate Committee on Finance
June 1, 2017
Page 5

SENATOR PARKS:

What is the \$1,285,440 requested for the continuation of the transition from NOTIS going to be used for?

MR. BORROWMAN:

It includes a master service agreement to help us do the evaluation study. It is a big project, and we want to make sure all facets work well, both internally for us, and externally with our partners with whom we share information.

SENATOR PARKS:

I know that Senate Bill (S.B.) 184 with the Parole Commission was stalled out because of a fiscal note. Will you be working with your sister agencies to ensure interoperability of the new system?

SENATE BILL 184: Revises provisions relating to aggregated sentences and eligibility for parole. (BDR 14-83)

MR. BORROWMAN:

Absolutely. The scope of this request is to ensure that whatever is selected is not just best for DOC, but is also best for the State.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on A.B. 505? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on A.B. 505 and open the hearing on A.B. 506.

ASSEMBLY BILL 506 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Nevada Gaming Control Board for certain costs relating to the Alpha Migration Project. (BDR S-1201)

SALLY ELLOYAN (Chief, Administrative Division, Nevada Gaming Control Board):

Before you is A.B. 506, requesting the continuance of funding for the Alpha Migration Project. This project is successfully and incrementally replacing the Gaming Control Board's information technology (IT) system that is more than 30 years old.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on A.B. 506? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on A.B. 506 and open the hearing on A.B. 507.

ASSEMBLY BILL 507 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Department of Public Safety for the replacement of vehicles, pickup trucks and motorcycles for the Nevada Highway Patrol. (BDR S-1202)

JOHN O'ROURKE (Lieutenant Colonel, Assistant Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety):

Assembly Bill 507 is a request for \$ 8,531,643 for 125 police interceptor utility (PIU) vehicles and 18 pickup trucks. We are also requesting General Fund appropriations of \$385,252 for nine Harley Davidson motorcycles. These vehicles would replace those that have exceeded the mileage thresholds of 125,000 miles for PIU vehicles and pickups, 105,000 for sedans and 50,000 for motorcycles.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Are the vehicles you are replacing offered to other agencies?

LT. COLONEL O'ROURKE:

All of our vehicles are returned to State Purchasing Division. Other State agencies can purchase them there.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on A.B. 507? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on A.B. 507 and open the hearing on A.B. 508.

ASSEMBLY BILL 508 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Department of Public Safety for the replacement of dispatch center consoles and portable hand-held radios. (BDR S-1203)

JULIE BUTLER (Administrator, General Services Division, Department of Public Safety):

The General Services Division houses the Department's three regional dispatch centers in Carson City, Las Vegas and Elko. Assembly Bill 508 requests a Highway Fund appropriation of \$1,218,872 for the replacement of dispatch center consoles and portable hand-held radios for the dispatch centers in Carson City and Las Vegas. The current consoles are at end-of-life, no longer supported by the vendor and suffer frequent downtime. It is difficult to find replacement parts and qualified technicians to work on them. The requested funding would purchase ten desktop consoles and five portables for the Las Vegas center, and five desktop consoles and five portables for the center in

Carson City. This is an officer safety issue, and it is critical that the Department has functional and supported radio equipment in its dispatch centers.

SENATOR DENIS:

What is the life expectancy of a console and a portable radio?

MS. BUTLER:

The ones we currently have were purchased in the 1990s. I would hope we would get at least five to seven years out of the replacements. With technology evolving as quickly as it does, it is hard to say.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I just want to comment that I am still very concerned about closing the dispatch center in Elko. I believe that is an officer safety issue as well.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on A.B. 508? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on A.B. 508 and open the hearing on A.B. 509.

ASSEMBLY BILL 509 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Department of Business and Industry for implementation of an electronic management system for public works and prevailing wage surveys in the Office of the Labor Commissioner. (BDR S-1207)

SHANNON M. CHAMBERS (Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry):

Assembly Bill 509 requests a General Fund appropriation of \$48,920 to implement an electronic management system for public works projects and prevailing wage surveys. Currently, these tasks are done manually using outdated technology. We want to update that process and make it more efficient and responsive.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify regarding A.B. 509?

WILLIAM STANLEY (Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council):

As you are probably aware, the building trades access this data very often. The current format is cumbersome. We certainly support any effort to bring it into an electronic format.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to further testify on A.B. 509? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on A.B. 509 and open the hearing on A.B. 510.

ASSEMBLY BILL 510 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Bureau of Services to Persons Who Are Blind or Visually Impaired of the Rehabilitation Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Rehabilitation Division of the Department for enhancement of client information systems. (BDR S-1208)

SHELLEY HENDREN (Administrator, Rehabilitation Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation):

The Rehabilitation Automated System of Nevada (RASN) is our case management system for the vocational rehabilitation program. The Division purchased source code for the RASN program over 13 years ago. It has been maintained, until recently, by the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation IT personnel. There has been no system upgrade to RASN in 13 years. The manufacturer, Alliance Enterprises, has released over 25 upgrades in that time period. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find programmers with the necessary skills to maintain the system.

The case management system upgrade is necessary to remain compliant with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014, with regard to reporting and operational requirements. All changes within WIOA require changes in programming of our case management system. We have not had a dedicated programmer since September 2014.

It is concerning to depend on such an antiquated system for compliance with a program that brings up to \$24 million annually into the State of Nevada to serve people with disabilities to become employed.

The upgraded Aware Vocational Rehabilitation (Aware VR) product would provide for efficiencies through improved automation, ease of use, screen layout, inventory control, dashboards and ad hoc reporting ability so we can make data-driven decisions in the vocational rehabilitation program. There are enriched data edits and enhanced data search criteria. Aware VR provides more efficient caseload management including reduction of redundant data entry and better integration of other applications.

The Social Security module, for example, meets all the stringent requirements of the Social Security Administration and provides for complete claim management tracking and reporting. We estimated the cost savings of staff time with the new system to be 21,000 hours per year or \$546,000 per year. All of these efficiencies will allow staff to be more responsive to our consumers in Nevada and should result in more successful employment outcomes for Nevadans with disabilities.

My written testimony is submitted for the record ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on A.B. 510? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on A.B. 510 and open the hearing on S.B. 547.

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

SENATOR AARON D. FORD (Senatorial District No. 11):

Senate Bill 547 is intended to require a school district that has agreed to pay teachers and administrators who complete professional growth plans (PGP) to set aside the funds to pay them.

JOHN VELLARDITA (Clark County Education Association):

I want to frame this discussion in the proper context. In the 78th Legislative Session there was funding appropriated to try to improve our education delivery system in the public schools. There was much discussion as to the best way to attract and retain good educators, particularly in at-risk schools. One of the bills that came out of it was A.B. No. 483 of the 78th Legislative Session, which embraced the concept of merit pay.

We had a conversation in our organization on methods of improving performance in today's classroom. In that context, we investigated how to give educators and administrators the tools and resources they need to improve their practices and correlate that with student outcomes. We developed a new salary schedule, in partnership with the Clark County School District (CCSD), that is a radical departure from the way educators have always been compensated. It is now based on their ongoing, continuous professional growth in current, relevant terms.

What came out of that discussion is a salary system based on an educator electing to invest, with their own time and resources, in professional development that improves their practice. It is aligned with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF), which requires annual evaluations and the development of a growth plan for the educator.

What we are proposing with this bill is another reform that asks to set aside monies for those educators and administrators that have completed this high rigor of professional development. This bill has no fiscal impact to the State. It uses the roll-up costs that are already allocated in the Distributive School Account (DSA), which is approximately 2 percent. This bill has no fiscal impact to the local school districts in the first year of the biennium. The bill provides that if an educator completes their PGP, they would move over a column and be paid the incentive. It is the second year of the biennium that there would be a fiscal impact.

Senate Bill 547 applies to any school districts with more than 100,000 pupils, which currently is only CCSD. With the 2 percent roll-up allocated to all school districts of approximately \$54 million in FY 2017-2018 and \$100 million in FY 2018-2019, Clark County gets 75 percent. In April of this year, CCSD estimated that a little under 4,000 educators in the two-year track at Title I schools would be eligible. These are the over 200 schools that are at risk, with vacancy rates of up to 80 percent. These are the schools where we are trying to recruit and retain teachers. The total cost for the school district for this program would be approximately \$27.9 million in the second year of the biennium. The CCSD will receive \$75 million of roll-up costs. That roll-up cost in the DSA, which is intended for step increases, would be in alignment with funding this piece of professional growth. We think in that context this is the type of prescriptive legislation that we need so there is an investment in professional development. There is an incentive for an educator or administrator to make a commitment to hone their practice, have it in alignment with their growth plans, which in turn are in alignment with student growth needs and to correlate it with better outcomes by improving the practice.

SENATOR FORD:

I want to offer context to my colleagues. The concept about which Mr. Vellardita has spoken is a conceptual amendment to S.B. 547. We are in conversations with Staff and are working on articulating the new ideas. In its current form, this bill is a jumping off point.

THEO SMALL (Vice President, Clark County Education Association):

This work has been a five-year collaboration focused on affecting and improving student success in CCSD. The Clark County Education Association (CCEA) is working with the CCSD to ensure we are taking care of the most vulnerable students in our system. The issues we addressed with the District were the new evaluation system, vacancies in our highest-need schools and support for new teachers. The most important problem to address was the recruitment, support and retention of the best talent in all of our schools, but particularly in our hardest-to-fill schools, which we identify as the schools with the highest poverty levels.

We co-created the professional growth system, which tied together an educator's practice through his or her evaluation. It has focused goals on the needs of the students. It asks the questions 1) Who are my students? 2) What needs do they have? and 3) How do I have to change my practice to meet those needs?

Professional growth includes working with one's peers, done under one's administrative supervisor. We have actually connected the practice, professional development and follow-up in a seamless way. This bill ensures that teachers and licensed professionals who choose to do a PGP, commit to a school, stay in a school and follow a plan that improves their education practice. These are proven educators using proven practices, who will stay in these schools and build stability, which is what these schools need the most.

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

I have not been a union man all of my life. For the greatest part of my professional life, I was a principal supervising middle schools and high schools. I think there is nothing more important than investing in our teachers and principals. The Nevada Legislature has a history of investing in our children. We have targeted funds for students of poverty and English learners (EL). We are getting ready to introduce a weighted funding formula that will further target students in every single school.

What we have not done is target professional growth for the two most important groups of people who work with our kids—principals and teachers. I think it is safe to say this should be looked at as an additional reform coming from the Legislature that will legislate the necessity for doing what has just

been described. That is, investing money in principals and teachers to get better outcomes for kids. For far too long, our salary schedules have been independent of that notion. I think the teacher salary schedule moves us in the direction of making the connection between professional growth, additional compensation and better outcomes for children. We cannot continue to do otherwise.

The reason this effort is good policy is it improves the skills, the competencies and the capacities of people who work with children so they find new, better and innovative ways to deal with the challenges facing so many of our children.

BRENDA PEARSON (Professional Learning Director, Clark County Education Association):

I have served as one of the architects of the Clark County PGP. I have worked in conjunction with CCSD to design, build and implement the innovative salary incentive system. It allows education professionals to autonomously pursue professional learning in order to improve instructional practices and impact student achievement. The intent is for professional learning to be ongoing and dynamic. A system was designed to simultaneously support the educator, the student and the community, resulting in greater teacher retention.

Research has demonstrated that high-performing school systems across the world clearly communicate that student learning is what matters. Effective professional learning is at the core for improving student learning and is central to school improvement.

I would like to provide you an example of the type of professional learning an educator might pursue within the PGP. Let us consider a first-grade teacher in one of our most challenging schools. Prior to the beginning of the school year, this teacher will reflect upon her current practices, while considering both their strengths and their areas of growth. This specific teacher knows that she struggles to engage all learners during mathematics and struggles to develop lessons that include entry points for all learners, including her special education, EL and gifted students. She also knows she needs to learn how to work with her students in diverse populations. These can become her goals for her individualized PGP.

In order for this teacher to earn her professional growth salary advancement, she has no less than two years to accrue the clock hours needed that are in line with her goals. For example, she can enroll in a Teaching English as a Second

Language (TESL) certificate course to help her work more efficiently with her EL students. These courses are offered at university graduate levels within our local universities as well as at CCSD. She can also enroll in a yearlong series of professional development courses offered with the Regional Professional Development Program. These courses are structured to build a support system for educators to actively engage in learning and develop a learning community where educators from across the District can meet and learn from each other. In these courses, their learning and growth is monitored to ensure an impact on student outcomes. She can work with other educators in her school, across grade levels, and in professional learning communities. These communities are structured to have educators review data, share instructional practices, set goals for student achievement and monitor their progress. Lastly, this teacher can share the knowledge she has gained through designing and presenting school-based professional learning to her colleagues. This develops a structure that builds upon the human capital in the school. This is what we want for all schools.

Through the development and implementation of the Clark County PGP, I have worked with many teachers who were elated at the opportunity to choose their own path related to the needs of their students through professional learning. They have made significant growth in their own practice. Teachers from our community have spent hours dedicated to the pursuit of their own professional growth.

BETSY GILES (Director of National Board Certification, Clark County Education Association):

Throughout Nevada, and certainly in Clark County, schools are grappling with the challenge of staffing high-need schools with high-quality teachers. The Nevada State Equity Plan identified the root causes as high teacher turnover, inadequate professional development, a weakened professional culture and persistently low student achievement. The National Board Professional Development Program seeks to address these systemic problems through rigorous and relevant professional development.

More than a decade of rigorous research has shown that National Board certified teachers are more effective at improving student achievement than their non-Board-certified counterparts, and that the impact is even greater for minority and low-income students. Given this evidence, it is crucial that we

ensure that Board certified teachers reach the students who need them the most.

National Board certification is the teaching profession's gold standard for teaching quality. It is an extremely rigorous, performance-based assessment aligned with the NEPF. It takes one to three years to complete the process. Clark County School District recommends Title I schools with strong instructional leaders and supportive collaborative cultures to participate in this program. Administrators and teachers must apply to be part of this site-based professional development.

In the upcoming 2017-2018 school year, 50 National Board professional development schools will be served by this program in Clark County. Eighty percent of these schools are serving high-need populations. This will affect over 700 teachers and counselors in the coming year.

Let us talk about the exponential impact to our schools. In Washington state, a recent study found that Board certified teachers gained an extra month and a half instruction over non-Board certified-teachers. A Harvard study reported that teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District gained two additional months of instruction in math. Imagine how quickly we could close the achievement gap when school-based cohorts of 10 to 35 teachers are collaboratively pursuing Board certification.

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas is serving as our external evaluator on this program. The first year of participation has had the following impact: 95 percent increase in job satisfaction, 98 percent increase in collaboration, 82 percent increase in understanding how to teach children of diversity and an 85 percent increase in how to support minority and low-income students. We are also affecting the teaching continuum through a partnership with Nevada State College. National Board certified teachers and candidates are being used as coaches and mentors for pre-service teachers and helping facilitate their transition into CCSD. We are proud to say that the Clark County National Board professional development school model has been identified as a National model for imbedding site-based professional development into schools.

In conclusion, I want to leave you with a vision. What would be the result of professional development that makes Board certification the norm in teaching? The guarantee from the teaching profession to Nevada families would be crystal

clear. You will be taught by an accomplished teacher, one who has been trained by expert practitioners and whose practices have met the highest standard.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

The bill says the CCSD Board of Trustees "shall reserve" funds for the fiscal year. Are you suggesting it will go into the budget and carve out some sum of money?

MR. VELLARDITA:

Assembly Bill No. 483 of the 78th Legislative Session established the model that said school districts should reserve an amount of funds to fund a merit pay plan. This is the same kind of model. The legislation in its conceptual form tries to embrace that concept. The district knows what funds it will receive for roll-ups, which are intended for steps and columns. Our professional development program is based on the columns. The idea would be to set aside those roll-up dollars for this type of program.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

Would those monies be set aside and be there when you went into binding arbitration?

MR. VELLARDITA:

That money would be there for an educator upon completion of their fulfillment of their commitment to improve their practice, notwithstanding the status of the collective bargaining agreement.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

So this money would not be considered during bargaining or arbitration.

MR. VELLARDITA:

It is intended to be there upon completion of the professional development of an educator or administrator.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

Are you assuming it will be a portion of the roll-up? I am concerned with how much money we might be talking about.

MR. VELLARDITA:

Once the final DSA budget is passed and there is a 2 percent roll-up, then that money is clearly there for this program in the second year of the biennium. There is no money needed for the first year in this proposal.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The bill is effective July 1, 2017. Where does it talk about it not being effective until the second year of the biennium?

MR. VELLARDITA:

In section 3, subsection 2, the bill outlines the two-year program that an educator or administrator in a Title I school must complete before being eligible for the merit pay. In order to earn it, they must stay at a Title I school for a third year, which is when they would receive the salary incentive.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Would they maintain that incentive if they left that school in year four?

MR. VELLARDITA:

Yes, they would.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I do not see in the language where it will not need funds in the first year. In section 4, it indicates the Board must reserve funds each fiscal year. The salary schedule itself has been in effect for a number of years, has it not?

MR. VELLARDITA:

We will end the first year of this new salary schedule June 30, 2017.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If you are able to legislate this into place, why does it need to be added to the list of items that are mandatory collective bargaining provisions?

MR. VELLARDITA:

I wish I had an easy answer. I think this is consistent with why this Body and prior legislatures has had to pass legislation that is very prescriptive in terms of how funds are used. In this case, this piece of legislation is advocating that funds be used for professional development and that there is a salary incentive

upon acquiring that. We believe that making legislation prescriptive is the right policy direction to go in.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are there any other items in mandatory collective bargaining provisions that are county specific? Why is this limited to CCSD?

MR. VELLARDITA:

It explicitly states school districts of 100,000 or more pupils. Currently, only CCSD fits that description.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

In the current salary schedule, is the growth plan the only way a teacher gets a salary increase? Are there cost-of-living adjustments?

MR. VELLARDITA:

There are two ways a teacher gets a raise. One way is the annual step increase, which is not affected by this piece of legislation. The second is the column movement, which is addressed by this legislation. Column movement is elective. An educator has to make a commitment of resources and time.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How much does the step increase cost for CCSD? The 2 percent roll-up is designed to capture a lot of that.

MR. VELLARDITA:

The step increase for next year is approximately \$31 million, or less.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The 2 percent roll-up included in the budget was about \$51 million for FY 2017-2018. If 75 percent is going to CCSD, that is \$38 million. If the step increase is costing \$31 million, how is the 2 percent roll-up going to cover the \$25 million you said would be necessary for this carve-out?

MR. VELLARDITA:

There is no fiscal hit in FY 2017-2018 for column advancement or salary incentives. Nobody is eligible for it. They would be eligible for it in the second year, when CCSD will receive \$75 million in roll-up costs. It is FY 2018-2019 in

which CCSD projects about \$28 million for salary incentives for those that are currently enrolled and will attain their certification.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Do you know what the anticipated step increases will be for FY 2018-2019?

MR. VELLARDITA:

I think about \$31 million, or approximately the same as the upcoming year.

SENATOR HARRIS:

How much will a teacher expect to receive in salary incentive once they have completed the professional development?

MR. VELLARDITA:

It is approximately \$5,400 salary incentive.

SENATOR HARRIS:

As I heard in the testimony, part of the reason we are doing this is to provide stability in our Title I schools. In the bill, the salary incentive is given when an educator remains at a Title I school when eligible, and then remains at a Title I school for one additional year. How did you arrive at that time frame?

MR. SMALL:

We wanted to ensure that they would stay in a Title I school. What happens currently is that many educators depart the Title I school after just one year. We worked with CCSD and asked what keeps good teachers at the high-risk schools. Salary is just one piece of that. That is why we have introduced bills designed to enhance the climate, culture and leadership in our schools. Good teachers stay because they believe in the school, and its direction and leadership. They stay because they are making progress with the students.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Why not extend it to two or three years? I do not see one additional year as being particularly stable. I do not want to require people to stay in an employment situation that may not be working out for them, but at the same time, we have made a commitment to our students, and we want to provide stability.

MR. SMALL:

I agree with you. We will bring that up in conversations with CCSD. I reiterate that teachers stay when the culture of the school nurtures them. The trend, though, has been the opposite, and we are trying to reverse the trend.

SENATOR HARRIS:

I agree. I think having highly-trained teachers who are committed to their students and the requirement that they stay at their school is how you are going to change the culture and move the needle. You will have more precisely trained professionals capable of handling the challenges they face every day.

MR. VELLARDITA:

This is a new system and is a cultural change within our ranks. We are trying to get educators to invest in the practice, to have it correlate to student outcomes and to reward them with a salary incentive around professional development. Currently, there is nothing that requires an educator to stay in a specific school. This program takes the first step to try and add stability.

I want to remind everybody that before the 2015 Session, there were 10,000 openings in the western United States for teachers. Clark County had a need for more than 1,500. We could not compete. We started the year with 750 vacancies and 25,000 kids started and ended the year without a qualified teacher in the classroom. This year, 1,300 teachers have left the CCSD since the start of the school year. We are trying to change the culture, and this is a first step.

MS. PEARSON:

I wanted to address Senator Harris' question about the duration of the commitment. We really took that into account when we were building this program. If you take a look at what is included in the opportunities for these teachers in the Title I schools, we have imbedded structures for collaboration and professional development communities. What we want to do is build a large community of learners who are invested in that community and that school. Although at this time the commitment is three years, we truly believe that the structure we have built within the professional development system will enable people to be dedicated to that school site.

SENATOR HARRIS:

My concern is that the bill is not school site-specific but merely limited to Title I schools. Nothing would prevent a teacher from moving to three different Title I schools during her development. That would not provide stability.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 547?

VICKI COURTNEY (President, Clark County Education Association):

I support this bill because it is good practice. It is about a culture change. I came to CCSD in 1980, and we were not fifty-first in the Nation. My children have gone to school in a district that is fifty-first in the Nation. It is important to think about how you change a culture. That is what this is.

I have worked at Title I schools, and I stayed there based on the culture in that school. We have to reward teachers who recognize and strive to develop the skills they need to be successful. This is an important first step.

CHELLI SMITH (Director, Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program):

During the school year, we have just over 1,000 teachers enrolled in professional development opportunities to fulfill their PGP. There are 620 who are enrolled in credit-bearing opportunities such as reading specialist endorsement, library endorsement, TESL endorsement, middle school math certificate, high school math certificate and a yearlong kindergarten program. The other 300 teachers are enrolled in workshop opportunities centered around a specific content area. The workshops consist of between 75 and 140 hours of content. This professional development is written into the teacher's evaluation, and progress is evaluated during a mid-year and end-of-year conference.

These programs are rigorous and include many hours of instruction as well as outside work. They are specifically designed to enhance classroom practice with the end goal of increasing student achievement. Because we feel it important that these teachers' commitments to their craft and their students be recognized through negotiated compensation, we stand in favor of S.B. 547.

RON DREHER (Washoe Schools Principals' Association):

We stand in support of this bill. There are approximately 64,000 students in Washoe County School District (WCSD), and professional development is

important to our teachers as well. We understand this bill affects only Clark County, but we support the intent behind the bill.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Would you expect your association to try to get this legislation extended to WCSD in future legislative sessions?

MR. DREHER:

More than likely, as we support the intent. We currently have professional development in the collective bargaining agreement, as well as National Board certification.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If this bill did not pass, would you still be able to create a professional development structure under the terms of your collective bargaining authority?

MR. DREHER:

Yes, we could. This legislation makes it mandatory, rather than elective.

MEREDITH SMITH (Director of Policy, Nevada Succeeds):

We support S.B. 547. Quality professional learning increases student achievement, and this bill is a positive step to ensuring that the right type of professional learning is happening in Nevada. The bill furthers a policy position that supports our organization's larger vision for how professional development should be leveraged to help teachers and principals be most effective for students.

We believe that a salary incentive program for professional growth, such as has been established in Clark County, serves as a better use of the funds than the traditional step and column increases in salary. By moving toward a system that compensates education professionals for professional learning that is aligned with school and student needs, we are taking a step in the right direction of building the type of system that research shows supports student learning and achievement.

A soon-to-be-published, peer-reviewed synthesis of 35 rigorous studies of professional development found that professional learning programs that both improve teaching practices and student achievement share several elements: relevant content, active learning, high-quality collaboration, models of effective

practice, expert coaching, feedback and reflection, and sustained duration. Studies that show little or no effects from professional development focus on more traditional types of learning that lack most or all of these elements. Of these, engaging in the right kind of feedback and reflection may be most critical in improving teaching effectiveness.

It is imperative that the State and districts are very conscious of what is being considered or accredited as professional learning. Ensuring that the courses, classes and certificate programs are appropriately robust in content and required practice is essential. In Clark County, the current system for determining how PGPs are approved is determined by an agreement between CCEA and CCSD. This is the best type of system we can expect at the moment. However, Nevada Succeeds would support a mechanism by which professional learning be accredited by an independent body of practicing educators and that specifically takes into account the research on what has been shown to be effective. Even though this bill does not include such a provision, we still fully support it, recognizing that meaningful change takes place incrementally.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 547?

NICOLE ROURKE (Clark County School District):

Our Board of Trustees value our teachers and want to invest in their growth. That is why we negotiated the PGP with the CCEA. The District is working hard to implement the reorganization of the school district and allocate more funds to school budgets. That is difficult to do when union leaders make more and more demands and ask for legislation to create unfunded mandates instead of negotiating compensation through the regular process.

The PGP negotiated with CCEA is still in its infancy, and it is yet to be determined whether it will have any impact on teacher retention in our most at-risk schools or on student achievement. Requiring a reserve for a new, unproven professional development program limits the District's ability to bargain on an even playing field. Once required in statute, the program will have to be funded even when our revenues may not be able to cover it. That could happen during a recession when the entire State is making cuts. If that happens, we may be in the position of having to lay off teachers and increase class sizes just to meet this requirement.

When 2 percent roll-ups are added to the DSA in the budgeting process every year, it then goes through the Nevada Plan. Clark County School District is not guaranteed the entire 2 percent of our allocation. Therefore, there is no guarantee that the roll-ups will cover the step increases and the professional growth salary incentives. Additionally, we have just been through the process, and in the case of the administrators' union, the program was decided by an arbitrator and not agreed upon by CCSD.

If the 5,415 educators in Title I schools that we believe are eligible for this program were to earn it, the total cost in FY 2018-2019 would be \$38 million. That is just for the column increments; the step increases would be in addition to that.

It is important to note that we negotiated the current contract before the regulations of the reorganization were established. Even though we are required to distribute 80 percent of unrestricted funds to the school, you have to realize that most of it is in salaries for teachers, administrators and support staff, and further limits the discretionary funds available.

The Legislature has always looked at incentives for teachers and professional development funds in a categorical way, not in a set-aside. Performance pay is very different than the PGP. The PGP is something that is earned and awarded based upon participation. Performance pay is based upon performance, which can be measured in different ways. The analogy here does not quite work.

I want to point out that the K-12 funding bill already has an allocation for National Board certification. We support the PGP, we did negotiate it, but we need to continue to negotiate it for each contract term, along with all other employee compensation, based on the funding that we receive from the Legislature. I want to reiterate that we value our teachers, but their salary schedule should be left to the collective bargaining process, not determined by statute.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

Whether the salary schedule is a good idea or a bad idea, it is a local idea. We feel this is a local control issue, and should not be placed on the backs of our legislators at the State level. In section 5, subsection 2 (a), the scope of mandatory bargaining includes "salary or wage rates or other forms of direct monetary compensation." We are opposed to S.B. 547.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

Our government affairs committee has reviewed S.B. 547, and because of several concerns, we are opposed to the bill. We have, and continue to, support public education and have long been engaged in K-12 issues on behalf of the business community. The Chamber's leadership is concerned about this bill reducing CCSD's ability to negotiate contracts, and it could cause additional financial constraints. The effectiveness and return on investment of the PGPs is relatively new and undetermined. Our Committee also has concerns that the bill is restricted to Clark County.

We appreciate the perspectives of the opponents and value our educators, but the Chamber cannot support the bill at this time.

SYLVIA LAZOS (Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now):

We oppose this bill for many of the reasons that have already been stated. I would like to talk about why, in law and policy, special legislation is disfavored. The most important reason is the Legislature is always at a broad, top level. When you go to the specifics of an issue, especially this kind of dispute between CCEA and CCSD, we cannot expect to know all the details. There are already mechanisms to try to work these things out.

I would like to address the issue of Title I schools. If this was primarily about helping to recruit and retain at our most disadvantaged schools, this would not be the structure that I would choose. In other jurisdictions, collective bargaining agreements do not allow teachers to choose where they are assigned. School districts normally assign based on need. As a professor, I do not choose my courses; the administration assigns them to best fulfill the needs of the students.

The reason Victory schools have been so successful has not been a PGP; it has been the incentive pay. The kind that has been proposed in A.B. 434. If we are serious about Title I vacancies, I do not see any evidence that this program is the primary way to get there.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 434 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes appropriations for incentives for employing teachers at Title I and underperforming schools. (BDR S-1033)

My written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)) is submitted.

JOHN GUEDRY (Immediate Past Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

My record in support of public education is well documented. That said, I am opposed to S.B. 547. I am not opposed to teacher performance pay. I am concerned with the slippery slope we head down when the Legislature acts as a negotiation or administration arm for any existing contract of any State agency. This Body should not take a position on one side of an existing contract. In this case, mandating a money set-aside related to current contractual obligations of CCSD does just that. The current contract, as I understand it, states that CCSD pay for PGPs subject to availability of funds.

If this Body wants to set aside funds to reward teachers for certain professional growth, I think you will find support from many in the business community, as long as the monetary rewards are directly tied to measurable performance standards that improve district outcomes. Specifically, the goal should be graduating more students who are career or college ready. This is consistent with the goals outlined in the 2015 Session.

During the August 11, 2016 Spending and Government Efficiency (SAGE) Commission meeting, Mr. Vellardita, on behalf of the CCEA, asked the Commission members to consider a recommendation to the Legislature to dedicate a funding stream for a teacher's professional growth goals. We did not reject the proposal, but we requested he submit a written plan that outlined the details. The Commission requested benchmarks that could measure improvements during the process. To the best of my knowledge, no such plan was ever submitted.

My position has not changed. I would support any reasonable performance-based plan to reward top teachers who perform in measurable ways that are tied to overall classroom objectives of CCSD. If the Legislature wants to fund such a plan, I and my fellow members of the business community would work closely with you and teachers and educators to come up with a plan that rewards good teachers who produce students that are college and career ready.

Short of the Legislature agreeing to increase funding to develop the fund earmarked for such a plan in partnership with business and education community leaders that meets those objectives, I stand firm that the Legislature

is overreaching and acting as an administrator in the collective bargaining process.

VIRGINIA M. MILLS (President, Education Support Employees Association):
The Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) represents 12,000 support professionals, providing vital services to the children in CCSD. We recently learned about this bill that would set aside school district funds for additional pay for teachers and principals who complete PGPs. While ESEA supports our brothers and sisters who work within the Clark County schools, we are opposed to S.B. 547 unless it is amended to set aside an equivalent amount of funds to enhance the pay of education support professionals.

My written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)), detailing this as an issue of fairness and economic and racial justice, is submitted.

GABRIEL LEITHER:

I am married to a teacher in CCSD who has been teaching for ten years. There are some things about the PGP we think are beneficial to teachers, but, overall, we are opposed to the plan that has been implemented, and we would not like to see this as something required to be in the bargaining process in the future.

The issue that my wife has with the PGP is that it requires teachers to spend vast amounts of time in order to get a raise. No other profession requires this. Step increases max out, and you cannot get across the column without going through a PGP. There is a lot of misinformation out there regarding the whole PGP process.

Teachers are already overly stressed with huge time commitments, and this requires them to spend hundreds of hours to get a raise. They just do not have the time. My wife routinely works at least 60 hours per week. If you are going to incentivize something, incentivize by giving them extra time for class preparation.

Placement on the scale right now should be reflected by the education a teacher receives. As the PGP is currently implemented, a teacher who works at CCSD and receives a master's degree as part of her PGP receives a column increase. Teachers who are already in the system with a master's degree do not have that opportunity.

NANCY E. BRUNE, PH.D. (Executive Director, Guinn Center for Policy Priorities):
In 2016, the Guinn Center provided research to the SAGE Commission. We published two reports that are directly related to the S.B. 547. This bill is not a mandate on the importance of professional development. The Guinn Center believes in the importance of highly effective professional development. My written testimony is submitted ([Exhibit F](#)).

This bill is about the proper scope and role of the State. Based on our research, we have two concerns. First, we believe that it is premature and bad policy to legislatively mandate an investment in a program that has no proven success. The PGP was implemented in the 2016-2017 school year. The program is too new to evaluate its impact on teacher effectiveness, teacher retention and student achievement. In other school districts around the Country that have implemented similar programs, to date, the research is inconclusive on the benefits. In cases where there has been some evidence of improved outcomes, researchers acknowledge that the gains could not be directly attributed to the new salary schedules. There have been so many programs introduced in the last several years, it would be impossible to determine the root cause of improvement in outcomes.

Our second concern is related to the appropriate role of the State and the danger of State overreach. If approved, the legislation would essentially allow the State to intervene in local collective bargaining agreements. This would establish a troubling precedent.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify neutral on S.B. 547?

CHRIS DALY (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) represents 31 local affiliates across the State. We are neutral on S.B. 547, as two of our local affiliates, the CCEA and the ESEA are on opposite sides of this issue. My written testimony is submitted ([Exhibit G](#)).

We appreciate CCEA attempts to remedy a significant contract enforcement issue. At the same time, we understand that ESEA is in contract negotiations representing the lowest paid workers of CCSD, whose compensation has yet to recover from takeaways during the recession. To ensure that there are no labor winners and losers here, we recommend an amendment to set aside an

equivalent amount of funds for education support professionals in large school districts.

NATHA ANDERSON (President, Washoe Education Association):

My union brothers and sisters are on both sides of this issue. I am neutral on S.B. 547, and I have no recommendations. I applaud the efforts to think outside the box when it comes to helping our members. I took offense at some of the things that have been said today. I am proud to be an educator, whether I am at a Title I school or not. I believe the majority of us wish to invest in our profession, and we do not do it just for higher pay. We believe in our kids, and we believe in our profession. The insinuation that money was the only incentive to undertake professional development was offensive.

Our negotiated agreement holds until 2019. We will be making the decision regarding our professional development as an organization as we have done for many years. We negotiated in 1999 for an 8 percent salary increase upon National Board certification. We will continue to ensure that our professional development helps our students and our profession.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 547. We have three bill draft requests (BDR) to hear and prepare for introduction on the Senate Floor. The first is BDR 34-1232. This provides for the establishment of the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation. This is a \$1 million appropriation over the biennium to establish the Institute and move forward with improving the teacher pipeline.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 34-1232: Establishes the Governor's Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation. (Later introduced as S.B. 548)

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 34-1232.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS FORD AND KIECKHEFER WERE EXCUSED.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The second request is BDR S-1231, which makes an appropriation of \$17 million to a disbursement account for costs relating to a human resource management information system for CCSD. This is needed for the reorganization of CCSD to move forward.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1231: Makes an appropriation from the State General Fund to the Clark County School District for costs relating to a human resource management information system. (Later introduced as S.B. 550)

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR S-1231.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS FORD AND KIECKHEFER WERE EXCUSED.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The third request is BDR S-1240. It makes an appropriation of \$500,000 over the biennium to the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records of the Department of Administration for certain projects, services and technology.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1240: Makes an appropriation to the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records of the Department of Administration for certain projects, services and technology. (Later introduced as S.B. 549)

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR S-1240.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS FORD AND KIECKHEFER WERE EXCUSED.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to make public comment? Seeing no one, this meeting is in recess at 10:17 a.m. until the call of the Chair.

This meeting is reconvened at 8:37 p.m. I will open the hearing on S.B. 550.

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)

Ms. ROURKE:

The CCSD is requesting the Legislature to allocate \$17 million for the District to purchase a new human resource management system. This new system is critical to CCSD's implementation of the required reorganization, including the provision that provides schools with control over 80 percent of the District's overall budget. It will also allow CCSD to be more transparent about our central and school budgets, where our employees work and which budgets their salaries should be assigned to. The District currently uses an outdated payroll system that is patched together, resulting in inefficient processes that are costing CCSD millions of dollars in lost time and human capital. The payroll system is unable to communicate with our finance and human relations systems, making it almost impossible to track employee costs accurately to the departments and schools they serve. This makes it difficult for us to implement strategic budgeting for our schools and is quite inefficient.

The current system is programmed in COBOL, which makes it virtually impossible to find technical programming help. It was purchased over 25 years ago. The District has about 1,200 employees that directly serve multiple schools. For example, we have EL facilitators that work in multiple schools. We have to centrally budget them because the system will not allow us to do it any differently. We have 118 employees who work in our maintenance department. They work primarily on school campuses, but the current system will not allow us to allocate their costs among schools. A request for proposal is out, and all the bids are in, and are being reviewed and assessed. If the Legislature is inclined to give us the funding, we can move forward quickly with the new system.

The bill allows us to spend the allocation over four years. That is so we can distribute payments to the vendor upon completion of certain benchmarks.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on S.B. 550?

MR. DALY:

We support S.B. 550 to modernize the CCSD human resource management system. We have been engaged in the reorganization of CCSD along with ESEA. We understand that a new system is necessary for the successful implementation of the reorganization, including the provision that provides schools with control over 80 percent of the District's overall budget. Further, a new system will allow CCSD to be more transparent in budgeting and will help identify employee work locations.

Both NSEA and ESEA have expressed concerns about the possible contracting out of services through the reorganization. We believe that a new human resource management system will allow CCSD to track staff time and may help preserve positions. My written testimony is submitted ([Exhibit H](#)).

MR. MORADKHAN:

On behalf of the Government Affairs Committee of the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, we support S.B. 550. We believe this investment of dollars is important for CCSD to move forward with their modernization and reorganization effort.

BRIAN MCANALLEN (City of Las Vegas):

We support S.B. 550 and thank the Legislature for providing these necessary tools to CCSD.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify on S.B. 550? I will now close the hearing on S.B. 550 and open the hearing on S.B. 551.

SENATE BILL 551: 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):

Senate Bill 551 is the bill that establishes the State's contribution in support of the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP) for the upcoming biennium. It establishes that the State shall contribute \$743 per month in FY 2017-2018

and \$740.92 per month in FY 2018-2019 in support of the active employees' group insurance. It establishes the State contribution for non-Medicare retirees as \$445.03 per month in FY 2017-2018 and \$451.23 per month in FY 2018-2019. Lastly, it establishes the monthly contribution for retirees who participate in Medicare and retired prior to January 1, 1994 as \$180 per month in both years of the biennium. For retirees on Medicare who retired after that date, it establishes a monthly contribution of \$12 per month per year of service up to 20 years with a maximum of \$240 per month.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Could you repeat the State contributions for non-Medicare retirees? I cannot find the number you quoted.

Ms. CROCKET:

For non-Medicare retirees, the State contribution is \$445.03 per month in FY 2017-2018 and \$451.23 per month in FY 2018-2019.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Thank you, I must have misheard.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify on S.B. 551?

CARTER BUNDY (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International):

It has been a rough decade for our active members in terms of furloughs, longevity and lack of pay raises. Anything you can do to improve the State's share of PEBP is something that our employees greatly appreciate. It makes a difference in their take-home pay, and we thank you for your support.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Retired Public Employees of Nevada):

We want to offer our thanks for bringing forward S.B. 551.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Does anyone else wish to testify on S.B. 551? I will close the hearing on S.B. 551 and open the hearing on S.B. 552.

SENATE BILL 552: Revises provisions governing the cost of certain coverage under the Public Employees' Benefits Program. (BDR 23-1226)

MS. CROCKET:

Senate Bill 552 is a budget implementation bill for the PEBP budget as approved by the full Committees. This bill modifies the participant premiums for non-State, non-Medicare retirees to align the monthly premiums paid by these retirees with the similarly situated, same plan and tier, State non-Medicare retirees by amending *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 287.023. This would lower the premiums for non-State retirees and require local governments to contribute additional funding in support of their retirees.

The bill allows for a one-time exception to noticing requirements outlined in NRS 287.043, which require 30-day written notice to local governments and PEBP participants when a proposed change of rates or premiums occurs and specifies that PEBP is not required to hold an open enrollment period. This exception would apply just to the plan year that begins July 1, 2017.

The bill allows for a four-year phase-in period for increased local government contributions to allow local governments time to allocate additional funding in support of their retiree health care costs. The phase-in period would be: for FY 2017-2018, the State General Fund would cover 100 percent of the increased cost to local governments, for FY 2018-2019, 75 percent, for FY 2019-2020, 50 percent, and for FY 2020-2021, 25 percent of the costs. For fiscal years 2021-2022 and beyond, local governments would be required to cover 100 percent of the increased contribution in support of their retirees.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there any supporting testimony?

MS. LOCKARD:

We strongly support this legislation and want to thank you and your Staff who have worked on many different options, trying to resolve what we call the "orphan issue." These retirees, through no fault of their own, have been put in this situation. I would like for the county representatives to know that one of the options considered was having the counties pay the health care costs of those retirees, since they did not have to pay the premium cost to the same extent as the State. This has not been an issue for this Session only; this has been an issue for at least four sessions.

MR. DALY:

For the NSEA retirees, the orphan issue is the top legislative priority in this Legislative Session. The majority of the orphans were school district employees. Over the course of the last few years, their stories of large premium increases have grown. Obviously, most of them are on fixed incomes. Again, we thank the Committee for hearing us out and finding a solution we can support that is fair to everyone involved.

MR. BUNDY:

I want to commend the Legislature for tackling this issue. It was a hard thing to do, but it is the right thing to do. The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International retirees stand in strong support of S.B. 552.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition or neutral?

MR. MCANALLEN:

We have been asked for a fiscal note on this bill and are currently preparing the information. We are concerned about the bill as it affects local government retirees. We currently have 300 participants, with premium payments of \$1.5 million to the State. We cannot calculate the future financial impact of this due to the lack of data on the State's total insurance plans and cost. We have concerns because we are unable to control or influence the insurance plans offered by the State.

We know there will be a fiscal impact to us, and we are concerned about what that might be. At the moment, it is an unfunded mandate. We believe the retirees should be contributing a portion to their insurance as well. There should be a way to do this where costs are shared by employer and employee, much like the private sector.

JEFF FONTAINE (Nevada Association of Counties):

We certainly recognize the issue related to the orphans and worked with others trying to find a solution. We are neutral on the bill because we really do not have an idea what the fiscal note will be for the 17 counties.

MICHAEL CATHCART (City of Henderson):

I will echo what Mr. Fontaine said. We just do not know what the fiscal impact will be. It could be minimal; it could be large. We are going to need a little bit of time to understand the fiscal implications.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 552. We will now go to work session.

ADAM DROST (Program Analyst):

Senate Bill 155 makes an appropriation for educational leadership training programs. The bill was heard by the Committee on April 10, and would provide General Fund appropriations of \$1 million in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium to the Department of Administration to contract with the Clark County Public Education Foundation for the implementation and operation of educational leadership training programs. The bill requires the Foundation to provide matching funds before receiving the appropriation. The bill also requires the Foundation to work in cooperation with all 17 school districts, other public education foundations and other partners to design and implement educational leadership training programs.

SENATE BILL 155: Makes an appropriation for educational leadership training programs. (BDR S-1)

The bill requires the Foundation to use the funds for personnel, resources to facilitate instruction, research related to the design of curriculum, communication with education leaders and data systems for the reporting of participation and results. The Foundation must prepare and transmit a report to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) on or before December 21, 2018, that describes each expenditure made from the General Fund appropriation made through December 1, 2018 and a report by September 20, 2019 for expenditures through June 30, 2019.

The General Fund appropriations in this bill are not included in the *Executive Budget*. The bill was presented by Senator Farley and individuals from Clark County Public Education Foundation. The Foundation indicated it has generally secured \$6.90 from the private sector for every \$1.00 provided by the State. The Foundation also provided examples of the training provided, which included Executive Leadership Academy that is available to promising leaders at the administrative level to build skills and maximize capacity. The Foundation

indicated that upon completion, participants may earn a Certificate of Education Leadership and Management from Georgetown University's McCourt School of Policy. Additionally, the Foundation indicated they offer a twenty-first century site-based Leadership Program that is available to district leadership and school principals. The Foundation indicated this program assists with the transition and paradigm shifts associated with the CCSD reorganization.

Testimony in support of the bill was provided by representatives from the Public Education Foundation Board of Directors, educators from CCSD that had participated in the various academies and Vikki Courtney with the Clark County Education Association. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral. The bill becomes effective upon passage and approval for the purposes of performing any preparatory administrative tasks necessary to carry out the provisions of the legislation and on July 1, 2017 for all other purposes. There were no amendments offered at the time. If the Committee does wish to approve the bill, Fiscal staff would suggest the General Fund appropriation in section 1 be provided to the Department of Education instead of the Department of Administration. Fiscal staff would also suggest the first report to the IFC that is required in section 3, subsection 1, include expenditures through FY 2017-2018 and be submitted no later than September 21, 2018, with the subsequent report due September 20, 2019 for expenditures through June 30, 2019.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 155 AND APPROVE THE GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATION IN SECTION 1 BE PROVIDED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION INSTEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND AMEND THE REPORTING REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE ALL FY 2017-2018 EXPENDITURES TO BE PROVIDED TO IFC NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 21, 2018.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

JULIE WALLER (Senior Program Analyst):

Senate Bill 167 was heard by the Committee on May 3. The bill appropriates \$615,000 over the 2017-2019 biennium from the State General Fund to the

Department of Agriculture for the creation and maintenance of school garden programs for certain Title I schools. The bill specifies the criteria that must be met for a school to receive funding and provides that a school meeting those criteria may receive an allocation of not more than \$10,000 for FY 2017-2018 and not more than \$5,000 for FY 2018-2019. The fiscal impact of the bill is General Fund appropriations of \$410,000 in FY 2017-2018 and \$205,000 in FY 2018-2019 that are not included in the *Executive Budget*.

SENATE BILL 167 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the creation and maintenance of school gardens. (BDR S-834)

This bill was presented by Senator Farley and Ciara Byrne, the Co-CEO of Green Our Planet. Testimony in support of the bill was presented by representatives from CCSD, the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and School Administrators and the NSEA. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral. There is a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit I](#)) proposed by Ciara Byrne. Pursuant to this amendment, a school that receives an allocation of funding from the Department may use funding to provide professional development for teachers related to, but not exclusively, special need students, school site food safety plans, plant science, agriculture, science, technology, engineering, arts and math, known as STEAM, curriculum development, teacher travel and to support existing school garden conferences in Nevada.

The amendment provides additional requirements on how school garden programs may use the funding, including requiring these programs have a curriculum that is compliant with Next Generation Science Standards, utilizes experiential learning or project-based learning, and involves supervised learning in the classroom and in an outdoor garden setting. The amendment also requires a school garden program to create teams composed of teachers and others that meet on at least a monthly basis. Finally, the amendment would require the school garden programs that work with local nonprofits to implement the program to work with nonprofits that have at least two years' experience of successful school garden program implementation.

This legislation becomes effective July 1, 2017. If the Committee wishes to approve the bill and the proposed amendment, Fiscal staff recommends that section 1, subsection 3, of the amendment be revised to indicate the funds may be utilized by schools, rather than the Department of Agriculture.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Will the Department of Agriculture have any impacts from this bill? Will they take any administrative fees out of these funds?

MS. WALLER:

There is no administrative allowance in the bill for the Department of Agriculture. They will be providing the allocation based on the Title I status of the schools that apply.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Would the Department be charged with any oversight to see how the money was spent?

MS. WALLER:

The Department of Agriculture testified in neutral at the time the amended bill was heard in the Committee on Education.

MARK KRMPOTIC (Senate Fiscal Analyst):

Douglas Farris of the Department of Agriculture indicated there would be no cost to them at the original Committee hearing.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 167 WITH THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE FROM GREEN OUR PLANET.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR KIECKHEFER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

ALEX HAARTZ (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):

Senate Bill 192 was heard in Committee on May 4. This bill establishes new required hours of operation for certain mobile mental health units in counties with populations of 100,000 or more. The bill requires any mobile unit of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) providing mental health services to be open from 8 a.m. or earlier to 12 a.m. or later, 365 days per year.

SENATE BILL 192: Establishes required hours of operation for certain mobile mental health units. (BDR 39-816)

There was testimony presented on the bill that indicated these units would be open four additional hours per day. There was testimony provided by Washoe County Social Services and various law enforcement agencies. Testimony in support of the bill was presented by the National Alliance on Mental Illness, who encouraged inclusion of rural Nevada in providing these types of services. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral on the bill. The DPBH submitted a fiscal note indicating the cost of the additional services would be \$1,400,528 in FY 2017-2018 and \$1,417,080 in FY 2018-2019. There are no amendments on the bill.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Would we need to amend it to include an appropriation?

MR. HAARTZ:

You are correct.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 192 TO INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATION OF \$1,400,528 IN FY 2017-2018 AND \$1,417,080 IN FY 2018-2019.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. HAARTZ:

Senate Bill 187 was heard by the Committee on May 12. The bill makes an appropriation to the IFC for an allocation to a nonprofit for the establishment of a fine arts museum in Las Vegas and the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in Reno. The bill contains a \$10 million appropriation not included in the *Executive Budget*. The bill was presented by Senator Segerblom, accompanied by David Walker, CEO, Nevada Museum of Art.

SENATE BILL 187 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the establishment of a fine arts museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, and the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in Reno, Nevada. (BDR S-267)

Section 2 of the bill requires that every \$1 of State appropriation must be matched by \$1 raised by a nonprofit organization, whether by gift, grant or donation. The intent is to locate the new museum at Symphony Park in Las Vegas next to the Smith Center. Testimony was provided by various individuals, including individuals who have served on the current Board of Trustees for the Nevada Museum of Art and individuals from the art community in Las Vegas. The City of Las Vegas indicated they would donate the land.

There was no testimony against the bill. Neutral testimony was offered by the Office of the Secretary of State indicating it had removed its fiscal note as of the first reprint of the bill, which was the version the Committee heard. There was no additional amendment offered on the bill. The bill contains a General Fund appropriation of \$10 million that was not included in the *Executive Budget*.

MR. KRMPOTIC:

During testimony on the bill, the Office of the Secretary of State indicated the fiscal note no longer applied. There had been a fiscal note from the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, for \$192,292 in FY 2017-2018 and \$138,391 in FY 2018-2019. Staff notes that fiscal note is no longer pertinent as it applied to the bill as originally introduced and was removed by the first reprint.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The \$10 million price tag is steep, and I am recommending we approve \$500,000 in each year of the upcoming biennium, for a total of \$1 million.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I am sure any amount they get will be appreciated. This is going to be used to recruit additional donors and is a statement of the State's commitment to seeing this through. If there is an appetite to increase the amount, I would be in support of that as well. I certainly support a project that will enhance life in the Las Vegas Valley for everyone.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

That is my recommendation for now. If it looks like funds could be added before sine die, Assembly Ways and Means can amend the bill.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 187 TO INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATION OF \$500,000 IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2017-2019 BIENNIUM.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

JAIMARIE DAGDAGAN (Program Analyst):

Senate Bill 300 was presented by Senator Denis and heard by the Committee on April 10. The bill appropriates money that is not included in the *Executive Budget* from the State General Fund to carry out a program of peer assistance and review (PAR) of teachers. The money must be used to provide assistance to teachers in meeting standards of effective teaching, including conducting observations, and providing information and resources to teachers about strategies for effective teaching.

SENATE BILL 300: Makes an appropriation to the Clark County School District for a program of peer assistance and review of teachers. (BDR S-4)

There were eight individuals providing testimony in support of the bill. There was no testimony in opposition, and there were two individuals who testified in neutral. Clark County School District has submitted a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) that would add language that would allow appropriations to be used for expenses related to carrying out a program of peer assistance and review of teachers including, but not limited to, salaries and benefits of PAR consulting teachers and supervisors, mileage, supplies, professional development, and substitutes.

Staff received an amendment that revised the amounts in section 1. Originally, the appropriation was for \$2 million in each year of the biennium. The amount has been revised to \$1.2 million in each year of the biennium, of which \$1 million will be allocated to CCSD, and \$200,000 will be allocated to WCSD in each year of the biennium.

The bill is effective on July 1, 2017. If the Committee approves the reduced amount, Fiscal staff suggests revising the language in section 1 to appropriate

the money to the Department of Education for transfers to the school districts as opposed to directly appropriating the funds to the school districts.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 300 TO INCLUDE AMENDED LANGUAGE SUBMITTED BY CCSD AND TO REVISE THE APPROPRIATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR TRANSFER OF \$1 MILLION TO CCSD AND \$200,000 TO WCSD IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2017-2019 BIENNIUM.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. KRMPOTIC:

The next bill is S.B. 444. This bill makes General Fund appropriations of \$124,981 in each year of the biennium to the Department of Veterans Services to provide financial assistance and support for the Adopt a Vet Dental Program.

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)

The bill was sponsored on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs. The effective date of the bill is July 1, 2017.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 444 .

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

BRODY LEISER (Senior Program Analyst):

Senate Bill 391 was presented by Senator Denis and heard in Committee on May 22. Information was provided by Dr. Nancy Brune of the Guinn Center for

Policy, and President Michael D. Richards and K.C. Brekken of the College of Southern Nevada.

SENATE BILL 391 (1st Reprint): Provides for awards of scholarships by community colleges in the Nevada System of Higher Education. (BDR 34-815)

As amended, S.B. 391 establishes the Nevada Promise Scholarship Account in the State General Fund, to be administered by the State Treasurer. The bill provides the eligibility requirements for a student to receive or renew a Nevada Promise Scholarship, including completion of community service. The bill requires community colleges within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to award scholarships to eligible students and to provide training and mentoring programs for scholarship applicants.

Senate Bill 391 requires the State's plan to improve the achievement of pupils enrolled in public schools to include strategies to provide information regarding Nevada Promise Scholarships. The program is subject to audit, and the Board of Regents must submit an annual report to the Legislature on the number of recipients, total cost of the program, number of community service hours, and graduation and retention statistics.

Proposed Amendment 4492, which was presented to the Committee, revised the definition of "gift aid" to mean "any public or private grant or scholarship received by a student" that must be used first to pay the registration fee and other mandatory fees charged to the student by the community college. The bill becomes effective upon passage and approval for the purpose of adopting regulations and performing preparatory administrative tasks, on July 1, 2018 for determining the eligibility of scholarship applicants and awarding scholarships, and on July 1, 2017 for all other purposes.

Testimony in support was offered by NSHE, Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC), Communities and Schools of Nevada, Jobs for America's Graduates, the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) Advisory Council and the Urban Chamber of Commerce. There was no testimony in opposition to the bill. Neutral testimony was provided by the State Treasurer's Office and by the Nevada Faculty Alliance.

There were two fiscal notes submitted. One was from the Treasurer's Office which identified costs associated with administering the program and adopting

regulations to carry out the provisions of the program. That fiscal note indicated the workload associated with the administration of the program may be able to be absorbed with existing staff, but it could not be determined at that time. If that was the case, it would likely reduce the costs associated with their fiscal note, which was approximately \$70,000 in each fiscal year of the biennium.

The second fiscal note was submitted by NSHE, related to administrative costs associated with the program. The fiscal note was approximately \$987,000 in FY 2017-2018 and \$995,000 in FY 2018-2019. The Committee should note that letters were received from both TMCC and CSN, indicating they could absorb the administrative costs for the program. No information was received from Great Basin College (GBC) or Western Nevada College (WNC), so it is unclear to Fiscal staff whether they would also be able to absorb those costs.

In addition to the administrative costs that were described on the fiscal note, NSHE provided testimony during the May 22 hearing that they estimated the cost to award the scholarships for all eligible students totaled about \$6.8 million.

SENATOR DENIS:

I would note that the Guinn Center estimated the cost to be \$3.5 million. There has still been no response from GBC or WNC, so we do not know if there would be administrative costs.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

If it is acceptable to the Committee, we could approve the \$3.5 million and let it go to the Assembly. This might put pressure on the other community colleges to respond. We want it to go Statewide, rather than just southern Nevada, correct?

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes. Originally, it was going to be a pilot program at CSN, but the concept grew to be Statewide.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is the estimate of \$3.5 million total or for each year of the biennium?

Senate Committee on Finance
June 1, 2017
Page 45

SENATOR DENIS:

In the first year, there are no costs as the schools set up the mentoring programs. The \$3.5 million cost occurs in the second year of the biennium.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Were you going to increase the amount of required community service?

SENATOR DENIS:

We have increased the community service requirement to 20 hours, and the minimum grade point average (GPA) is increased to 2.5 from 2.0. I thought that amendment was out, but I do not see it.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

In order to maintain eligibility, does the student have to maintain a 2.5 GPA?

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes, once a student has received the scholarship, they must maintain a 2.5 GPA to continue the award.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is the 20 hours of community service a pre-award requirement and a requirement for the continuation of the award?

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If a student receives a Pell Grant, are they required to spend it on registration fees and other fees before it is used for any other purpose?

MR. LEISER:

Not to the best of my knowledge.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The way I read this language, if a student gets a scholarship they can use it for any purpose. It does not meet the definition of "gift aid" and would not have to be deducted for calculation of the scholarship purpose.

MR. LEISER:

I am not familiar with the federal requirements. I know that NSHE accounted for Pell grants and other State awards prior to the calculation of Nevada Promise scholarships.

MR. KRMPOTIC:

We have just received Proposed Amendment 5146 ([Exhibit K](#)). It was prepared May 30 for Senator Denis. Under the amendment, section 4 reads "Gift aid means a federal Pell grant, a federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity grant, a Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship or a grant awarded under the Silver State Opportunity Grant Program." Section 12, subsection 8 (b) establishes the requirement for initial eligibility. Section 13, subsection 2 (g) (1) establishes the ongoing need for community service to continue eligibility.

Page 10 of the Proposed Amendment 5146 strikes the language that the State Treasurer shall adopt regulations prescribing the manner in which the money in the Account will be disbursed, and continues "if there is an insufficient money in the Account to disburse the amount requested for all students who applied to renew a Nevada Promise Scholarship and disburse the available money in the Account to each community college in the following manner:

(1) If there is insufficient money in the Account to disburse the amount requested for all students who applied to renew a Nevada Promise Scholarship, the State Treasurer shall not disburse any amount requested for first-time recipients of a Nevada Promise Scholarship and shall disburse money to each community college to fund a scholarship for each student who applied to renew a Nevada Promise Scholarship, in the order in which applications were received by the community college, until the money in the Account is exhausted; and

(2) If there is sufficient money in the Account to disburse the amount requested for all students who applied to renew a Nevada Promise Scholarship, the State Treasurer shall first disburse the money requested by each community college for all students who applied to renew a Nevada Promise Scholarship and then disburse money to each community college to fund a scholarship for each student who applied for the first time to receive a Nevada Promise Scholarship, in the order in which applications were received by the community college, until the money in the Account is exhausted."

It further goes on to say the State Treasurer shall provide notice of shortage to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the Board of Trustees of each school district. A community college shall award Nevada Promise Scholarships in a manner that gives priority first to students applying for renewal of a Nevada Promise Scholarship and then to the order in which applications were received by the community college.

If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, the amendment should include \$3.5 million in General Fund appropriations in the second year of the biennium.

SENATOR HARRIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 391 TO INCLUDE PROPOSED AMENDMENT 5146 AND TO INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATION OF \$3.5 MILLION IN FY 2018-2019.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I appreciate all the work Senator Denis has done on this bill. I continue to have some concerns about how the colleges are going to manage the mentorship program and the potential timing. Nevertheless, I am certainly supportive of getting more Nevada students to go to, and graduate from, college.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. KRMPOTIC:

That completes the bills for this work session. Senate Bill 551 and S.B. 552, heard earlier this evening, require Staff to obtain fiscal notes from local government. Local governments have an eight-day time frame to report fiscal notes, which takes us beyond sine die. These two bills are necessary in order to implement the budget. Staff would suggest, for the Committee's consideration, waiving the time frame for the fiscal notes in order for them to be processed.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO WAIVE THE FISCAL NOTE TIME FRAME FOR S.B. 551 AND S.B. 552 .

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Finance
June 1, 2017
Page 48

MR. KRMPOTIC:

Based on the Committee's actions, Staff will request the Legal Division to draft amendments for consideration by the Committee.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone wishing to make public comment?

PEGGY LEAR BOWEN:

I want to thank you all for your fine work in protecting children against bullying and all you have done for education.

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

Senate Committee on Finance
June 1, 2017
Page 49

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no further business before this Committee, this meeting is adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Barbara Williams,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	8		Attendance Roster
A.B. 510	C	2	Shelley Hendren / DETR	Written Testimony
S.B. 547	D	1	Sylvia Lazos / Educate Nevada Now	Testimony in Opposition
S.B. 547	E	2	Virginia M. Mills / ESEA	Testimony in Opposition
S.B. 547	F	2	Dr. Nancy Brune / Guinn Center for Policy Priorities	Written Testimony is Opposition
S.B. 547	G	1	Chris Daly / NSEA	Testimony in Neutral
S.B. 550	H	1	Chris Daly / NSEA	Written Testimony in Support
S.B. 167	I	2	Ciara Byrne / Green Our Planet	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 300	J	1	Nicole Rourke / Clark County School District	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 391	K	15	Senator Moises Denis	Proposed Amendment 5146