

March 26, 1992      LB 988, 1184

CLERK:    27 ayes, 0 nays, Madam President, on the advancement of LB 1184.

PRESIDENT MOUL:    LB 1184 is advanced.      We'll proceed with LB 988.

CLERK:    Madam President, 988 was a bill introduced by the Executive Board of the Legislative Council.      (Read title and brief description.) Bill was introduced on January 9 of this year, at that time was referred to the Government Committee for public hearing. Bill was advanced to General File. Senator Warner, do you want to offer...go to the bill first, Senator, or go to your amendments right away? Amendments? Okay. Madam President, Senator Warner would offer amendment. Senator, it's on page 906 of the Journal.      (Refer to FA276 as found on page 906 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT MOUL:    Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER:    Madam President, members of the Legislature, this legislation will restructure the existing performance evaluation process the Legislature has had in place since 1977 or '76 and, in fact, expands the role of the Legislature in its oversight responsibility that's been a part of the statutes for the Legislative Council since 1937. The amendment was offered at the hearing but inadvertently did not get included in the committee report, though not particularly substantive. There are four parts to the amendment if you looked at it in the Journal. One, the bill as introduced just strictly designated the Director of Research as the Director for performance review. This would allow the Exec. Board to designate someone within the Legislative Research section or another legislative employee to serve as director, give a little flexibility. The bill, as introduced, composed of five members of the Legislature, including the Chairman of Exec. Board and Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and three members. As introduced, the three would have been selected on the floor of the Legislature. Amendment was to have Exec. Board make the selection and the reason for that change is that these types of evaluation...program evaluations in most...in most states that have them generally are people who have a lot of interest in that...legislators who have a lot of interest in that area. Perhaps the selection through the Exec. Board would be able to accomplish that goal more readily. Then there's a clarification