

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
April 8, 2013**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Elliot T. Anderson at 3:57 p.m. on Monday, April 8, 2013, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2281 of the Lied Library, UNLV, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013](http://nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblyman Paul Aizley  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz  
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan  
Assemblyman Andy Eisen  
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore  
Assemblyman Randy Kirner  
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford  
Assemblywoman Dina Neal  
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart  
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None



**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly  
District No. 24  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Clark County Assembly District No. 12

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Todd Butterworth, Committee Policy Analyst  
Jacque Lethbridge, Committee Secretary  
Steven Sisneros, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ben Pelt, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada  
Alex Bybee, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada  
Curtis Blackwell, representing the Nevada Student Alliance and the Associated Students of Western Nevada College  
Ivon Padilla-Rodriguez, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada  
Rama Raja, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada  
Frank Perez, representing Associated Students of Western Nevada College  
Michael Gordon, President, Graduate and Professional Student Association, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; and President, Nevada Student Alliance, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Casey Sitler, Student, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
William O. Voy, Judge, Department A, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District  
Jennifer Henry, Court Hearing Master, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District  
Tara Raines, Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology and Higher Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Latricia Coffey, M.D., Board Certified Psychologist, Child, Adolescent and Adult Psychiatry  
Margherita Jellinek, Director of Field Education, School of Social Work, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Cheryl Perna, Lecturer, School of Nursing, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Michael Johnson, Lecturer, School of Nursing, University of Nevada,  
Las Vegas

Lynn Chapman, representing Nevada Families for Freedom

Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Families for Freedom

Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District

Calli Fisher, representing Washoe County School District

Lindsay Anderson, representing Washoe County School District

Tray Abney, representing The Chamber

John Sande IV, representing StudentsFirst

Lonnie Shields, representing Clark County Association of School  
Administrators

Christine Miller, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards

Geoffrey Lawrence, representing the Nevada Policy Research Institute

Craig Hulse, representing StudentsFirst

Craig Stevens, representing the Nevada State Education Association

**Chairman Elliot T. Anderson:**

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.]  
Madam Secretary, please note for the record we do have a quorum.  
Please mark other members present as they arrive. We will open the hearing on  
Assembly Joint Resolution 8.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 8: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to  
provide for the appointment of a Student Regent to the Board of Regents  
of the University of Nevada. (BDR C-201)**

**Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24:**

I had the privilege of serving as the Chairman of the Interim Legislative  
Committee on Education. I am here to present a product of that Committee,  
Assembly Joint Resolution 8, which would provide for a student member of the  
Board of Regents. This idea was presented to me by the Associated Students  
of the University of Nevada. As most of you know, we have gone through  
multiple sessions now of very impactful budget cuts to higher education.  
The student activity we have seen across the state on this issue has  
been tremendous. Out of that activity came an understanding of the need to  
promote the voice of students at all levels of the process. The Board of Regents is a major one. Throughout the discussion of this issue, it  
was noted that Article 11, section 7 of the *Nevada Constitution* provides for the  
election of members to the Board of Regents and that an amendment would be  
needed to allow for the appointment of a student member. As a result of the  
testimony heard during the interim, the Legislative Committee on Education is  
proposing A.J.R. 8 to amend the *Nevada Constitution* requiring the Legislature  
to enable the Board of Regents to appoint a student regent who will serve as a

voting member. It also requires the Legislature to provide for the qualifications and terms of office of the student regent.

It is entirely proper and fitting that we empower the students of our higher education system by providing them with the voice of a systems-governing board. As the consumers of higher education services, our students can offer a unique perspective about the policies and offerings of Nevada's public colleges and universities. I appreciate the opportunity to introduce A.J.R. 8 and thank you for your consideration of the measure.

We have students in the north and south who wish to express their support for this measure.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

Will the student regent be undergraduate, graduate, or does it matter?

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

There was a lot of discussion about whether the student should be from the north or south, graduate or undergraduate. There is already tremendous communication between institutions and the different associations representing those student bodies. The process, as I see it, would be to provide a recommendation, or list of recommendations, to be submitted to the Board of Regents. Rather than go with a structure that is an election or going with a north and south seat, it was felt the simplest way to provide for this voice would be for the Board of Regents to make the appointment. Even though there is an amendment, I understand that amendment is being withdrawn. I think this is a clean concept that could go before the voters to say, "Do you want to add a student to the Board of Regents?" Simplicity is what we are going for with this, yet profound impact for the better.

**Chairman Anderson:**

The resolution says, "The Legislature shall, by law: Provide . . . ." The way I read that is this would come back to Legislature for statutory authority as well. Those open questions could be decided later.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

I might have your analyst weigh in on that to walk through the mechanics of how this would go.

**Chairman Anderson:**

That is a legal question.

**Assemblyman Stewart:**

Having worked with the Nevada Youth Legislature for several years and having taught seniors in high school, I think it is very important we get this input, not only their voice, but the voting voice of the students whom many of the laws and issues directly affect. I am very much in support of this bill and I will be voting for it as a legislator and a voter later on.

**Chairman Anderson:**

I just received a message from our legal counsel. She is on top of it and has confirmed the way I read it. We would come back and pass a statute to provide for the process. This would put the authority in constitutionally and require us to create a statute.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

The concern I had about the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)), and why it is being changed, is yes, you would have that statutory authority to provide for more than one student regent. My preference would be that it is just one. What you are putting before the Board of Regents is the legislative authority to create the process by which you do the one, but not leaving it to Legislature to do more than one. The voters might have some issue with more than one.

**Chairman Anderson:**

I read it "Provide for the appointment by the Board of Regents of a Student Regent . . .", singular. So we will make the record very clear that this would be a singular appointment. We would just be setting up the process for that appointment of the singular student regent. That amendment has been withdrawn.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Thank you, Committee, for your consideration. You should hear some very valuable input.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.J.R. 8? We have a lot of bills on the agenda so please try to keep your comments brief. If you have written testimony, feel free to summarize and hand it in. We will put it on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) for the record.

**Ben Pelt, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada:**

I represent the Department of Legislative Affairs with the Associated Students of the University of Nevada and I am here to support A.J.R. 8. [Summarized written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).] Currently, 40 states in the country

have a student member on their governing board of education, 32 of which have full voting powers ([Exhibit E](#)).

**Alex Bybee, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada:**

I am here to represent the Associated Students of the University of Nevada as one of the assistant directors of legislative affairs. I sit before you today to offer testimony in favor of A.J.R. 8, which proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to provide for a voting student member on the Board of Regents. [Read from written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Curtis Blackwell, representing the Nevada Student Alliance and the Associated Students of Western Nevada College:**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of A.J.R. 8. I am the President of the Associated Students of Western Nevada College and I speak today on their behalf. As Student Government President, I am also required to be a member of the Nevada Student Alliance. [Read from written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).]

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

I had an opportunity to meet with some of these students. Have you met with the Chancellor or any of the other regents regarding this initiative?

**Ben Pelt:**

We met with the Chancellor and one or two of the regents. We did not get an "on the record" answer from them, if that is what your question was directed toward.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

I wanted to clarify something about the pathway that was being taken. I am a big fan of the idea of having student representation on the Board of Regents. Currently, the makeup of the Board of Regents, the fact that there are 13 members and how they are elected, is in statute. The *Nevada Constitution* defines the initial Board of Regents, the founding of the Superintendent of Instruction, et cetera. It then directs the Legislature to provide for the election of a new Board of Regents and define their duties. Did you find something specific there in terms of legal interpretation that would prohibit the addition of an appointed student regent as a statutory measure rather than as a constitutional amendment?

**Ben Pelt:**

That was something we went through during the interim. The Legislative Counsel Bureau confirmed that it would require a constitutional amendment as opposed to a statute to provide for it. We were not sure of that for some time.

**Chairman Anderson:**

I just confirmed with legal counsel. Because it says, "provide for the election" of a Board of Regents, it is specific and we have to honor that. I do agree with Assemblyman Eisen's sentiment that it would be easier if we could do it as a statutory measure.

**Assemblyman Aizley:**

I think there should be a student seat. There have been students on the Board of Regents. John Buchanan was a graduate student in public administration; he ran for regent and won his election. Why do you think it is better to appoint, rather than have students run for a seat like anyone else and have the people decide?

**Alex Bybee:**

Part of the intent of this resolution was to create a seat on the Board of Regents to serve as a liaison between the students and the Board of Regents on policy decisions that affect students. Yes, a student could run for a seat on the Board of Regents, but their constituency would be representative of not just the students. I think by the creation of this, and again 40 out of 50 states have student representation on their board, it provides a pure perspective on what students on campus want. They can dedicate themselves to outreach for students on those campuses specifically rather than geographically.

**Assemblyman Aizley:**

Do you think we should have the Board of Regents do something so that students who represent students come from different campuses each time there is an election? Over a period of eight or nine years, someone will be there from a community college, a university, a graduate school, or state college. One person has to represent a lot of people.

**Chairman Anderson:**

That is provided for by law. It is not in the scope of this. This would be a consideration we would have to come back, potentially in 2017, and pass that. I want to keep us on time and on schedule.

**Assembly Aizley:**

We could indicate our intent to the Board of Regents that it is a problem.

**Chairman Anderson:**

We will do that when we provide for it by law. Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support of A.J.R. 8?

**Ivon Padilla-Rodriguez, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada:**

I am representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Department of Legislative Affairs, and we are strongly in favor of A.J.R. 8. [Read from written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).]

**Rama Raja, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada:**

The value of student members as participants of higher education governing boards is evident today as 40 states in America currently possess at least one student regent position. [Continued reading from written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).]

**Ivon Padilla-Rodriguez:**

As a further matter, the influence of student regents and trustees has increased twofold between 1997 and 2010. The number of student regents and trustees who have been granted the vote has increased from 20 percent to 50 percent. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).]

**Frank Perez, representing Associated Students of Western Nevada College:**

As a student senator, I am the voice of my students at Western Nevada College. There are seven student senators and we represent over 3,000 students on our main and rural campuses. We are strongly in support of A.J.R. 8.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of A.J.R. 8?

**Michael Gordon, President, Graduate and Professional Student Association, University Nevada, Las Vegas; and President, Nevada Student Alliance, University Nevada, Las Vegas:**

Ever since I became involved in student government, one of the driving forces for the Nevada Student Alliance was to get a voting student regent on the Board of Regents. We have since found out from talking to former University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) and University Nevada, Reno (UNR) student body presidents that this has been an objective for student leaders as far back as the mid-1980s. The obvious rebuttal argument against the voting student regent is that students are students for a reason; they should focus on their studies and leave the oversight of the higher education system to the professionals. We do not discount that argument, but we believe that since the current regents also have full-time jobs, this argument is null and void. While the student will walk the blurred line between regent and being a student themselves, we would not support this action if we did not believe a student were not capable of faithfully executing his or her duties. According to the



book *The Young Guardians: Students as Stewards of the Past, Present, and Future of American Higher Education* by Sarah K. Elfreth, as of spring 2010, there were 65 student trustees serving on 39 boards in 28 states, representing more than 400 institutions and over 5 million higher education students. Since 2010, only three years ago, as Mr. Pelt from UNR has pointed out, the number of states with a student regent has increased to 40 out of 50. As graduate students, we are taught to deal empirically with situations, to make our evidence known, and to subject our work to peer review. In this case, the evidence is clear. Forty states allow for this provision in their higher education governing boards. Why should we not take this step?

**Casey Sitler, Student, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

I received my undergraduate degree in political science from UNR. I am currently a student at William S. Boyd School of Law at UNLV. I want to thank the Committee for their time, the Board of Regents for their efforts on behalf of students, and the Interim Legislative Committee on Education. I want to encourage the Committee support of this legislation as it is a pure matter of representation. While students have the opportunity to speak out at Board of Regents meetings, Board of Regents members are elected and, as a matter of course, are accountable to their constituents. There currently is not a member on the Board of Regents who directly represents students, has the authority to vote, and is accountable for those votes to the students. The addition of a student representative to the Board of Regents will ensure there is a representative on the Board who is directly accountable to students and has the authority to vote on their behalf.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to A.J.R. 8? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral on A.J.R. 8? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on A.J.R. 8. This bill looks like it is in decent shape with no opposition. If the Committee is willing, I will entertain a motion to do pass A.J.R. 8.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP MADE A MOTION TO DO  
PASS ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 8.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY ABSTAINED.  
ASSEMBLYWOMAN FIORE WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

**Chairman Anderson:**

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 386.

**Assembly Bill 386:** Establishes a pilot program for the administration of mental health screenings to pupils enrolled in selected secondary schools in the Clark County School District and the Washoe County School District. (BDR S-1022)

**Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Clark County Assembly District No. 23:**

Assembly Bill 386 establishes a pilot program for the administration of mental health screenings in secondary schools. Judge Voy of the Clark County District Court and my cosponsor Assemblyman Ohrenschall will explain in greater detail the need for this measure and the logistics of implementation. This legislation addresses two key factors: one, there is a growing epidemic of untreated mental illness which often eventually manifests itself in unfortunate ways for both the individual and society, including, but not limited to, acts of violence; and two, early identification and intervention is the key for best outcomes. If treatment begins at its earliest stages, before it begins to manifest and build self-destructive and outwardly destructive behaviors, the individual has a much higher chance of recovery. Both the social and financial cost to society are greatly reduced. As we originally drafted this bill, it would have required mental health screenings be administered in all secondary schools in the state, starting in sixth grade and every two years thereafter. After further thought, I did not want to impose either a financial or logistical burden on the school districts and hand down an unfunded mandate. I thought it wiser to collect data before expending additional time and resources. We pared the bill down to establish a pilot program in both Clark and Washoe County school districts for the administration of mental health screenings to at least one secondary school in each district. If they chose to, they could administer it in more than one school.

You have a proposed amendment by Judge Voy that we are on board with, that adds the words that all of the elements of this bill should be coordinated with community stakeholders ([Exhibit I](#)). The community stakeholders would select an age-appropriate, professionally recognized, mental health screening and administer the screening in at least one secondary school. In section 1,

subsection 3, the opt out was changed to opt in. Parental permission would be required to have the screening administered to their child. In partnership with the community, stakeholders would conduct follow-up screenings by a qualified professional if a pupil scores in a range that would indicate the need for a follow-up. If the professional determines that the pupil should undergo further diagnosis or treatment, the parent would be notified of the finding along with any available resources to assist parents in obtaining further professional diagnosis and/or treatment. I want to emphasize that the tool the school chooses would not diagnose and the school district would not treat. It would only be a screening, a follow-up, and provide information to the parent.

Finally, this bill requires that the school districts report program outcomes to the Interim Legislative Committee on Education and the Department of Education. It requires the Department to compile the results and submit them to the 78th Session of the Nevada Legislature.

**Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Clark County Assembly District No. 12:**

It has been a pleasure to work with Assemblywoman Woodbury, Judge Voy, Judge Henry, and all of the other stakeholders. Assemblywoman Woodbury is trying to fill an area that is needed. In my private life I work as a deputy public defender in the juvenile division of the juvenile courts. Since I have been in the juvenile division, I see many children who end up getting in trouble with the system because there is a mental health issue that oftentimes has gone undiagnosed. It only gets found once they are in the system and the long arm of the law has caught up with them. For a lot of these kids, that is a good thing and maybe they are going to get help. For many of the kids, it turns to self-medicating through illegal drugs or prescription drugs they get ahold of. This bill is crafted very carefully in that it lets the next Legislature get a report as to how the pilot program worked. The 2015 Session can look at the data and decide whether this needs to be expanded. We have many examples from around the country and you are going to hear from other witnesses where screenings like this are being done. That is exactly what they are, they are screenings. The school would not diagnose and the school would not treat. Assemblywoman Woodbury said it perfectly. They would just screen, and that information would be given to the parent. That is not something that would harm the child in any way. This is a reasonable measure and the 2015 Session would benefit from having the information as to how the pilot program worked.

**William O. Voy, Judge, Department A, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District:**

I am the juvenile court judge for Clark County, the delinquency court judge. I have overseen the mental health civil commitment for Clark County since 1994. Seventy percent of our kids coming through our system suffer from mental health issues. Most of the time they are either not diagnosed until

they get to us or have been diagnosed but are not being treated. This resulted in a conversation I had with my Hearing Master, Jennifer Henry, and Assemblyman Ohrenschall, and their conversations about the questions, "What are we doing with mental health? What are we doing to prevent these kids coming through the juvenile system? What can we do to better assess and get treatment to those kids that are identified that need treatment that are not being treated now?" I think, to some extent, the controversial provisions have been watered down. I heard a lot of concerns that we are overstepping our bounds, this is a parent-child issue, Big Brother is watching you, or whatever it may be. I have been involved in the mental health side since the 1980s when I was a Judge Advocate General officer in the U.S. Army. I have come to accept that it is a fact of life. Ten percent of the population suffers from major mental illness, not to mention the lower level of the spectrum. It is time to come out of the twentieth century into the twenty-first century and acknowledge this needs to be done. In Clark County we do have a problem.

In the materials that were submitted, there is an article from *USA Today* from January 1 of this year, talking about this very subject and the importance of dealing with these issues now ([Exhibit J](#)). The material also includes statistical data, a couple of testing instruments, and two case studies. In both cases the kids had been suffering from mental health issues for many years. In one case the kid had not been diagnosed until he committed a crime against someone, came to us, we diagnosed him, and got him treatment. There was another case where a child was diagnosed, but the parent did not know how to access treatment services. There is also a screening instrument from Wisconsin and statistics from a Wisconsin school district which currently does this.

The juvenile court should be the last resort for assistance and not the starting point. All too often the juvenile court is the starting point for kids and families, at least in Clark County. What causes me great concern is the confusion and frustration families deal with in trying to deal with mental health. Even if they are diagnosed or the family spots it, accessing services is very difficult. I have had parents tell me they were told by someone that next time Johnny acts up at home, call Metro, do a domestic violence complaint, they will take him to juvenile detention, and he will get treatment. That is sad. After doing this for ten years, I have that happen at least a couple times a year. A lot of confusion encompasses a denial that a problem even exists, whether it is the parents, the system, or whatever. There is an inability to pinpoint and draw an axis between the behavioral issues and health care needs, whether physical, mental, or believing repeated behavior is just a teen reaction to hormones. Untreated mental health issues lead to poor performance in school and conduct issues. Those conduct issues find their way to me.

Poor performance is another statistic, another dropout, and another failure of the school system.

The bill was drafted in such a way it leaves it fairly wide open. That is what a pilot is for. A pilot is to come together and determine what is best. For example, the screening tool. There are several screening tools available. There is the Signs of Suicide (SOS) program which is a suicide prevention program in Clark County School District. There is Teen Screen in Washoe County School District. These are very good programs and a good tool. Somebody suggested it is being done already. We are already screening for mental health because we are doing the SOS as far as suicide prevention. Unfortunately, mental health is a larger issue than we can handle. The SOS program is designed to help a small portion, but not all. It has its limitations. If you hear later that we are already doing something like this, no, we are not. We are not looking at the vast majority of those other issues that exist. They are not being adequately assessed. The question is, why are we not doing it in school? We test for hearing and eyesight, conduct physicals for sports, and give shots students have to have. Why is mental health such a taboo subject? What are we doing? If a screening instrument like this existed, would we have had Columbine? Everyone wants to come out and say, "Let us do something about this." It is the topic du jour of this session too. Sometimes people are afraid to hear the answers. If you want to effectuate change, if you really want to deal with the issue, you have to get down, get dirty, and deal with it. You have to deal with the parent who refuses to be involved or acknowledge their child has a problem. Or, someone in school may find out and Johnny has been labeled. They are already getting labeled, Individualized Education Programs label them all the time. If we are serious about this, should we not at least do a basic test? The kid sits down with a paper and pencil and is asked 25 or 30 questions, or he sits at the computer and does it that way. That is scored by an individual that does not know Johnny. They may determine Johnny has issues and needs to schedule a session with somebody that knows something about mental health. The family and Johnny can discuss if he has issues that need to be addressed. Then you bring in community resources to refer those kids and families to services so they do not end up in juvenile court, or dropping out and walking away from school, or so they do not end up doing drugs, trying to self-medicate. We need to catch these issues at age 12 or 13, stop it there, and get that intervention that needs to occur. We are talking anything from medication to simple counseling. A child who struggles all of his life and is diagnosed in his twenties with something that should have been diagnosed at age 14, by then he has nothing in life and is another statistic. I am trying to make a point because there are folks out there that think we should not be doing this. You need to take a look at it. I do believe this will make a substantial impact in identifying undiagnosed,

untreated mental health issues, both from a community safety standpoint and for that child's future. The drain we have on the system because of undiagnosed, untreated mental health occurs in our jail systems and adult mental health systems. If I get a child at the age of 14 who is seriously mentally ill and get him used to treatment, and treat him then, we can avoid him being placed in the adult system. With early intervention, the chance for improvement is there.

**Chairman Anderson:**

I want to give my Committee an opportunity to ask questions.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I am glad that you framed the bill on the public issue that you are trying to deal with. Your backup material cited a school district that charged \$3 for the screening. The fiscal note for Washoe County had \$300 per pupil for the screening. Why is that a gross markup? In the material you provided, you showed an example of two types of tests. I have concerns about some of the questions about low self-esteem and do you like yourself. How do these questions come into a mental health issue? In high school, when students feel out of their skin, lack self-confidence, weird, and their friends do not like them, they show weird and wacky behaviors. How do we identify at-risk kids? The bill does not specify who and how we are identifying these children. I do not want to fall into a situation where a kid is being identified because he is talking out of turn excessively and you are thinking there may be a mental issue.

**Judge Voy:**

There are two parts to this. First, the screening test and score is identified to throw the red flag up. When you have the red flag, then you talk to the qualified mental health person, a social worker-type of person, about the issues. It is the screener who will identify if there is an issue. You have to have a follow-up conversation one on one with the person to determine if it is a normal thought process at the time given, the age, and other stressors at that age. That is meant to be a screening tool, it is not meant to say someone has an issue. From that conversation, which is like a second step, you go to the next level.

I do not know where they got the fiscal note of \$300. Right now I pay a contract with several board-certified forensic psychologists. It is \$250 for a full-blown psychological evaluation on a child. This includes testing, interview, and the whole nine yards. The second-level step where you have that conversation with the mental health provider can currently be done with social workers. We also use interns from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas

(UNLV). In the short time this bill has been out, we have already had the UNLV psychology department come on board and say they would like to fill that void and provide that service. As part of the pilot process, that is what you ferret out. The anticipation we had was that we would find a screening tool that would be cost neutral or sufficient enough where court resources could take care of that portion of it, relying on community partners to provide that second layer of screening. We do not anticipate, in the pilot program, spending a lot of money.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I get the bill, I understand the intention, but there was a historical presentation that discussed how certain racial groups were targeted for schizophrenia or bipolar disorder in the 1960s because they were outspoken, or they displayed behavior that was not considered part of the normal culture. They were tagged and studied. I recall reading a recent report where a person was identified because he was talking out of turn in a social group or setting which was in a test facility. He was labeled as being disruptive because he said what was on his mind. I worry about when we get into sociological viewpoints and cultural norms and how people fall in and out of those cultural norms, how those are then described and perpetuated as being outside of the norm. Do you understand what I am saying?

**Judge Voy:**

Yes.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

When I look at all of the mass shootings, and being equivalent to the mentally ill or challenged, all of the people involved with these mass shootings were described as mentally ill and were on psychotropic drugs. What are you going to do about the people that are actually mentally ill? When you said if we had screening maybe Columbine would not have happened, I have to doubt that.

**Judge Voy:**

We are dealing with mental health. It is not an exact science. At least doing the screening you are identifying that maybe this person has a problem, that maybe you will get that person into treatment, and maybe that treatment is going to work. There is no easy answer to this. The students in the Columbine case were not receiving treatment at the time. In the most recent cases, you touched the system, but were not in the system yet. If we caught that issue when they were 13 or 14 and got them into treatment, would we still have that same individual at 22? The earlier you get intervention the more likely you are going to be able to resolve the issue and it does not fester, and fester, and fester until someone does snap. I am not a clinician, so that is my

best explanation. I do have Dr. Tara Raines, who is a Ph.D. psychologist at UNLV, who might be able to answer that question.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

These people were diagnosed and were seeking help.

**Judge Voy:**

I do not have specific case examples. From the information I have received in a lot of these cases, they touched systems but were not actively being treated.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

Under the pilot program, at what stage are parents notified that their child has been screened or they have a mental problem? Is it at the initial stage where they fill something out? Is it after they consult with another professional? Has anything like this been tried in other states and, if so, what were the results?

**Assemblywoman Woodbury:**

There are several in Las Vegas that might be able to answer some of these questions.

**Jennifer Henry, Court Hearing Master, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District:**

I am surrounded by academia and a couple of doctors. I think some of these questions are very well posed to them. Margherita Jellinek is the Director of Field Education at UNLV School of Social Work; Tara Raines is a professor in educational psychology and higher education; Cheryl Perna is a clinical instructor and coordinator for the School of Nursing; Michael Johnson is one of the instructors and lecturers at the School of Nursing; and Doctor Latricia Coffey is a psychiatrist in Las Vegas. Ms. Raines would like to answer some of those questions because she did her dissertation regarding mental health screening in middle schools.

**Tara Raines, Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology and Higher Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

My research is in universal screening for behavioral emotional risk in public schools. I have been a part of a grant funded by the Institute of Education Sciences since 2007. We performed universal screenings in both Los Angeles Unified School District, as well as multiple school districts in Georgia.

The function and purpose of this screening is to identify students who have the risk factors and early warning signs of the later development of behavioral and emotional problems. If we were cardiologists, we would be looking for



smokers, people who are obese, and people who have the risk factors of later developing heart disease. At this stage of universal screening, the purpose is not to form a diagnosis. The purpose is to identify children who are struggling and put into place interventions that can support them in the school. If they are having additional difficulties, we refer them to outside agencies that can support them and their families. The screening program I have been involved in costs less than 50 cents per child to perform the universal screening. The structure for this is already in place in the school districts, with intervention being the vehicle we use to identify students through special education services. Universal screening fits very nicely into the Tier I approach. Students who have difficulty after that point are taken to a school-based team to discuss. We determine which students need additional support and whether or not that support needs to be individualized or can be done in a larger group. With the screening program I have worked with, parental notification has taken place after the initial universal screening. I have worked with districts that have allowed us to use a passive consent approach. That is where the parents contact the schools if they do not want their student screened. However, I do realize for the purpose of this pilot, we would be using an active consent approach.

To address the statement about over identifying students of color, my dissertation research was on how universal screening can specifically reduce the overrepresentation of students of color in programs for students with emotional behavior disorders because we are using normed reference data to make those initial decisions regarding who would require intervention and additional support and who would not. It is an easier way for schools to target their behavioral and emotional interventions. The school districts I have worked with have used this data for some of their school climate interventions and whether or not to use a school wide positive behavior support plan. This helps to identify specific areas in which teachers may be able to increase their competency as far as interacting and working with students for de-escalation or in other areas. I am a huge proponent of universal screening. I have seen it work, I have seen it help students, and I have seen it help schools.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? I will note that Judge Voy had to leave to catch a flight.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

Under this current pilot program, at what stage would the parents be notified? From those other studies, you mentioned Georgia and Los Angeles. Do you have figures about how many interventions were made and how many kids entered treatment plans or were assisted?

**Tara Raines:**

The schools we worked with used their school-based team to make decisions regarding who needed additional treatment, so I do not have outcome data regarding the individual students. We have seen an improvement in teacher morale and teacher perception of student interaction after giving the school climate results from our screening to the teachers and faculty.

**Jennifer Henry:**

The bill is written so that a notice would go out to all parents. That notice would include a consent form. It would be an active consent form in that the parent would have to say, "Yes, my child can participate," or "No, my child cannot participate." Then the school would take those children that can participate and give the screening. If the parental or guardian consent form is not returned, the child would not be included in the screening.

**Chairman Anderson:**

In section 1, subsection 3, the way I read that, "The notice must inform the parent or guardian of his or her right to include or exempt the pupil." It seems like it is opt out, the way you describe it. Were we understanding you correctly because it reads as opt in?

**Jennifer Henry:**

I am not sure if you got the version I recently sent up at the request of Assemblymen Ohrenschall and Woodbury ([Exhibit I](#)). It says a parent or guardian consent form will be included with the notice provided and the notice must inform the parent or guardian of his or her right to include or exempt the pupil from the screening and contain a form for the signature of the parent or guardian to include or exempt the pupil from the screening. If the form of exemption is signed by the parent or guardian and returned to the school, the principal must exempt the pupil and the pupil must not undergo the mental health screening. If the parent or guardian consent form is not returned, the pupil must be excluded from the mental health screening. Is that the version you are seeing?

**Chairman Anderson:**

Okay, I wanted to clarify you are talking about the amendment. We have that up on NELIS now.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

After the parent has allowed their child to participate in the program, if the child is flagged for maybe having a mental health problem or there are concerns, at what stage is there notification to the parent? Is it at that first stage where problems seem to be identified, or are school staff going to point the child to

another professional and after that professional has looked over the situation, notify the parent?

**Jennifer Henry:**

With the amended language we are going to put together community stakeholders in both Washoe and Clark Counties. When I say stakeholders, I mean individuals from our universities, colleges, local mental health professionals, medical professionals, the courts, the juvenile justice services personnel, charitable organizations, and child welfare agencies. As a community we need to decide how this model should look, at what stage the parent needs to be involved, at what stage we move the child on to a higher level of services, and whether they need a one-on-one interview after the screening. We are even talking about having the community decide what screening tools to use. I would never dictate and do not think I am the be-all and end-all to make this decision. This is a very hard decision, and I commend you all for taking on a controversial bill because it involves mental health. This is truly the whole adage that it takes a village to raise a child and to get our youth going in the right direction, to get school participation higher, grades higher, dropout levels lower, and make sure we are raising healthy young adults for our future. The way the bill is written we would get community stakeholders, who we will identify globally as a group, and then decide how this model would look.

**Chairman Anderson:**

To be clear, you are still talking about the amendment?

**Jennifer Henry:**

Yes, I am talking about the amendment. If you would like some of the academic personnel and doctors present to answer questions, tell you what they think, what models they have participated in, and how it should look, I would be glad to turn the microphone over to them. This is a community stakeholder, very malleable bill so we can define and decide as a community when the parents need to be involved. I would never exclude a parent from this information. It is very important. The only exception to that might be if we identify a child who might be in an abusive situation and this is their first cry for help. In talking to the director of Teen Screen in Wisconsin, she says there are a number of kids that step forth for the first time thanking them for asking this question outside the presence of their parent. That is where the process has helped those children get out of abusive situations and get the counseling they need so they can be healthy.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Thank you. Sorry to interrupt you, we just need to keep the record clear that we are talking about the amendment.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

Section 1, subsection 4, says, "If a pupil scores on a mental health screening administered pursuant to subsection 2 in a range which indicates the pupil may have a mental health issue . . .," I am concerned about the word "issue." Adolescents by definition have mental health issues. It does not mean they have abnormalities. It also says, ". . . The school district shall ensure that an appropriate qualified professional . . . conducts an in-person assessment . . . ." Who are these appropriate qualified professionals going to be? I am concerned about our ability to identify those even for a pilot program, but trying to look ahead if this is something that were to expand, where are we going to find these folks? What is the mechanism by which the school district would be empowered to ensure that assessment occurs? How is that supposed to work if something comes up on the assessment that flags as a concern, how does that happen? How does the district enforce an assessment? I am very much a proponent of routine mental health screening for adolescents. It is something I do and something I teach. I am concerned about being able to do it in this mechanism.

**Jennifer Henry:**

I believe you are looking at the original bill. There have been some amendments made. In section 1, subsection 4, it goes to the community stakeholders to decide who the appropriate individuals are to do an interview after a child scores in a problematic scale. Screening tools have various scales, they also have questions that allow there to be a check and balance so you know there is truthfulness to their answers. That would be once again what the community stakeholders would have to identify, who those individuals would be. I am here with two academics from the School of Nursing. Their students come into my courtroom and watch what goes on. That is how I got hooked up with Ms. Perna. She said, "What you are proposing is valuable and I am here to help you; what can we do?" Professor Raines is also here. She has pledged her support as a stakeholder and to give pro bono services that may be appropriate for the students who are doing internships. The Director of Field Education at the School of Social Work at UNLV has also pledged her help. I feel confident in telling you we, with a pilot program, can identify pro bono resources at the social work level, at the therapist level, at the doctor level, at the psychiatrist level, and at the psychologist level, to assist in getting our children what they need. You need to hear from some of the dynamic people I brought to the table. I am hoping there will be questions they can answer.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

I am not taking issue with the concept of screening tools. I know both the Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale (Basis-32) and Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (BASC-2 BESS) are validated mental health screening tools ([Exhibit J](#)). I teach my students about doing these types of screenings when I teach them about how to do an assessment of adolescents. My concern is the way the bill is written. It says a screening that raises a concern will lead to an in-person assessment by an appropriate qualified professional. As much as I appreciate the offers of the academic programs to send their students to do this work, those students are not appropriate qualified professionals; they are students. I do not claim that my medical students are physicians. I have enough trouble finding mental health providers for adolescents whom I refer as a physician, and we are talking here about being referred from a screening that takes place at a school. What is the mechanism by which the school would be empowered to ensure that in-person assessment takes place? They are the ones designated in the bill as responsible for ensuring that follow-up actually occurs.

**Tara Raines:**

The schools have these structures in place. There are school psychologists available to possibly assist with some of these assessments. That would be a decision made by the community stakeholders later. In my experience, I found that the majority of the students identified by the screener have not required a referral to an outside source. The schools have found ways to support them and the families within the schools and recommend that the family follow up with outside sources. If families choose not to follow up with other resources, that is their choice. This gives the schools the information to help support the students while they are on campus.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Not every school has a psychologist on campus. Not every family has the finances or insurance to follow up in order to move into the second stage of what would be identified as a mental health issue. You talk about the amendment and community stakeholders; in some of the presentations or the information in the backup material related to the 12- and 17-year-old children, clearly there were family issues that were integrated into how the child functioned or did not function, or the disfunctionalism that may stem from both parents, or is generational. Tell me about how this bill, pilot or not, will intervene when the child goes back to the household that has those characteristics. I do not see that element in there.

**Jennifer Henry:**

If a child scores elevated on a screening device, there will be a one-on-one interview. Maybe the stakeholders decide that can be a nurse. Some of the questions may be misunderstood, and we need to ferret that out. If there is a problematic answer after the one-on-one, then we start with the counselor. Or, if they are so acute, we get them to a residential treatment center, we triage them, and we do what we need to do to stabilize them. I can pull from information I have from Wisconsin. I spent a lot of time talking to the director there. They have a case manager at the school level. That person is a resource because there are barriers to access information. This person also looks at the family resources in relation to what is being suggested for treatment. If they can get to a pro bono clinician, then they go to a pro bono clinician or a doctor. If they cannot get to a pro bono clinician, they work on a sliding scale. We do that a lot of times in the court system. If they have insurance or Medicaid, the manager helps the family coordinate the insurance to pay for the services that child may need, or the Medicaid coverage, and get them to the right Medicaid person. It is a matter of management. At any point along the way, if the parents decide they do not want the school to be involved and they do not want their child's case managed at this level, they have every right to opt out of it and deal with the information as they want. If they choose to stop getting assistance for their child, then that is what they do. There is nothing else we can do beyond that. If it rises to the level of a Child Protective Services referral, then as a person and place to do that, I make the referral and let a different agency become involved.

**Latricia Coffey, M.D., Board Certified Psychologist, Child, Adolescent and Adult Psychiatry:**

I did want to continue to answer and address some of the questions globally. I am a child psychiatrist, adolescent psychiatrist, adult psychiatrist, and forensic psychiatrist. That means I work within the legal system, where the legal system and mental health intersect across the board. This population we are talking about frequently ends up in my office. As a group, the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry has debated this across the country for years.

As a professional medical doctor, meaning I am largely doing the prescribing for these people, if these conditions or issues are addressed under these circumstances, then we completely support this type of screening. We completely agree that universal screening is important for the obvious reasons. Early intervention is huge, it is absolutely critical in making a difference. We are talking about the school system. The school system is not a mental health organization. However, the school system here, particularly in Nevada, unique to what I have seen in other states, has resources, has social

workers, nurses, and psychologists at a level that I have not seen before, that are able to intervene and do intervene, and make use of the information that they have.

The issue is there are lots of people who could benefit from existing services. Those people are not identified until they are in trouble. Our concerns would be that there are not enough community resources for appropriate follow-up. There is a lack of resources, especially with child psychiatrists, everywhere in the country. From my medical point of view, that is not a legitimate enough reason to say we are not going to try to help people or see who has problems. It is like closing your eyes to take a position of, "If there are a lot of people with problems we cannot help them with, let us not find out." I get it. I know fiscally down the road it creates other problems, but from a medical point of view, if you end up with thousands of kids who need help, that helps us with the next legislative issue of what do we do to fix it.

The community stakeholders absolutely have to be involved making sure we have adequate and appropriate follow-up resources and deciding who is the appropriate follow-up. Is it medical students, psychology students, or somebody who put up a sign? The child psychiatrist and psychologist should be in the group that identifies who the qualified community stakeholders are. That is critical. If those qualified people are not clearly identified as being qualified, then that by itself could knock the whole thing out. We do not want these kids being identified and then falling through the cracks because they are following up with bad people. From what I understand from this group, the screens they are considering, and will continue to consider, must be age appropriate, and that will happen in this circumstance.

Is the child required to follow up or not? My understanding is that it is not required; therefore, there is not an issue of enforcement. It is recommended and then resources are given that are specific to that child. The child is not just given a list of doctors. The resources that already exist here within the school system help the children identify the resources that those families can use. Those resources specifically address if you need help with family issues, if you have insurance, or if you have medical problems. The follow-up that is recommended, not required, is tailored specifically to that child. This is not new, this is not something we would have to create, it is occurring right now. If that had to be created, I would not be in support of it, because it could not be created at this point. That sort of referral already exists.

The other issue that has not been discussed, but down the road should be discussed, is making sure it is not punitive if the parent chooses not to follow up. That is something I do not think should make or break the bill.

**Chairman Anderson:**

I think that is outside of the scope of the bill. I do not want to talk about what we are going to do if parents do not follow up. We are talking about what we are requiring the school district to do. Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I am not sure if everyone at the UNLV library has had an opportunity to testify.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are they part of your presentation?

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

They are part of our group in support of the bill.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Those in Las Vegas in support of A.B. 386, please come forward.

**Margherita Jellinek, Director of Field Education, School of Social Work, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

I am a social worker and Field Work Director at the School of Social Work at the university. I completely support A.B. 386, particularly the things mentioned by Judge Voy and Dr. Coffey. I do think that parents must be involved in the process from the outset so that after any step is taken parents have to be involved. This is something I would expect.

**Cheryl Perna, Lecturer, School of Nursing, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

I teach the mental health course. I am in full support of A.B. 386. I spent about 17 years of my career in inpatient settings, primarily with children and adolescents from age 3 to 21. What I have seen is that kids present to inpatient so late they are in crisis, and their families are in crisis. There were signs years ago that were never picked up, and they were not given the proper treatment. Had they had that proper treatment, family dynamics, and a whole host of other things, it would have been significantly different. I think identifying early is the only answer to addressing a lot of the issues we are having with these school shootings, bullying, and teen suicide.

**Michael Johnson, Lecturer, School of Nursing, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

I am a lecturing clinical instructor with the School of Nursing at UNLV and I also teach a mental health course. I am in full support of A.B. 386. For several years I worked in our county hospital and pediatric intensive care unit. I witnessed many children who came in on legal holds, which essentially meant they were brought in against their will because they were a threat to themselves



or someone else. In discussion with parents, there were warning signs that could have been identified many years prior to escalating to that point.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of A.B. 386? [There was no one.]

**Jennifer Henry:**

Everyone here in Las Vegas has testified that is in support. We have no opposition in Las Vegas.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support of A.B. 386? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 386?

**Lynn Chapman, representing Nevada Families for Freedom:**

I am a little concerned. I know this pilot program is voluntary, but how many times does anything with government entities start off voluntary and end up mandatory? Thomas Edison was a premier inventor and, when he was six years old, he was kicked out of school. His mother was told he was retarded and he would never make anything of himself. Of course, that man probably had to eat his words. I read a very interesting article by Genevieve Young who wrote for the *Education Reporter*. She wrote about Albert Einstein and how he was a poor student. He suffered from what now would be called dyslexia and attention deficit disorder. What would it be like today if his public school teacher had sent him down to the school clinic for testing for social, emotional, mental, and physical disorders? Can you imagine? He would be on Ritalin, the data would have been compiled, he would not have performed well in any of the school programs, and he would likely have been dependent on the government upon reaching adulthood. It sounds silly, but at the same time, that is probably what would have happened.

She goes on to say she does not know what plagues the education system in America, but she does know that our schools have turned into social and health services delivery centers. They compile all kinds of private information on families and children. They medicate and physically examine them or otherwise treat children with or without parents' knowledge or consent. This one would have consent, but is it opt in or opt out? It goes back and forth. What about the confidential records? What about the records of the children, would they follow the child throughout the rest of their educational career? What about entering the military, will that cause a problem? What about entering college? What about going on to their work career?

**Chairman Anderson:**

Ms. Chapman, I believe all of those records are confidential due to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). We can certainly get that answered. Would you be willing to ask those questions to the bill sponsors?

**Lynn Chapman:**

I can ask the bill sponsor. I am worried about the children being labeled for the rest of their lives with physical and mental disorders. I do not think this is such a good idea. I think parents need to be able to handle the situation. It used to be parents were called and took over from there.

**Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Families for Freedom:**

Many of this nationwide screening began in 2002 when the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health by George W. Bush began to promote it. The Commission recommends routine and comprehensive mental health screening and testing for every child in America. Since that time there has been mental health screening promotion across the country. One of the major ones is that of Teen Screen. There has been a lot of controversy. I appreciated some of the questions, especially what Assemblywoman Neal mentioned. I thought I would probably fall into that category of a disruptive person because I was outside the norm. When they did the Teen Screen, about one-third of all students ended up being screened as having potential mental health issues. Of that one-third, half of those were referred for mental health follow-up. It could be a serious problem to be screening for hidden mental illnesses. It could lead to discrimination, labeling, and forced treatment. One of my greatest concerns is that of forced treatment. There are significant warnings for antidepressants for children from the Federal Drug Administration. They have essentially said that all antidepressants must carry warnings that they increase the risk of suicidal thinking and behavior in students.

I have one experience to tell you about with these psychotropic drugs. I think they are a significant problem in our schools. Will parents see copies of the test and know what their child will be asked? I am concerned to some degree about the parental involvement. When my son went on a mission, he got a bleeding ulcer, ended up in the hospital, and was sent home. When I took him to the doctor, the doctor gave him a psychological test to see whether he was depressed or not. I said, "Well, of course he is depressed, he has lost 25 pounds, and he got sent home from his mission." The doctor told me not to worry about it because he was going to give my son Paxil, and that 40 percent of his patients were on it. I told him, "Thank you very much and we will say good-bye." It was his preferred method of treatment to put people on psychotropic drugs like Paxil. We went to another doctor who diagnosed my

son with three different food poisonings and he was depressed because he was ill.

I think sometimes people can be misdiagnosed when we do not look at the whole person. I am concerned about the schools taking on the additional burden of determining whether or not our children are mentally fit and how that will interfere with the family. I caution you to move forward carefully. We know the pilot program is in order to lay the foundation for a statewide program. We are concerned about laying that foundation.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there anyone else in Carson City who wishes to testify in opposition of A.B. 386? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral of A.B. 386?

**Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District:**

The Clark County School District is neutral on A.B. 386. We currently use a mental health assessment in 11 of our schools that looks for signs of depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, and alcohol abuse. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).]

**Calli Fisher, representing Washoe County School District:**

Currently in the Washoe County School District, we are piloting a mental health screening tool in several of our middle schools. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).]

**Chairman Anderson:**

Any further testimony on A.B. 386? [There was no one.] We will invite the bill sponsors back for closing remarks.

**Assemblywoman Woodbury:**

Thank you for hearing this bill. I was just handed a copy of today's *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, Health and Fitness section, and there are a couple of things I wanted to read. It says that half of all lifetime cases of mental disorders begin by age 14. A quote by Jacqueline Harris, Chairwoman, Clark County Children's Mental Health Commission says, "I worked in early childhood mental health for 15 years and what we know is the sooner that there is intervention, the better the outcomes . . . but we wait until it's too late" ([Exhibit M](#)). What I have heard is that most agree early intervention is key and most beneficial. Maybe there are questions about how we get there. I am more than willing to work with Committee members and stakeholders on actual language of the bill. I thought it was very important to discuss how we get there.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I do not think we do a service to these children to let them continue to go on undiagnosed. If there is something like this screening test that will help them, help their parents, and get them to the resources they need, I think this Legislature does a great service to the kids. I hope the Committee will consider passing this bill.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 386. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 343.

[Assembly Bill 343](#): Revises provisions governing educational personnel.  
(BDR 34-1020)

**Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Washoe County Assembly District No. 26:**

I would draw your attention to the amendment which rewords this bill ([Exhibit N](#)). This bill is designed to give authority to each school district and ask teachers to apply to their school districts for approval prior to starting an advanced degree program. The reason an approval is important is so that the school district can measure whether the proposed advanced degree is consistent with a teacher's field of study and area they teach. In section 1, I did add subsection 4 that reads, "Section 1 of this bill shall not apply to a teacher seeking to advance their career in school administration or in an area of study designated as an area of high need, as determined by their respective school district." An area designated as high need might be math or science. They would receive an automatic okay. That is the essence of the bill.

**Assemblyman Aizley:**

Would it count if a math instructor takes a physical educational (P.E.) course because they want to become an athletic coach?

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

The purpose of this bill is to keep things germane. If I was a P.E. teacher taking a math course so I could become a math teacher, that might be an area of high need. Presumably the district would rate that as a high need. If I am a math teacher taking a P.E. course to become a coach, that would be up to the school district to decide whether or not that is germane to where they are moving. I am not going to make that decision for the school district.

**Assemblyman Aizley:**

That states the problem, what is relevant and what is not?

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

That is up to the school district.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

I have a similar concern about relatedness. Is there criteria for relatedness that would make it more helpful? If you left it to the school district, you could end up with inconsistencies.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

You are correct in the sense there could be inconsistencies between one district and another. I submit to you there is an inconsistency between Clark County and many other districts simply because of the challenges and size of the organization. I am comfortable with the school districts setting up their own criteria.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

If a teacher was getting additional education in the area they teach, that would count. If a teacher was getting education in an area that was determined by the district to be in high need, even if it was not in the area they were currently teaching, that too would count. How would that be communicated? How would it be determined? When would it be determined? What is high need district by district?

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

When a teacher gets an advanced degree, there is a stipend they receive. With this bill, I am trying to say, before you start that degree program, go to your school district and make sure it is okay, that it fits into their curriculum needs, et cetera. Does it count? That would be decided by the district.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

These are not necessarily continuing education courses. These are courses that lead to some degree or certificate that would change the way a teacher is compensated.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

That is correct. It is not a certificate; it is an advanced degree program.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

This is not going back to be recertified? A teacher is required every five years to recertify. This is when you are going toward an advanced degree.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

Yes.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

It is strictly for that and not trying to climb the salary ladder. If they go back to school, they can improve and enhance their salary because they get credit beyond their bachelor's or master's. They get into step categories. That is based on the number of advanced credits you have.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

If I am a teacher and I have a bachelor's degree and I want to take a step to increase my salary, I would go to the school district and tell them I am interested in getting a step increase and I am going to do that by taking X, Y, Z course or program. The school district would have the option to say it is germane to your field of teaching at that school or they could say it is not germane to your area of teaching. The exception would be to those moving into administration. You might be taking a master of education or doctor of education or some other things that relate to administration, or moving into a high-need area which is typically math and science.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

I think what you are doing is a good idea. As a teacher you want to strengthen yourself and be stronger. You can bring so much more information and knowledge to your class.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

I cannot remember what you did in your early life. Can you tell us?

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

I have ten years of postgraduate work. Two master's degrees and a doctorate.

**Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:**

We have had a lot of good conversations about education. I agree with you on a lot of issues. I do know that you have a postgraduate degree in education administration. While some would ask why you did that, others might say to become well rounded or more knowledgeable, a lot of reasons. I can tell you over the course of years I took a lot of classes. I could probably have two doctorates and two masters and three who knows what else by now with all of the classes I took. A lot of them were absolute requirements, English language learner classes, early childhood classes, and library classes. Some of them were simply because I was very interested in knowing how an at-risk student did things and operated in their daily life. I was given that opportunity when I did my master's, specialist degrees, undergraduate degrees, and my early childhood degree. I was given those electives to take. I do not think teachers are taking box classes. They are doing these classes to better themselves. They are requirements for recertification. I know within the

system there are at least 17,000 to 18,000 teachers in Clark County. I am not sure how the paperwork would mandate down there. I think while I appreciate the idea of the bill, I want teachers to be the most effective they can be. I know I am a professional and I feel I have the ability to make those decisions. I am a little worried about that part.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

It has been suggested I should change the language to school board or designee because of the volume of applications that Clark County School District would get. Before somebody starts a program, it would be good if somebody would say that is the kind of program that is going to result in your getting an increase, or that is not the kind of program we would like to see you do, and it will not result in getting an increase.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

What happens to those educators that currently have a degree? Does this apply to them retroactively? Or is this something we are going to move on forward if it passes and it just applies to new teachers?

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

It would not apply to somebody that already has an advanced degree, unless they were going for a second advanced degree. This applies once the bill is effective so that teachers get approval before they pursue the degree so that nobody is moving in a direction that is a waste of time. It is not retroactive.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Assemblyman Kirner, are there any folks you want to call up as part of your presentation?

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

I believe there are some people that will testify in support.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas who wishes to testify in support of A.B. 343?

**Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District:**

The Clark County School District is in support of A.B. 343. Currently teachers have two ways to increase their pay, whether it is years of service or educational increments. Clark County School District agrees that all teachers have a right and are encouraged to seek additional degrees. We agree that when teachers earn degrees in nonrelated subjects, it is not relevant and has little impact on student achievement. Rather than have the board of trustees

approve each request individually, we would prefer they publish a list on an annual basis of those approved degrees. Every year we go through a formal process related to identifying positions deemed as critical labor shortage. We could identify advanced degrees that are sought after.

We would like to ask for an exception to subsection 1 of the amendment, if the change is related to a reduction in force or other circumstances out of the control of the teacher. For example, if a teacher who has a master's degree in math opted to move to teaching P.E., then the law would take effect. However, if the teacher with the master's degree in music has his classes cut due to budget cuts, then he would not be penalized. Additionally, we would also like you to know that there is a statement in our collective bargaining agreement that says for some of those increments, the degree must be pertinent to the position.

**Lindsay Anderson, representing Washoe County School District:**

Washoe County School District is in support of A.B. 343. We talked to the bill sponsor and he is open to the suggestion of adding "or designee" to the board of trustees so that it does not become an overly onerous process. We are fortunate to have a positive working relationship with our Washoe Education Association, and we are planning to address this issue during upcoming contract negotiations. While we hope similar provisions are in our contract, we understand the bill sponsors intend to codify this as it aligns with our board platform.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Is there overwhelming evidence in either school district that teachers are not taking courses that are good for them? Do we have a lot of teachers taking classes that are irrelevant to their fields in order to advance on the pay scale?

**Lindsay Anderson:**

I do not have data on that but I can follow up and see if that is an issue.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

That would be helpful. We all say we like to make data-driven decisions. I know for teachers to get that pay scale increment you do have to submit all of the classes you took and where you took them so that it is well documented. It would be beneficial for the Committee to see this data.

**Tray Abney, representing The Chamber:**

The Chamber strongly supports A.B. 343. I want to thank Assemblyman Kirner for bringing this forward. This is about what is best for kids and our future workforce. We get hung up a lot talking about what is best for adults



and what is best for labor contracts and negotiations. This is about our future workforce. We think teachers are free to take any additional courses they like, but if taxpayers are going to pay for it and give them extra pay for that, it should be directly related to what is going on in that classroom and making sure our students achieve.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Are you aware who pays for the classes the teachers take?

**Tray Abney:**

The teachers.

**John Sande IV, representing StudentsFirst:**

StudentsFirst supports A.B. 343 and thanks Assemblyman Kirner for this legislation. We support teachers seeking post-secondary degrees. However, given the fiscal constraints faced by this state, we believe it is better policy to provide incentives for the educator to pursue secondary education that is directly related to the field they are teaching. Additional education presumptively increases the effectiveness of the educator's ability to pass the knowledge on to their students and we support that policy.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of A.B. 343? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 343?

**Lonnie Shields, representing Clark County Association of School Administrators:**

I would like to thank Assemblyman Kirner for taking care of one of our problems, going for the higher education degree for education administration. We were concerned that was not in the bill. We still stand in opposition to the bill simply because we believe it is the bargaining units that should negotiate salaries with the districts. If this is a problem, we are willing to sit down and negotiate that. It sounds like it has been somewhat negotiated in Clark County. We think it would be best handled at the local district because each of the 17 districts would have a different perspective.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone else wishing to testify in opposition of A.B. 343? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 343?

**Christine Miller, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards:**

We want to thank Assemblyman Kirner for his willingness to tackle this complicated issue with the goal of improving classroom instruction and conserving district resources. I am here in the neutral position because the Association supports the concept as developed by Assemblyman Kirner, but would like to continue working with him on a detail of concern, especially in smaller districts. Section 4 of the proposed amendment states, "Section 1 of this bill shall not apply to a teacher seeking to advance their career in school administration or in an area of study designated as an area of high need, as determined by their respective school district." It is possible, especially in a small district, perhaps even in a larger district, that a teacher will want to obtain an advanced degree in an area that is not currently needed by the school district but which can be anticipated as being needed in the next several years. We would like to work further with Assemblyman Kirner on a quick fix to ensure this situation does not harm the teacher. With a clarification or other appropriate change, we would support A.B. 343.

**Assemblyman Aizley:**

Every time I hear someone say, "students first," I get a little upset. I think the policy should be "teachers first." They are the ones that teach the kids. If you have unhappy teachers, you are going to have unhappy students. Make life better for the teachers, you will get better students.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

I am willing to work with the folks that have suggested they would like to add some language to this bill. I have a lot of education, I appreciate the value of education, and I want to make sure that whatever education the teacher might pursue adds value to the classroom.

**Chairman Anderson:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 343. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 373.

**Assembly Bill 373: Establishes a tax credit for donations to a school tuition organization. (BDR 34-716)**

**Assemblyman Wesley Duncan, Clark County Assembly District No. 37:**

Assembly Bill 373 is a tax credit scholarship program which has also been called an opportunity scholarship program. One of the things I have been struck by with many of the bills we have heard is that many reforms are reforms that have been tackled by Florida. Florida, in many ways, is a lot like Nevada in terms of the demographics, the English language learners (ELL), and the per-pupil spending. Assembly Bill 373 is really an extension of that. My goal is

to target our most vulnerable students who we know are having trouble in our schools—our ELL kids and kids who are 200 percent and below the federal poverty level.

I will quickly take you through the mechanics of the bill. Any business organization or gaming organization, someone that is subject to the banking excise tax, would be allowed to have up to a \$100,000 deduction. They would put that donation into a 501(c)(3) organization. My intent with the bill is there would be one 501(c)(3) organization that would give out merit scholarships and need-based scholarships to our ELL kids or anyone who is 200 percent and below the federal poverty level. As a comparison, Florida has a very similar program, the Step Up for Students program. In their program, 36 percent of the students are African American, 25 percent are Latino, 24 percent are Caucasian, 5 percent are other or mixed race, and 1 to 2 percent are Asian. Their program extends all the way up to anyone who qualifies for free and reduced lunch. Our bill would be targeted to the ELL kids and anyone 200 percent and below the federal poverty level. As a comparison, for a family of four, that would be anyone who is making \$47,100 and below that would qualify under this bill to apply for an opportunity scholarship. In Florida, 75 percent of the money would have to be used for tuition at a private school, but the other 25 percent could be used for textbooks, transportation, or anything else.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

This is a dollar-for-dollar tax credit so if a business donates \$1 to one of these organizations, they pay \$1 less in taxes?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

Yes, but the bill limits it to nothing over \$100,000. You could not pour \$100 million into it and get that kind of a deduction. Florida has one 501(c)(3) that is administering these programs. They have \$239 million dollars that have been donated.

**Assemblyman Kirner:**

Various stores might have a "donate a dollar for such and such a school program," or the grocery store will donate two percent of the proceeds; are these excluded or would that be part of the \$100,000?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

The intent of this bill is they donate into the 501(c)(3) that is specifically for this scholarship. It could not be just any donation you took at the store. If the money was earmarked specifically for that program, it would apply.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

How low of a poverty level do kids have to be at before they can apply for these funds?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

The intent of the bill is that any ELL student would apply, wherever you are at on the federal poverty level. For everybody else, you have to be below 200 percent of the federal poverty level. The Health and Human Services Department with the federal government sets the poverty levels. If a family of two, say a single mother with a child, wants to apply for the scholarship, she would be eligible for this program if she made \$31,000 or less for the year.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

My question is about the application process and how ELL and other students will have access. In the community I work with, it is hard sometimes to do the outreach and for them to be aware that this aid is there. How are we going to match the funds to the children?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

The intent of the bill, and the way other states have done it, is to work in concert with the Department of Education to get the word out that these types of programs exist for students. It is not just a stand-alone 501(c)(3) that you have to come across. I really want to go after our most vulnerable students, our ELL kids and our kids that are in poverty. That would be one of the things I want to work on with the Department of Education, that they are working with one 501(c)(3) organization specifically for this program so there is information going out to K-12 schools that this program exists.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

How is the school tuition organization defined? What is the scope of that? That is not a public school, so who is envisioned to be that group?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

In section 4, the school tuition organization is the nonprofit that is going to administer the merit scholarships to your ELL students and to other students that qualify.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I read section 4 and I saw the nonprofit, but is that any nonprofit? We could have a nonprofit pop out of the woodwork and say they service the ELL students and they do not. They are holding on to this money and nothing is happening.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

The intent is the 501(c)(3) works in concert with the Department of Education so there is one organization to administer the scholarships. Florida has one organization that administers \$239 million of funds that have been accumulated. We do not want some rogue organization setting something up and saying they are helping students. In terms of the administrative costs, the school tuition organization can only expend 3 percent of the money for salary.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

Section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (e), says that the school tuition organization must "Not limit to a single school the schools for which it provides grants." Could that organization limit their grants to a single entity that has multiple campuses? Or was the intent that they would have to provide grants to different entities that manage schools?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

The intent is it could not be just the one entity that then gives it to its various entities. I want it to be expansive. If we need to massage the language a bit to show it cannot go solely to one entity that controls four other entities, I want that to be clear. In Florida there are 1,322 schools participating in that program. I do not want to limit it to one with a few umbrella organizations.

**Assemblyman Eisen:**

If you had a company that operated five private schools in Nevada, could there be a 501(c)(3) organization that existed solely to provide grants to that company, or is that something you are trying to avoid? As it reads right now, the language seems it would allow that. If you had more than one campus, more than one functioning school, your company could have a 501(c)(3) that is solely dedicated to it.

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

That is not the intent of the bill. I do not want the 501(c)(3) to be set up specifically for its parent organization. I would definitely want to clear that up in the bill.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Do you have anyone you want to call up as part of your presentation?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

I believe there were a few in support.

**Chairman Anderson:**

They are not part of your presentation?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

No, they are not.

**Chairman Anderson:**

We have an amendment from StudentsFirst, but is that a friendly amendment?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

It is for the most part. There is one part, and the only part that would be considered unfriendly, where they want to limit it to students who are in one- or two-star schools. My intent for the bill is it would apply to all ELL students and anyone under the federal poverty level at any school.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Per our rules, for the purposes of testimony we have to take them in opposition. They are free to support the concept. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of A.B. 373?

**Geoffrey Lawrence, representing the Nevada Policy Research Institute:**

I want to go over how these programs work in other states and talk about the fiscal impact. There are many states that have programs similar to this. Florida's was the first one, but now about 12 states have implemented something similar. The states are very diverse and include Arizona, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Florida, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Iowa, Indiana, and New Hampshire, states that are broad in terms of geography, population, and political persuasion. For the most part, these programs are targeted to low-income students. Florida's is also 200 percent of the federal poverty line or below, as well as ELL students. It is very similar to the program created by this bill. Florida's program, Step Up for Students, has grown significantly over time. It started out with 200 students participating in the first year, then over 1,000 and now they are up to about 33,000 students in the program. The average household income of participants in this program is \$26,500. The average household size is 4.2 persons. It is very low income for that size of family. Florida's public school system is 54.3 percent Caucasian, 25.4 percent African American, 18.2 percent Hispanic, and about 2 percent Asian. You have heard the statistics for those participating in the Step Up for Students program. It is disproportionately minority beneficiaries. This is correlated to their ELL status and below 200 percent of the federal poverty level. It is important to keep in mind who the beneficiaries generally are here.

There is also an important fiscal element. I have submitted "Choosing to Save" ([Exhibit O](#)) which is an analysis of the fiscal impact of this type of program on Nevada. It is a peer-reviewed study that we commissioned about four years ago at Nevada Policy Research Institute.

**Chairman Anderson:**

I will let you mention the study, but I do not want to get into fiscal issues in this Committee.

**Geoffrey Lawrence:**

One of the tangible benefits is because the scholarship levels are less than we spend per pupil in the public schools, there is actually a cost savings to the public school district. They have more resources remaining in public school districts.

**Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Families for Freedom:**

Nevada Families for Freedom supports A.B. 373. In Washington, D.C., they have a program called the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, where families with incomes under \$22,000 are allowed to participate. The students who saw these scholarships saw a graduation rate of 82 percent, while the graduation rate for those in the regular D.C. school program was about 56 percent. It was also a huge cost savings for the district. In that district they were spending \$28,000 per pupil. They were participating in the scholarship program for less than one quarter of that. We think that choice in education can improve academics and it can give people an opportunity to become involved in determining their own children's education.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 373?

**Craig Hulse, representing StudentsFirst:**

StudentsFirst is in support of the concept of A.B. 373. The amendment will clarify two things ([Exhibit P](#)). The first, that students eligible for the scholarship would be in an underperforming school based on the Nevada Performance Framework as a one- or two-star school. The second would require some accountability metrics that would go back to the Department of Education. If and when this program is put into place, you could see the success or failures of how this program is working out.

**Craig Stevens, representing the Nevada State Education Association:**

The Nevada State Education Association stands opposed to A.B. 373. We appreciate the sponsors' thoughtfulness in trying to create this policy; however, the issues we have are fiscal and the fact we are taking money out of the taxable money. We understand it will be a tax credit, but the money that comes out of these folks' hats has paid for a bevy of students. It feels like bad policy.

**Chairman Anderson:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 373? [There was no one.]

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

Thank you for hearing this bill. We will work with everyone. If we can help even 100 ELL or low-income students in the next year and maybe increase that over a few years, it is worth achieving and going after. I applaud this Committee's efforts. We have been following after other states in our reform efforts to try to make Nevada a more prosperous place for our students to excel.

**Chairman Anderson:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 373. This bill has to go to the Committee on Taxation. I do not think any of us will be in a place to vote up or down at this point. We will give Assemblyman Duncan a chance to give it to the Committee on Taxation. I will entertain a motion to refer A.B. 373 to the Committee on Taxation with no recommendation.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO REFER  
ASSEMBLY BILL 373 TO THE COMMITTEE ON TAXATION WITH  
NO RECOMMENDATION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECOND THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY ABSTAINED.  
ASSEMBLYWOMAN FIORE WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)



Assembly Committee on Education

April 8, 2013

Page 41

**Chairman Anderson:**

Is there any public comment in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was none.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 6:28 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Jacque Lethbridge  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name: Committee on Education**

**Date: April 8, 2013**

**Time of Meeting: 3:57 p.m.**

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.J.R. 8	C	Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24	Proposed amendment
A.J.R. 8	D	Ben Pelt, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada	Written testimony
A.J.R. 8	E	Ben Pelt, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada	Student Regent State Comparison
A.J.R. 8	F	Alex Bybee, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada	Written testimony
A.J.R. 8	G	Curtis Blackwell, representing the Nevada Student Alliance and the Associated Students of Western Nevada College	Written testimony
A.J.R. 8	H	Ivon Padilla-Rodriguez / Rama Raja, representing the Associated Students of the University of Nevada	Written testimony
A.B. 386	I	William O. Voy, Judge, Department A, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District Court	Proposed amendment
A.B. 386	J	William O. Voy, Judge, Department A, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District Court	A.B. 386 Materials
A.B. 386	K	Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District	Written testimony
A.B.	L	Calli Fisher, representing Washoe	Written testimony

386		County School District	
A.B. 386	M	Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Clark County Assembly District No. 23	<i>Las Vegas Review-Journal quote</i>
A.B. 343	N	Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Washoe County Assembly District No. 26	Proposed amendment
A.B. 373	O	Geoffrey Lawrence, representing the Nevada Policy Research Institute	Choosing to Save
A.B. 373	P	Craig Hulse, representing Students First	Proposed amendment