

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 6, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 3:59 p.m. on Monday, May 6, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Vice Chair
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Senator Donald G. Gustavson

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Pat Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Assembly District No. 24
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Assembly District No. 28
Assemblyman Michael Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Counsel
Diana Jones, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Elisa P. Cafferata, President & CEO, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood
Affiliates
Sara Wainwright, Nevada Women's Lobby
Wendy Boszak
Cheryl Blomstrom, Nevada Nurses Association

Senate Committee on Education
May 6, 2013
Page 2

Vanessa Spinazola, ACLU of Nevada
Angie Sullivan, Teacher, Clark County School District
Sara Lemma
Elisha Morgan, Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada
Michelle Dudley
Theresa DeGraffenreid
Janine Hansen, Nevada Eagle Forum
Jeanette Clark
Benjamin Affleck
Rachel Affleck
Katherine Loudon, Coordinator, Guidance Counseling Services, Washoe County
School District
Craig M. Stevens, Nevada State Education Association
Caitlyn Anderson, Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada
Dawn Johnson
Emmily Bristol
Lynn Chapman, Nevada Families
Kimberly Burchiel
Jeannie Adams
Ruth Johnson
Terilyn Taylor
Larry Matheis, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association
Sally Jordan, Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada
Brenda Aguilar, Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada
Howard Watts, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Don Nelson, NevadaLIFE
Mark Foxwell, Knights of Columbus
Mike Dang
Jody Osburn
Jennifer Ferre
Bruce Bayne
Margo Piscevich, Board Member, Mar Monte Planned Parenthood
Sheila Ward, Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee, Carson City Republican
Central Committee
Rocio Grady
Kevin Ferre
Rebecca Affleck
Melissa Clement, President, Nevada Right to Life
Christle Robinson

Senate Committee on Education
May 6, 2013
Page 3

Heidi Wixom
Lisa Nelson
David Strickland
Juanita Clark, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation
Susana Taylor
Sheila Moulton
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District

Chair Woodhouse:

I will open the hearing with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 230.

ASSEMBLY BILL 230 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing courses of instruction in sex education. (BDR 34-1034)

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien (Assembly District No. 24):

The Legislature has a constitutional obligation to provide for uniform common schools in the State. The needs of students across the State may be different and distinct, but we need a common focus for instruction. As a member of the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools, Department of Education, I am familiar with the process of developing and implementing standards for subjects taught in our schools. This public process includes walking through the proposed standards, reviewing what should be taught, making decisions about what to include and developing a framework for implementation using local curriculum delivered by the school districts. It became obvious to me that the topic of sexuality education is not subject to this process of standardization.

A similar bill was presented to the Assembly in the 2011 Session. The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) conducted research about sex education to determine what was taught in each district. I will make this information available to the Committee. This research highlighted the variability in what is taught throughout the State. Most distressing was the finding that although current law requires districts make information available to parents regarding what is taught in sex education programs, the LCB did not get a response from districts when questioned on this issue. This concerns me as a Legislator and as a parent. Great variability was found across districts, and there is a potential for inadequacies in what is taught to our students.

There are many reasons these standards are needed. Nevada has the fourth highest rate of teen pregnancy in the United States. In 2008, there were more than 7,000 teen pregnancies in our State. This rate is decreasing, but it is still the fourth highest rate in the Nation. Although young people from 15 to 24 years of age represent only 25 percent of our sexually experienced population, they acquire nearly half of all new sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). In 2009, young people ages 13 to 29 accounted for 39 percent of all new human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infections. One in five teens reports some form of abuse in a romantic relationship.

The economic impact of teen sexuality was also described by the LCB. In 2008, costs associated in the State from births to teen parents were approximately \$84 million. The annual medical cost in Nevada to treat STDs is \$46.2 million. A 10 percent reduction in teen pregnancy could save the State as much as \$10 million a year.

This bill would require teaching medically accurate information to provide all students the information they need when they need it. It recognizes students have different levels of experience. It accepts that our students are different and treats them all with respect. It would provide tools for students to enable them to recognize and build healthy relationships. It also would provide a framework to ensure this instruction is provided in all school districts at a high quality level.

This law would allow districts to maintain local control over instructional materials. Each district now has a local advisory committee to review materials and textbooks proposed for district use. This local advisory committee recommends programs to the local school board of trustees, which has the final approval over what is taught. This bill proposes adding two students to the local advisory committee tasked with reviewing these materials.

Nevada is one of only three states requiring parents to opt their children in to classes in sex education. This bill would change our process to a parental opt-out process. One reason for proposing this change is to ensure children of working parents do not miss the opportunity to participate in these programs. The two largest school districts in the State, Clark County School District (CCSD) and Washoe County School District (WCSD) differ in their views on this process. I worry a large number of students will not participate in this program if we do not change to an opt-out process.

Elisa P. Cafferata (President & CEO, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates):

This bill would not create new mandates; these requirements already exist. The bill would not remove local control. It would maintain the current structure of approval for all major decisions about sex education curriculum. This bill would not remove parental control. Parents would maintain 100 percent of the control over their children's participation in the program.

Section 1 of A.B. 230 maintains the requirements that the school district boards of trustees establish the course of study in sex education. Section 1, subsection 1 refers to section 2 of the bill by referencing the Council. It requires this Council to add standards for sex education to the health standards that currently exist. This would allow the curriculum for sex education to be periodically updated on a cyclical basis similar to other content areas. The standards for health were last updated in 2010, so they would be updated in the next cycle.

Section 1, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) through (k) would add to the existing topics covered in sex education instruction, which were identified 28 years ago. For example, under the study of the human reproductive system, not only anatomy and puberty would be taught, but students would also discuss emerging health topics such as gender stereotyping and body image. Paragraph (c) would require instruction on how to remain safe including methods to avoid sexually transmitted infections and information about vaccines. Paragraphs (d) and (e) would require instruction to develop awareness of the dangers students face in the community including domestic violence, sexual assault and human trafficking. To teach students the characteristics of healthy relationships including communication with parents and family, life skill instruction would be included in this area. Paragraphs (f) and (g) would add requirements to teach students medical facts about birth control, the importance of abstinence and reproductive health care they may need over the course of their lifetimes. Paragraph (h) has been amended to clarify the expectation that schools identify and explain available community resources, particularly those to assist students in violent relationships or for those students who are sexually active and require information about contraceptive methods or sexually transmitted infection testing and treatment. Paragraphs (i) and (j) relate to teaching the effects of alcohol or drug abuse and the impact of peer pressure on decision making. Paragraph (k) covers the laws relating to life choices students may make. To create student awareness of the possible results of their actions,

topics such as the legal ramifications of sexting would be added by this paragraph. Choice of the curriculum used to implement sex education and implementation decisions would remain the responsibility of the local school board of trustees.

Section 1, subsection 2 has been amended to clarify that instruction must respect all students and not discriminate based on their background or level of experience. Subsection 3 retains the local advisory committees. It would require two students be added to these local advisory committees. It would permit expansion of the local advisory committees to include up to four additional members including spiritual or community life representatives. This was requested by a school district.

Section 1, subsections 4 and 5 would maintain existing local control over sex education programs and give districts greater flexibility over who can provide instruction. A teacher or nurse may now teach these courses. This bill would allow a local board of trustees to add a health care provider or a professional educator to those approved to these courses. A health provider could be a retired health nurse or teacher. This expansion of those approved to provide instruction would be optional. It would only be done with local board of trustee's approval. A district could choose to continue its current status of teachers or nurses as the only providers of sex education instruction. The final decision would be made by the local school board.

Section 1, subsection 6 proposes to bring Nevada into alignment with most states regarding parental permission to attend sex education classes. It would allow parents to opt their students out of sex education programs rather than requiring them to opt students in to the program. This process would always include parental notification in advance of the course. Parents are now notified of their options more than once. Parent preview nights are offered by most school districts to allow parents to review the programs and curriculum being taught. This would continue under the proposed changes in this bill.

Section 1, subsection 7 would retain the requirement that materials used in sex education programs be available for inspection by parents and guardians. Subsection 8 provides definitions of terminology used in this bill. This was requested by a school district. To maintain consistency, the definitions have been taken from legislation passed in the previous two Sessions.

Section 2 of the bill would require the Council to develop standards for instruction in sex education. This would ensure a consistent focus for sex education programs statewide while allowing local boards of trustees to choose curriculum.

Senator Cegavske:

Who would gather the information about resources? Does each board of trustees determine if the information is appropriate? Is this language in the bill?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Are you referring to the information that would comprise the standards?

Senator Cegavske:

Ms. Cafferata mentioned information about resources. I would like to know what is meant by that term and how the information would be gathered.

Ms. Cafferata:

This is in A.B. 230, section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (h) as proposed to be amended. Districts now provide resources about many topics for students including those related to health and legal concerns. Statute does not mandate what this information should be other than it must cover available counseling, legal and medical information. Each school district compiles appropriate resources for its students. Because this is specified in the bill, the authority to approve the resources would be given to the local board of trustees.

Senator Cegavske:

Is the local board required to approve everything before it is used by a school?

Ms. Cafferata:

Because it is specified in the bill, the local advisory committee would have the responsibility for recommendation. The board of trustees would have the responsibility for approval.

Senator Cegavske:

Can a local advisory committee do this now? Are the local advisory committees now able to add members or representation from other groups to their membership?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Section 1 of this bill is designed to ensure consistent implementation in school districts. I do not know if they can do these things now. By articulating the activities that need to happen, this bill would clarify what must be done. The local boards of trustees would retain the ability to make final decisions.

Senator Cegavske:

How much time will it take to implement this program? What will we need to give up to implement this correctly? Educators express concerns about a lack of time to adequately address all curricular areas now. I am concerned about the fiscal notes attached to this bill.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

We ensured development of these standards would occur as part of the normal State curriculum cycle of review for health education. This will allow the Council time to complete this project correctly as part of their normal calendar and schedule of review.

The WCSD is implementing this program well now. It has a good understanding of the impact of this legislation on staff and instructional time.

Senator Gustavson:

Students are now opted in to the program. This requires a parent's signature. If we change to an opt-out process, a signature will not be required for participation. Why do you want to change this?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Nevada is one of only three states that have the opt-in process. With the opt-in process, I am concerned parents may not see notices this instruction is being offered. This is a policy choice. This bill would give parents many opportunities to review the materials and opt out of having their children participate in the instruction. It is a better model that allows our students to receive the information they need.

Ms. Cafferata:

We have identified two groups of students who fall through the cracks using the opt-in process. These are students who are in foster care and those who are homeless. Many times foster parents are not certain of their ability to sign the forms opting in foster children. Homeless students may not be living with

a parent or guardian and may have no one to sign the permission form. These groups of students have a high risk of being exploited or sexually abused. They have no other way to access the material being presented.

Senator Gustavson:

Information sent home with students does not always get to parents. If we change to a process requiring opting in, is there a way to verify receipt of the notification? Would it be possible to change the language in section 1, subsection 7, line 6, to state materials would be available for review at any time, not just before a course is taught? This would allow greater access for parents to review the materials.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I will work with you on any amendments that will secure your support of this bill.

Senator Gustavson:

We now have a State course of study that is difficult to meet. Nevada is ranked last academically on most scales in terms of student achievement. How can we ensure this will be a quality program when we now have problems implementing the core content areas?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I share your concern over the academic ranking of our State. Last Session, we worked to improve this problem. Our teen pregnancy rate is the fourth highest in the Nation. It is not easy to be a high-performing student if you are faced with difficult health challenges due to lack of information. This bill is important for the future success of our State. If a girl becomes pregnant, it is difficult for her to continue her education and become a productive member of the State workforce. This information will help our boys and girls become productive members of Nevada society.

Senator Ford:

I generally support the premise of A.B. 230 regarding the teaching of sex education. I have a concern about the opt-out process. It does not change parent involvement, but it does switch the paradigm. It makes attendance mandatory unless a parent has completed the opt-out process. Parents may or may not receive the paperwork for this program. Please consider retaining the

opt-in process that is used in the CCSD. Would you be willing to change this back to an opt-in process in this bill?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I have severe reservations about doing that; however, I recognize it is important not to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. There is an administrative impact to opting in. I suggest you continue the hearing on this bill and consider input from the school districts. I am willing to meet with anyone after the hearing to discuss issues about this bill if it is in the spirit of improving the bill to make it something people will support.

Senator Ford:

I would like the statewide default rule to be for students to opt in, with districts allowed the right of having students opt out. That places the decision-making process at the local level where it should be. The WCSD currently has an opt-out process and the CCSD has an opt-in process. I have received email from constituents supporting this bill if this caveat is included.

You have named two groups of students who may fall through the cracks: students in foster care and those who are homeless. Can the school districts focus more specifically on these students? We need to be certain our plan meets the goal.

Health is a part of the current curriculum. Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (7) of A.B 230 states: "Health, including, without limitation, the course of instruction in sex education required by NRS 389.065" Does this refer to instruction as it would be implemented based on the amended bill?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Yes, it does.

Senator Cegavske:

I have received many emails and phone calls about this bill. The majority of them have been opposed to it. Teen pregnancy crosses all socioeconomic lines. What is not working now? The teen pregnancy numbers have decreased in the last several years. We are seeing improvements. Why do we need to change what we are doing? How is the rate of teen pregnancy determined?

Ms. Cafferata:

Our students report a high rate of dating violence, sexual violence and exposure to domestic violence. A comprehensive sex education program would reduce the incidence of dating and sexual violence because students would have the information they need to leave abusive relationships and find safety. These statistics were not tracked 30 years ago. Sex trafficking is another issue we face today. Students who are gang members are being drafted into sex trafficking, which is a new phenomenon. This bill would address these threats to our students.

I can provide studies that demonstrate the positive effect of comprehensive sex education programs. These programs help children wait longer before they start having sex, which is a healthy choice. They help students use birth control and condoms so they are less likely to get pregnant or contract a STD. Sex education programs reduce the number of sex partners students will have in their lifetimes. Addressing these three things through the additions proposed to the curriculum in A.B. 230 will improve the health of our young people. This is a compelling reason to update the curriculum.

Providing our students medically accurate information when it is needed is an important policy for the State. This legislation will continue to allow each district to determine how this instruction will be implemented. Local school boards will decide when this instruction starts and what materials are used for instructional purposes.

The reports on teen pregnancy only include teenagers. These reports do not differentiate by marital status. They include married teens. Many of the challenges faced by married teens are the same as those faced by unmarried teens.

Senator Ford:

This bill includes permissive language regarding who can teach a course. It is left to local school boards of trustees to determine the requirements for hiring personnel to teach sex education courses and to hire personnel to teach these courses. Would you please review this for us?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

The hiring of personnel to instruct sex education courses is left to the local school boards of trustees. The intention allowing options for who can teach

these classes was to offer the districts flexibility. This bill does not mandate that any specific group provide this instruction. This is left for each local school district to decide.

Senator Ford:

Is it true a district can restrict the teaching of these courses to only highly qualified teachers if they prefer and not consider other groups or entities for this role?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

That is correct. It is up to the district, using their internal procedures, to decide who provides this instruction.

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores (Assembly District No. 28):

After disclosing during the Assembly hearing for this bill that I had an abortion when I was 16 years old, I received some very cruel and scary messages. Assembly Bill 230 is not about abortion. I disclosed my personal story to share the effect this bill could have had on my situation had it existed when I was a teen. Many of our young people face the situation I faced. This bill is about making a difference during a crisis. Many of our teens are facing this type of crisis on a daily basis.

In CCSD, 57 percent of the students qualify for the National School Lunch Program. Twenty-two percent of the students in the district live below the federal poverty level of \$23,000 per year for a family of four.

I grew up in a family that was perpetuating the cycle of poverty. All of my sisters became mothers at young ages—one gave birth to twins at the age of 14. The rate of pregnancy for young Latina women is twice that of non-Hispanic white women. The rate of pregnancy for young African-American women is similar to that of young Latinas. This is related to living in poverty, cultural differences and young people not having the information available they need to make good decisions.

The ability to opt in or opt out would not have made a difference in my case. My father, who raised my sisters and me, was not involved in my school experience because he was working two jobs to support his family. Many families in my district are in a similar situation. They do not have the time to call and give input on this issue because they are too busy providing for their

families. I urge this Committee not to base its decision on the number of phone calls each of you receives. You may represent a district where the constituents have the ability and time to be involved by calling or writing. Constituents in other districts may not have the time, education or knowledge to be actively involved in the legislative process.

This bill is about empowering our young people with the medically accurate information they need to make good decisions for themselves. This bill does not just relate to teen pregnancy. It includes helping students learn about healthy relationships and how to become involved in their own health decisions. If a student's parents are not as involved as we would like, instruction provided under this legislation would provide the information he or she needs. As Legislators, we sometimes need to step up for the family unit.

Senator Ford:

Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (d) requires instruction be provided in sexual abuse, domestic violence, sexual assault, exploitation and human trafficking. Paragraph (e) of the same section requires development of skills to assist pupils in identifying the characteristics of a healthy relationship, negotiating, communicating with parents and family and refusing unwanted sexual advances or activity. What is your response to those who feel our teachers should not be required to teach these sorts of skills?

Assemblywoman Flores:

This is the reality in which we live. There are also people who feel we should not provide breakfast at school, counseling for students or even public kindergarten because it is the parents' right to do whatever they want with their children.

From a policy perspective, these themes need to be included because they are relevant to the society in which our students live. Sexting is an issue that did not exist 10 years ago. Our students need to learn how to respect themselves as young men and women. The Internet has created different problems. Young women have killed themselves due to compromising situations that have been made public using technology. Many of our young people do not have the available resources to learn how to make good decisions. That is why this bill is important. As policy makers, we must look at the reality and then determine if this bill serves a compelling public interest to ensure these topics are covered.

Senator Ford:

A recent case in Ohio demonstrated the actual definition used to define rape was not clear to the young men involved in the crime. They did not think their behavior constituted rape because it was not within the typical definition of rape. The definition was also not clear to my nephew when I discussed the case with him. Education on this subject might have prevented this incident from happening. I disagree with you on the opt-in process, but I understand the importance of content of the bill.

Senator Pat Spearman (Senatorial District No. 1):

I knew Tessa from the time she was 9 years old. When I saw her at the age of 18, she was in the hospital—she had full-blown acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). When her senior class in high school was celebrating homecoming, Tessa was picking out items for her funeral. She told me she only had sexual relations one time, and she did not know she could get AIDS from only having unprotected sex once. Tessa told me she now knew having sex that one time would cost her her life. Tessa had plans for her life. She asked me not to forget her and to tell other young people her story, which I am doing today. You have received a sheet from the Texas Bureau of Statistics showing Tessa's date of death ([Exhibit C](#)). Had Tessa lived, she would be 36 years old, but she did not live. She did not live because she did not know how to keep herself safe.

I have asked myself if I could have talked to the young people I worked with, might I have saved Tessa's life? Pregnancy would be the best thing to happen to our young people who do not understand the realities of sex. Tessa was not the only young person who has been infected with HIV or gotten full-blown AIDS. If sex education is not taught by parents in a meaningful way that is medically accurate, taking time to explain things, children will find out about it in the streets. Many times, what they learn in the streets may literally cost them their lives. I urge you to pass this legislation in the name of Tessa Lanell House.

Assemblyman Michael Sprinkle (Assembly District No. 30):

For the last 9 years, I have worked in the environment of sexual and domestic violence prevention. For the last 20-plus years, I have worked as a firefighter and paramedic. I have seen the victims of crimes of sexual and domestic violence many times. A question kept coming to my mind at these scenes of violence: How do we stop this from happening over and over again? I could not grasp the answer until it dawned on me at the scene of a domestic violence

homicide—in the corner of the living room two children were crying. We are not just talking about the actual victims of domestic and sexual violence; we are talking about the children who are witnessing it. These children are learning this is the way you handle a situation; they are not being taught otherwise. Assembly Bill 230 will teach our children what a healthy relationship looks like. It will teach the men of our world appropriate ways to treat the women and other people they love. I am here to stress the importance of this aspect of this bill. Our children are not receiving this instruction now. I see the results of this daily in my role as a firefighter and paramedic.

Sara Wainwright (Nevada Women's Lobby):

I am here to support this bill. I was a victim of sexual violence. I did not know what sexual violence was because I had not been taught about it. All I knew was what I had seen in the media or heard about typical rape cases. I was assaulted by someone I knew and trusted. He was a police officer. I thought because he was in law enforcement, he knew better. He told me he was falling in love with me. He made me feel the situation in which I found myself was my fault and my responsibility.

Instruction related to domestic violence, relationships and communication could have helped me. I did not know what it meant to give consent. Understanding that domestic violence can be emotional as well as physical would have helped me. I am submitting my prepared statement ([Exhibit D](#)).

Wendy Boszak:

I am speaking for myself and those I have known. I am a former school administrator. Comprehensive sex education was available when I first started teaching. At that time, a fifth grade teacher provided the instruction. Emotional health is important to a productive life. Students want this information. They need to talk about sexual issues, especially the emotional aspects. Students can be taught reading and discussion skills while learning this information.

Often, if a school does not receive the signed permission slip from a student, a teacher will take the time to contact the parents to ensure they have knowledge of the option to participate. This requires more administrative time than an opt-out process. The requirement to opt in gives the appearance that sex education is somewhat taboo. Even if students are universally opted in, parents will still be able to opt their children out of the instruction.

Cheryl Blomstrom (Nevada Nurses Association):

The Nevada Nurses Association supports the concepts in A.B. 230. Teen pregnancy is a public health issue; it cost the State \$130 million in 2010. Think about what the State could do for education with that money. Changes in the way education is delivered in our State could be made. Other pathologies would not be happening as well. It is reported that three out of every ten girls are pregnant at least once before they are 20 years old. One-quarter of those girls will have a subsequent pregnancy before they are 20 years old. We are not equipping our girls with the skills and knowledge they need to understand a sexual relationship and what it means.

Assemblywoman Flores shared that all of her sisters were pregnant as teens. This type of pathology has consequences well beyond one family. It impacts society. Children who have children do not stay in school. They lose the ability to better their lives. They cannot finish high school or go to college because they are too busy supporting children. It is important to give our youth the ability to make mature choices. They can do this by being provided access to fact-based, medically accurate information delivered in the school districts.

The best type of control for this program is provided at the local level. The Standards Council, of which Senator Cegavske is a member, would determine the overarching topic and standards to be met by all districts. This is now done in other subject areas such as math and English. The local advisory committee would recommend the curriculum to be approved by the district board of trustees. The local advisory committee would recommend specific curriculum materials, not topics but the actual curriculum teachers would use with the students. It would determine what would be delivered, to whom it would be delivered, at what ages it would be delivered and by whom it would be delivered. In many districts, school nurses now do this. They would continue to do so if this is the option chosen by the district. The board of trustees would approve the recommendations of the local advisory committee.

The opportunity for parent participation would exist at all of these levels. Council meetings are open to the public. The public is welcome to attend and participate in local advisory committee meetings. Assembly Bill 230 would expand the local advisory committees to include students as additional voices. They would be able to provide input on the curriculum and react to its cultural relevancy and applicability. Board of trustee meetings are open to public attendance and input on issues regarding curriculum.

A study at the University of Washington compared abstinence-only education to comprehensive sex education. This study and others I would be willing to provide to the Committee found abstinence is the only 100 percent effective way of preventing pregnancy and STDs. Teaching comprehensive sex education to children using scientific methods and medically accurate information does not make them sexually active sooner. It gives them the tools they need to make better choices. They postpone sex until a later time, make better choices about contraception and protection and do not initiate sexual contact as often. Comprehensive instruction does not mean teaching deviant behavior. Each district would continue to determine what is taught. If deviant sexual behavior is not in a district's curriculum and a district says it will not be taught, it will not be taught. How to address the standards would be determined by the parents and the local school board.

Please pass A.B. 230. I support Senator Ford's suggestion to allow districts the choice of opting students in or out of programs. I recommend opting out as the best method because it allows the highest level of participation.

Vanessa Spinazola (ACLU of Nevada):

The ACLU of Nevada supports this bill because it calls for instruction in sex education using medically accurate information. It also requires the instruction be provided in a nondiscriminatory manner. Youth who face prejudice and discrimination are more likely to face teen pregnancy, STDs and sexually transmitted infections. I have provided the Committee an issue paper prepared by the Advocates for Youth titled, "Adolescent Sexual Health and the Dynamics of Oppression: A Call for Cultural Competency" ([Exhibit E](#)). It contains statistics about these issues.

Disenfranchised teens are most in need of services. They may not receive them at home due to family situations that are not welcoming. This information is particularly important for gay, lesbian, bi-sexual or transsexual (GLBT) teens. The issue paper states:

Research demonstrates that institutionalized homophobia results in high rates of violence toward GLBT youth in schools and communities. The violence and verbal abuse result in feelings of isolation as well as high rates of suicide and suicide attempts, substance use, and risk for HIV/STI infection among these youth.

As a consequence of persistent abuse, as many as 28 percent of GLBT youth eventually drop out of school.

By providing information in a nondiscriminatory way, we are reaching out to youth who may be at risk of committing suicide. The parents of these students may not be willing to sign permission forms allowing their children to opt in to the sex education program. For this reason, I advocate for the opt-out process. This is especially important where abuse is occurring. An abuser maintains control over a child through isolation and withholding information. The abuser is not the type of guardian who signs a permission form allowing children to learn this information. These children are in dire need of receiving this information. By implementing an opt-in process, students will be most likely to receive the information they need.

The nondiscriminatory language in this bill combined with the medically accurate provisions will be a step forward for teens in Nevada. We encourage the Committee to support this bill. I am providing a letter of support from the ACLU ([Exhibit F](#)) for the Committee.

Senator Ford:

The levels of opportunity for participation are different when parents opt their children in as opposed to when they opt them out. If we tell school districts students must participate, parents can only question the curriculum. If we allow students to be opted in, parents can have a discussion about whether or not the program should be provided in their school districts. That is why I favor that option. Statistics indicate 90 percent of the students in the CCSD opt in to the program. Do you have statistics on the remaining 10 percent indicating how many have not opted in because they are abused or subjugated? I am not sure the 10 percent is comprised totally of foster children, children who are homeless or those who are abused.

Ms. Spinazola:

I do not have those data. I advocate for the opt-out process because parents who are engaged can remove their children from the program if that is their wish. I do not have a statistic on the makeup of the 10 percent.

Angie Sullivan (Teacher, Clark County School District):

I teach kindergarten. Children begin sexual exploration at an early age and need to be taught proper behavior. They also need to be taught health and safety

regarding their bodies. I am aware of a situation where a preschooler was sent to the restroom and was molested by fifth graders. These situations occur in school settings, and our students need to be taught about appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Knowledge is power. I have worked in neighborhoods where the families are struggling. They need help on many levels including the sex education of their children.

As a child, I was not given the information I needed about this topic. In sixth grade, I was sexually assaulted by two students in my classroom. I knew it was painful and violent. I knew it should not have happened, but I did not know it was rape until after I was married. I had not been given the knowledge I needed to understand what happened to me. I developed emotional problems in middle school and no longer earned straight As. This event still affects me today. This is not uncommon, and that is why I am advocating for truthful, factual, sensitive people to be trained to teach this topic in our schools.

Many teachers are uncomfortable teaching sex education. We must support our youth. I would like more training in how to support parents and students in this area. Our youth are exposed to sexual knowledge at an early age. We must ensure their physical and emotional health. I support extending the option to have instruction given to all students. Parents who feel they are covering this topic at home should be able to opt their students out of the instruction. Topics should be standardized across the State. I urge you to support this bill.

Sara Lemma:

I am the mother of a student attending school in the CCSD. I am also a graduate student in public health at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). I want my daughter to receive comprehensive sex education for a number of reasons. My husband became a father at age 16 because he had not received sex education at home or at school. This has presented many challenges over the years. My stepson and his mother have always been dependent on public assistance to make ends meet. Because of this, they were unable to further their educations. I want my daughter to have the opportunities my stepson did not have. Schools and parents should work together as a team. Teaching sex education is no exception to that premise. In addition to the discussions of values I have provided my daughter at home, it is imperative that she receive medically accurate, scientific education about sexual health in school. Only 59 percent of the CCSD middle school youth have spoken to a trusted adult or parent about sex. Comprehensive sex education needs to be offered in schools

across the State to ensure all students make healthier choices thereby increasing their future opportunities.

I am working toward a graduate degree in public health at UNLV. I have chosen comprehensive sex education as the topic for my thesis. The opposition to this bill has frequently framed this as a moral discussion. This is not an issue of values; it is a public health issue. Public Health theorist Lawrence O. Gostin believes the state has an obligation to ensure conditions exist for people to be healthy. The state must achieve a balance between constitutionally protected rights while defending and advancing the public's health.

Assembly Bill 230 mandates the teaching of medically accurate sex education in Nevada's public schools. Research and data prove comprehensive sex education lowers teen pregnancy rates and STD rates. This bill does not dictate a specific curriculum. It requires the local advisory committee in each county oversee and approve the curriculum. It retains the rights of parents to choose whether their children participate in sex education in school. This bill implements a law for the health of the public, while leaving the final decision for participation in the hands of parents. Parents determine what is best for their children, and school districts construct a curriculum fitting the needs of the students in their districts. Passage of this bill would provide our young people the tools they need to protect themselves. Research shows that age-appropriate, medically accurate sex education saves lives. Please pass this bill for the safety and well-being of our young people.

Elisha Morgan (Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada):

I am a high school senior in the CCSD. I support comprehensive sex education because it helps prevent teen pregnancy and STDs. I am a student member of the CCSD Sex Education Advisory Committee. I have reviewed many textbooks describing teen pregnancy as an epidemic and STDs as something suffered by one in four teens. Although media such as MTV designed to attract youth has made strides in addressing these topics, a strong foundation in sex education will make a difference for youth.

I am acquainted with a young woman in my high school who overcame the challenges of moving to the United States from another country, learning to fit in with American students and mastering English as a second language. She maintained a high grade point average while preparing to exit our school's emergency medical technician program. However, she had not been provided

with a strong sex education program in school and did not receive information about this topic from her parents. This led to an unintended pregnancy. Her parents told her she could no longer live at home and she is now, with very little support, struggling to graduate. She is not alone. I see this situation daily.

This bill would provide youth with the skills and knowledge they require to enable healthy sexual experiences and personal relationships. Nevada, and other states highly affected by teen pregnancy, has spent years teaching the same abstinence-based sex education program with few positive results. Abstinence-based sex education programs are not effective for teenagers because they provide limited information along with a "Don't have sex until marriage" message. Research shows the outcome of this is detrimental to the health of youth.

As a volunteer with Planned Parenthood, I cochair our youth group, Youth for Truth. This group advocates for medically accurate, comprehensive, age-appropriate sex education in Nevada. Teachers in our State are not held to one set of standards when teaching sex education. Because of this, sex education becomes a game of chance. A system where students opt out would increase the number of students receiving a more comprehensive sex education. A student would not be disallowed from attending because he or she forgot to have the permission slip signed. Sex education should provide lifesaving knowledge that can be used over a lifetime. It is directly related to choices that can change the course of a young person's life. It should not be left to chance based on the teacher. Students require the best education available to help them make the healthiest choices possible. Please support this legislation for the health of the young people of Nevada.

Michelle Dudley:

I have served on the Family Life Committee in the Carson City School District. The system we have in place in my district appears medically accurate, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory. I recognize the need for this program in our schools. My children have participated in it and learned a lot. I do not understand the purpose of A.B. 230. Sex education is being provided adequately now.

The members of the Family Life Committee in my district are accessible to me. They listen to my comments and take them into account. When I served on the Committee, there were student members. I know I can call or write members of

the school board of trustees with my opinions on sex education. I do not know any members of the Council. I have never heard of this group, and do not know how to provide input to it.

I am opposed to A.B. 230. The ability to make decisions should be kept at the local level where I am able to provide input. Using the word "comprehensive" is troubling to me. I do not want my children exposed to all of the sexual practices or ideas that occur in the world. The curriculum in place now is comprehensive. I am opposed to anyone but school district employees delivering the instruction. Employees can be directed by their superiors and are accountable to the district. Instructors from outside the district do not have the same accountability. Their presentations would be slanted by their own motivations and views of acceptable behavior.

If we are concerned about parents lacking the time to oversee the sex education of their children, these same parents will be too busy to oversee who teaches these courses. This role should remain with the local school board because they are voted in by members of the community and can be held accountable by them. The default must be for parents to opt in to the program. Please oppose A.B. 230.

Senator Ford:

The language in this bill is permissive. It allows a district to choose who provides sex education instruction.

Ms. Dudley:

I still do not understand why this bill is being presented. We discussed the issues in this bill when I was on a local advisory committee. We now have a comprehensive curriculum. It is reviewed by parents. The school board provides oversight. What is the difference between what we have now and what is proposed in this bill? Our program seems to be working. My children learned more than I hoped they would learn. They learned more than I think was necessary. Children make their own choices.

Senator Ford:

Does it alleviate your concern that the bill permits a district to choose the provider of instruction?

Ms. Dudley:

No, it does not. My concern is turning the instruction over to someone outside of the district. According to my personal values, not everything my children learned was necessary, but I understand that this is the real world and my children should understand it. I do not understand why the Council should be involved in this process.

Senator Ford:

Your positive experiences in the Carson City School District may be different from that of parents in other districts.

Ms. Dudley:

Who has the responsibility to remedy this? Why do we need new legislation to fix this? If there is a problem in another district, it should be fixed. It should not require legislation.

Theresa DeGraffenreid:

I am opposed to A.B. 230. I will read from my prepared statement ([Exhibit G](#)) which I am submitting to you. When I was 14 years old, I was sexually molested by a neighbor while babysitting. I had the information I needed regarding appropriate and inappropriate behavior. I was aware that my molester's behavior was wrong. Children make their own decisions. I chose not to tell my parents about this event because I worried about what my father would do. I feared I would not be allowed to babysit for that family again. As a 14-year-old child, I thought I could handle the situation. I continued to babysit for this family for 2 more years. Regardless of whether children have the information they need, they make personal decisions that are not always in their best interests. I had the information I needed, but I chose to disregard it. Many young people do the same thing. Teaching sex education to young people does not mean they will make the correct choices. Please allow parents to provide sexual education for their children based on the needs of their families.

Janine Hansen (Nevada Eagle Forum):

I was present at the Legislature when the first sex education bill was passed in Nevada. I am a parent and grandparent. I am concerned about what my children and grandchildren will face in the future. This bill is an agenda from Planned Parenthood. Legislation originally limited the ability to provide instruction to a teacher or nurse to prevent Planned Parenthood from entering classrooms to advocate for its agenda. That is one reason I oppose this bill.

This bill makes the local advisory committees irrelevant. Section 1, subsection 1 of A.B. 230 states: "The course of instruction must comply with the standards of content and performance for a course of study in health established by the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools" As active as I am in educational affairs, I have never attended a meeting of this Council. This Council is not accountable to the public. This same subsection also states: "... the course of instruction must include comprehensive, and as applicable, medically accurate, information" Students now receive medically accurate information. This line is included as part of the Planned Parenthood agenda.

With a program requiring opting in, parental rights are maintained. Parents make the choice regarding their children's participation in the instruction; it is not automatic. It was stated in the Assembly hearings on this bill that 85 percent to 95 percent of Nevada's students participate in sex education. Requiring parents to opt out would take away opportunities for parents to be involved.

It is important to teach students about consequences. I do not see this topic in this bill. My daughter used drugs and became pregnant. She made the choice to have the baby and later told me this choice saved her life. It forced her to become a responsible person. The Guttmacher Institute finds among sexually active women not using contraceptives, only 12 percent cited either the cost or a lack of access as the reason. In 2012, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) studied 5,000 teenaged girls who gave birth after unplanned pregnancies. It found only a small percentage of these girls had difficulties accessing birth control.

The problem is not that teens do not have the access to contraception. The use of reliable contraceptives has increased since 1995. The unintended pregnancy rate, however, increased between 1995 and 2008. This is due to the effect of risk compensation. Those with access to contraception will engage in sexual activity more often. Increased use of contraception often fails to reduce the unintended pregnancy rate. In 1999, comprehensive sex education was actively promoted in Great Britain as part of a strategy to reduce the teen pregnancy rate. Since then, the British teen abortion rate has climbed steadily. In 2009, the *Daily Mail* reported British teen pregnancy rates were higher than they were in 1995. Pregnancies among British girls under 16, below the age of consent, were at their highest level since 1998.

There is no solid evidence proving a comprehensive sex education program reduces teen pregnancy. Please leave this program the way it is. It has been successful, and parents have been able to participate. The needs of each district are not the same. School districts should have the option to choose what works best for them. This bill will end up in a mandate of the Planned Parenthood agenda being forced on our schools.

Senator Ford:

Do you disagree with section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a) that information about AIDS should be taught as part of this curriculum?

Ms. Hansen:

No, this is in law now. It is not a change to law.

Senator Ford:

Is there anything in paragraph (b) of this section that you disagree with or feel should not be in our curriculum for sex education?

Ms. Hansen:

Most of this is now included in instruction. Biology has always been included. I have concerns about the discussion of psychosocial and emotional changes, because parents will not have the level of input we need.

Senator Ford:

You disagree with the discussion of psychosocial and emotional changes, but everything else in this paragraph is now in the curriculum. Is that correct?

Ms. Hansen:

I believe these topics are in the curriculum of most school districts.

Senator Ford:

If a school district does not include something in their curriculum, do you object to it being added?

Ms. Hansen:

I think this should be decided by local parents at the county level. This bill eliminates the say of local parents.

Senator Ford:

If we have a program where students are required to opt in, that discussion can still occur.

Ms. Hansen:

The opportunity for parent participation goes beyond opting a child in to the program. It includes being part of what happens in the local advisory committee, which is where decisions are made now. This bill makes the local advisory committee irrelevant.

Senator Ford:

Even with the opportunity to opt in?

Ms. Hansen:

The type of option does not impact the local advisory committee. This committee determines the curriculum at the local level.

Senator Ford:

Is there anything in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (c) you do not want in our State curriculum?

Ms. Hansen:

I have a great concern about vaccines. Girls are being encouraged to have certain vaccines before they are sexually active. That is a significant issue. I also have concerns about the approach to teaching students how to avoid diseases. The only real way to avoid contracting a disease is through abstinence.

Senator Ford:

We have abstinence in law. Is there anything in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (d) relating to sexual violence, assault and trafficking that you do not feel should be included?

Ms. Hansen:

I am concerned about when and how these topics would be taught. The local advisory committee can now determine what is best for their community. Under this bill, implementation would depend on the determination of the Council. I do not feel local communities are represented on this Council. I do not know how the agenda being forced upon us would affect this area.

Senator Ford:

Have you no unequivocal objections to these topics being included?

Ms. Hansen:

I have concerns about how, when and in what manner they will be determined. I am afraid the local advisory committee will not be allowed to make decisions in this area because the topics will be mandated by the State.

Senator Ford:

Do you have objections to paragraph (e) in section 1, subsection 1?

Ms. Hansen:

My concerns are about how these topics will be approached. Sexual responsibility is knowing the consequences of your behavior. Point of view makes a difference. I do not believe decisions about the teaching of these topics will be made by local parents, so I continue to have concerns.

Senator Ford:

Do you have objections to anything in paragraph (f) of this section, which discusses contraception?

Ms. Hansen:

This is already being taught in most districts. We need to help students understand contraception does not ensure against STDs. The idea is not presented that contraception does not help prevent broken hearts and destroyed lives. When contraception is promoted and more easily available, children participate in sexual activities more often. How this topic is taught is significant. I am concerned about how it is promoted. I am more concerned about the presentation of these topics than I am about the topics themselves.

Senator Ford:

Under section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (g), do you oppose the teaching of abstinence?

Ms. Hansen:

Abstinence is important. It protects children from STDs and the results of poor decision making. With a curriculum this large, I believe abstinence will be relegated to the back burner and become a choice, not a mandate, for inclusion in instruction.

Senator Ford:

Are you opposed to paragraph (h) in this section that relates to the identification and explanation of available counseling and legal services?

Ms. Hansen:

I have significant concerns about this paragraph. This will be an opportunity for Planned Parenthood to mine our classrooms for children to attend their counseling, medical and health services. Thirty-five percent of the income received from Planned Parenthood comes from contraceptives. They receive millions of dollars from performing abortions. This section will be used by those who agree with this agenda to mine our schools for clients.

Senator Ford:

Paragraph (i) in this section is about alcohol and drug use. Do you have concerns about this being included in the curriculum?

Ms. Hansen:

This topic should be taught. Teaching about it, however, does not mean children will act responsibly.

Senator Ford:

Do you have any objection to paragraph (j) that deals with peer pressure?

Ms. Hansen:

A focus on this area will cause more children to feel pressure to become involved in sexual activity. The more we strip children of their natural modesty, the more they are inclined to experiment. I have concerns about who would teach this.

Senator Ford:

Paragraph (k) discusses instruction relating to State and federal laws regarding consent, statutory rape and electronic transmission of sexual images or other materials. Do you have objections to teaching students about this area?

Ms. Hansen:

Students need to know the law. One of the problems today is pornography. I do not know that teaching about it in school will help when it is readily available on handheld devices. Pornography is one of the reasons we have so much sexual violence in our society today.

Senator Ford:

Paragraph (k) is designed to teach students about laws against transmission of images not pornography. We have reviewed the legislation, and you have expressed a recurring concern about who might present instruction to students. You are concerned Planned Parenthood might become involved in our schools. If Planned Parenthood does not teach these courses, are you opposed to this bill?

Ms. Hansen:

This bill was created because Planned Parenthood wanted it. Assemblyman Bobzien stated the components of this bill will be implemented. Participation in the process is being removed from parents and the local advisory committees to give Planned Parenthood more control. They will be able to determine the curriculum, and all of the items we have discussed will be included in it.

Senator Ford:

The only concern you have voiced is that Planned Parenthood would be presenting the information to students. If we take Planned Parenthood out of the equation and a school district determines it will only use nurses and teachers to provide instruction, would you support this bill.

Ms. Hansen:

My concern is not only that Planned Parenthood representatives would be teaching our children; it is that their agenda will be used to establish the State standards so their agenda drives instruction. Parents and the local advisory committees will no longer determine the curriculum. It will be based on the topics listed in this bill.

Senator Cegavske:

I would like to provide information about the Council. I served as the chair of this Council. This Council was commissioned to develop content standards for the State. The work was primarily done by State educators. Prior to implementation of the Common Core State Standards, this Council hired teachers to review curricula and academic standards from other states to develop our State academic standards.

I do not know if Common Core State Standards contains health or sex education standards. The public did not attend our meetings. Agendas for these meetings are posted, and the meetings are open to the public.

Jeanette Clark:

I will read from my written statement ([Exhibit H](#)). I am opposed to A.B. 230. I do not understand the need for this bill. In 1979 when sex education was first implemented in the CCSD, meetings of the Sex Education Advisory Committee were highly attended. This is a delicate and sensitive subject. If no limitations are applied to this topic, there will be community concerns. Possible litigation could occur if a nonemployee provides instruction. If a parent believes something is taught that is not acceptable, and it is taught by someone who is not a district employee, he or she might sue the school district. Due to the proposed universal opt in of students, there will be less parent involvement under this bill. Unless a parent opts his or her child out, students will be given sex education, perhaps without their parents knowing or having the opportunity to review the information being provided. The statute now works successfully. Nevada has a 50 percent reduction in teen pregnancy and abortion. The portions of the bill that are acceptable are from the CCSD sex education curriculum and guidelines. There is no need for an additional law.

Benjamin Affleck:

I agree with previous speakers who oppose A.B. 230. This bill requires comprehensive, medically accurate instruction. This is currently provided. In section 1, subsection 5, the definition of professional educator would be expanded. Who is that? We already have teacher listed at the top. I do not want anyone other than my child's classroom teacher to provide this instruction. I can readily contact his classroom teacher and have previously established lines of communication with him or her. I do not want someone I do not know teaching my child. I have the same concern about the term "provider of health care." The nurse is already listed. I do not want a representative from Planned Parenthood speaking to my son.

It is important parents continue to be allowed to opt their children in to this program. Local communities need to have input into the sex education curriculum in their districts. I do not see the need to change what is in place. It is a comprehensive, medically accurate program. Approximately 90 percent of the parents opt their children in to the program now. Teen pregnancy and abortion rates are dropping. Our program works. I do not see a need to change it.

Rachel Affleck:

I oppose this bill because is intentionally vague and ambiguous. It does not define the terms "comprehensive," "age-appropriate," "without limitation" or "medically accurate." I am appalled the community was not made aware this bill was being presented. Concerned parents were not formally notified about this bill so they could be part of the conversation. This bill will allow someone else to determine the best form of sex education for my child.

Katherine Loudon (Coordinator, Guidance Counseling Services, Washoe County School District):

I am the administrator in charge of the sexual health and responsibility education program for WCSD. The WCSD supports A.B. 230.

Craig M. Stevens (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association supports this bill. Teachers do not always know what they can or cannot teach. This bill requires creation of State standards for sex education. Students need and want the information provided by this bill. Placing the topics in statute helps direct instruction. It tells teachers what to teach and what students need to learn. It is difficult for students to complete their educations if they are experiencing teen pregnancy or dating violence. More education is the answer to these problems. It may not prevent these things from happening, but it will provide outlets and information for students during a difficult time in their lives.

Caitlyn Anderson (Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada):

I am a high school student in the CCSD. This bill is important to me. I participated in the sex education program provided by the CCSD. I was astonished by the lack of information in this program. I would have benefited from receiving medically accurate, age-appropriate facts. My sex education course in school did nothing but confuse me further. My teacher was uncomfortable with the subject and could not even use the proper anatomical terms. She did nothing to teach anatomy to my peers and me. I was left searching for answers to common questions that could easily have been answered.

Growing up impoverished, I was sometimes around undesirable people. I did not have the information about sex and relationships that could have saved me pain and suffering. I did not understand about consent, sex or the signs of healthy and unhealthy relationships. I was date-raped by a family friend. I had no one to

turn to, so this event went unreported. Due to my lack of understanding, I did not even know that what happened to me was rape. Society rarely teaches that rape is anything other than assault from a stranger. My sex education course did nothing to dispel this idea. It did not teach the ways rape, sexual abuse and violence present themselves. I struggled with "slut-shaming" and guilt for months after this incident. I also struggled with being in an unhealthy relationship where violence was always present. I was belittled, called names and made to feel worthless on a daily basis until the relationship escalated into physical violence. I remember feeling all this was my fault. My sex education class did nothing but perpetuate these feelings. I was considered dirty and unclean. People laughed at me when I said I was no longer a virgin. They felt abstinence was the only way to behave.

I was young and naive. Had I participated in the program proposed by A.B. 230, I am confident I would not have been in these situations. I found myself searching for answers in the wrong places and trying to discover things about my own body that should have been taught to me. I have grown significantly since that time. I have bettered my relationship with my mother. We are now able to discuss these topics openly, but this is an anomaly. I did not feel comfortable discussing these issues with my mother until very recently. Most of my friends and classmates have still not reached this point. I am now well educated about this topic. I am a survivor.

I may not have questions, but my peers do. They come to me asking for advice about their own bodies. One female peer required assistance in using feminine hygiene products, and a male peer was not aware condoms could be purchased by someone under the age of 18. I was able to assist them both. Another peer came to me thinking she was pregnant. She was not aware someone under the age of 18 could purchase a pregnancy test. She had not been educated to tell if she was pregnant and had many questions.

We cannot allow this lack of education to continue. Young people deserve to have the hard facts about their bodies taught to them. Teens depend on trusted adults such as Legislators, medical professionals and teachers to arm them with the knowledge they require so when they are ready for sexual relationships, they are not left in the dark. I want to ensure no more of my peers are left confused and frightened by the sight of their own bodies. I want to make sure no teen in the future will be unsure what has happened is rape. I want to ensure no more of my friends end up with a STD because they do not know how to

prevent it. As a high school student, I am asking you to say that enough is enough, and let us give our children what they need.

Teens trust that adults will provide this information. I support this bill. As a student who is still in high school, I know these classes are what we need. Had the standardized sex education courses this bill promotes been implemented, my life might have been different.

Dawn Johnson:

I am a senior at the UNLV and a mother. I support comprehensive sex education programs for Nevada students. These classes provide lifesaving information and encourage students to make better life choices. I was a teen mother. At 16 years old, I was pregnant with my first child. I had my second child at the age of 19. I do not consider myself a typical teen mother. Both of my parents are professionals. I was an honor student. I participated in extracurricular activities and attended church each week. Education was important to me. My parents stressed the importance of attending college. They did not, however, talk to me about sex. Getting pregnant completely changed my life. Raising my children as a teenager was difficult for me and for my children. If teens are given facts, they will make better and more informed choices.

My youngest daughters attend middle school in CCSD. Some parents do not want schools teaching their children about sex. Parents and schools should work together as partners in this area. Our children receive instruction in many subject areas from their teachers, and the concepts are reinforced at home. Why should sex education be any different? Why would I refuse to allow the school to provide my children information that could save their lives? I want my children to receive this information and then come home to continue the dialogue with me. I can provide answers to their questions and share family expectations and values with them.

Emmily Bristol:

Issues of morality and family values recur as they relate to this bill and the teaching of sex education in school. I consider myself a moral, God-loving person. I was the child of a teen mother—a third generation teen mother. My mother viewed motherhood as a life sentence, and I have suffered because of that. We lived in poverty. I was molested as a child. My mother blamed me for these things. Teaching abstinence-only programs is not going to remove the

problem of teen motherhood. We need people from outside the family to help students like me who fall through the cracks.

I received an excellent sex education course in Alaska. It allowed me to develop positive patterns of behavior I might not have been able to establish based on my childhood experiences. I learned about being the child of an alcoholic, and I no longer felt alone. In many ways, the education I received in sixth grade saved my life. It gave me hope and made me realize there were others in my situation. It told me about places I could go to receive assistance.

I want my daughter to have the tools she needs to make the best decisions possible. We should not be confused because this course is named "sex" education. It is actually "life experience" education. If I had not had an appropriate course, I would not be where I am today. I support A.B. 230.

Lynn Chapman (Nevada Families):

Section 1, subsection 3 discusses the makeup of the local advisory committees. It specifically mentions parents and pupils. I would like to see taxpayers mentioned as additional members of this committee. Retired citizens who no longer have children attending school may be impacted by this bill.

Because a parent does not opt in to the program does not mean a child does not receive sex education. I homeschooled my children and found materials at stores and the public library to use. I graduated from a high school with 632 seniors. At that time, only two girls were pregnant. We did not receive instruction in sex education at school. We should be teaching our children responsibility and self-control.

Kimberly Burchiel:

I am the executive director of the Community Pregnancy Center of Carson City, but I am speaking for myself. I often see the damage done to our youth regarding sex and free love. Teens want to learn about sex but are not emotionally ready to make good decisions. Comprehensive sex education is built on the premise that teen sex is a natural and normal part of adolescent development. In reality, teens have a natural curiosity at that developmental stage but it does not have to include sex. Comprehensive sex education is not primarily concerned with delaying sexual activity. It focuses on ensuring it is consensual and that contraception is used. Its goal is to reduce the physical

consequences of sex while ignoring its holistic nature. I see students daily who are emotionally ravaged by having sex.

Contraception fails. It does not prevent STDs or infections. It does not protect the minds of adolescents from the powerful hormones, meant to bond a person with his or her spouse, that are released during sex. Contraception does not protect a teen's emotions. The majority of teens are not sexually active. This makes me question why we focus on contraception when we should focus on teaching the skills needed to resist peer pressure and encourage use of self-control.

The Medical Institute for Sexual Health provides evidence-based guidelines for sex education on its Website. I suggest the Committee review these guidelines. They provide a scientifically and educationally sound approach to the sexual health education of school-aged children. They were designed to promote responsible sexual behavior, increase the proportion of adolescents abstaining from sexual intercourse and reduce HIV/AIDS among adolescents. They were developed in response to requests from parents, teachers and communities. The guidelines emphasize sexual health education in the context of the whole child. Their Website is <<https://www.medinstitute.org/resources/free-downloads/>>.

A 2012 survey of parents indicates little difference between Republican and Democratic parents in regard to support for abstinence education. This is true across all racial lines. Abstinence is the only method that protects our youth 100 percent, but it is given only cursory coverage in comprehensive sex education. This is because no one believes teens will be abstinent. I disagree with that belief. Teens will practice abstinence if we teach it and expect it of them. Rather than focusing on contraception, I would prefer we focus on helping teens resist peer pressure and providing them with strategies to develop self-control.

The CDC estimates that 20 million new sexually transmitted infections occur in the United States each year. The American health care system pays nearly \$16 billion in direct medical costs for these infections. Young people ages 15 to 24 comprise 50 percent of these infections. For many years, organizations have been making free condoms available to teens. Statistics show condom usage has risen, but the incidence of sexually transmitted infections has now risen to the epidemic level.

Jeannie Adams:

I have provided the Committee a copy of my presentation ([Exhibit I](#)). One of the most exciting things to discuss with teens is sex, but the most important part is when the concept of renewed abstinence is included. Page 1 of [Exhibit I](#) lists the levels of intimacy that can be discussed with teens. These types of intimacy have nothing to do with sex. Page 2 provides example topics that can be discussed when talking about hurts, fears and secrets. Page 3 provides a definition of love. This definition expands the usual teen definition to include commitment. Page 4 of [Exhibit I](#) provides a plan for renewing abstinence. Because students understand intimacy better after participating in these discussions, they no longer feel they need to initiate sexual activities to feel intimate. They understand it takes time to develop an intimate relationship with another person. Teens begin to comprehend how to move their relationships from the infatuation level to a loving level without the need for sex. I do not see this type of discussion in this bill. I ask the Committee to consider adding it as a priority.

Ruth Johnson:

I was a member of the CCSD school board of trustees for 12 years and have four children who graduated from the school district. I agree with many of the concerns expressed against this bill. The community would like to keep sex education a local issue under local control. We are concerned by the Planned Parenthood agenda proposed in this bill. Their Website, which is geared toward teens, encourages students to be engaged in sexual activity. It discusses subjects including different types of sex and masturbation. It does not discuss how to act responsibly or the consequences of these types of activities or choices.

Sex education programs should remain a local issue. What is taught, who teaches, how much is covered and why these topics are important to the community should all be discussed locally. The school board of trustees is elected locally. The community has a greater ability to persuade the board and the local advisory committee than it does a State committee. We would like to reserve the ability to have these conversations and make decisions for the people to whom it matters most, the children in our communities.

I was president of the Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB). This Board can assist in providing resources to communities that have gaps in their programs. The legislation is good the way it is now. Approximately 88 percent

of the students in this State reside in the CCSD and the WCSD. These districts have excellent sex education programs. These programs have community input, thorough and comprehensive programs and teach the responsibilities and opportunities listed in this bill. We do not need A.B. 230. We need to work together to ensure all sex education programs in the State are of the same excellent level as those in the CCSD and the WCSD.

Terilyn Taylor:

I am a teacher and the mother of five children. I agree with what has been said in opposition to this bill. I am confused as to why people support this bill. It appears they believe curriculum does not now exist. I have thoroughly reviewed the sex education curriculum used in the CCSD. It covers all the topics mentioned in A.B. 230 except sex trafficking and sexting. The CCSD is aware of this gap and has brought together a team to address it. I am concerned sex education would be mandated under this legislation. It is not the role of Planned Parenthood to teach sex education in our schools. Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (h) mandates the identification of counseling and resources available to assist students. Schools should not be clinics. Please do not take power away from the local district. That is where the strength of our system lies. If parental control is removed, you will find weakness. Parents are the strength of our schools. Local control is the strength of our schools. If we want to continue to make progress in sex education in Nevada, I ask that you not mandate the programs outlined in A.B. 230.

Larry Matheis (Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association):

The Nevada State Medical Association supports A.B. 230 for the reasons previously mentioned.

Sally Jordan (Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada):

I am a student at UNLV and attended public middle school and high school in Clark County. I have been a volunteer with Planned Parenthood for almost 3 years. I ask the Committee not to view me as a speaker from an organization with an agenda. I speak from my desire to increase the public health of young people in Nevada.

I worked on a similar version of this bill last Session. I testified about my experiences living in southern Nevada and the lack of comprehensive sex education available for teens in that geographical area. Since that bill failed to pass, I have witnessed some difficult things. One of my closest friends has been

diagnosed as HIV positive. My friend is 22 years old, a student who attended school in CCSD. My friend's partner, who caused the HIV infection, also attended school in CCSD. My friend told me AIDS was discussed in sex education during high school and a film about Ryan White, a young boy who died from AIDS, was shown. There were no discussions about how to prevent HIV/AIDS other than observing abstinence.

I cannot totally blame the lack of a comprehensive sex education program for my friend's contracting HIV, but it could be one reason. We need to prevent this. I do not want it to happen to other young people. I do not want young women to experience teen pregnancy.

Opponents of this bill agree Nevada is fourth the Nation in teen pregnancy rates but have stated that is acceptable because the number of pregnancies is decreasing. It is not acceptable. We are not doing enough. We cannot wait until these rates go down. Being No. 4 in the Nation is not all right. As Legislators, I urge you to be proactive.

I have heard opposition to this bill many times. It generally relates to the fact it is supported by Planned Parenthood volunteers and employees. This is not a good reason to oppose this bill. Teen sexual health is a public health issue. It is not a moral issue. We are not discussing abortion. Abortion is not in the bill language or the curriculum. Planned Parenthood is not named in A.B. 230. Information from the Planned Parenthood Website is not included in the bill language or curriculum. This bill retains the local control of districts over curriculum. Because the local board of trustees has the power to make this determination, I do not believe employees of Planned Parenthood would teach these classes in CCSD.

I will be leaving Nevada soon to attend graduate school. I want Nevada to be a better place when I leave. I want to feel confident the girls attending school today understand their right to consent and that they understand what constitutes rape.

Brenda Aguilar (Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada):

I am a program coordinator for Planned Parenthood, and I teach a CDC-approved sex education course to Latina girls ages 13 to 18. I am surprised to see how eager parents are to have their children receive this medically accurate, comprehensive sex education program. They are surprised their children are not

receiving this program in school. I often hear parents say they wish they had been able to participate in a program like this when they were younger. I teach this course in the community, but the information is needed on a broader level. Last week, one of my students mentioned a 14-year-old friend of hers is pregnant. This shows the need for this type of program. My grant currently allows instruction only for girls. Parents continuously request I share the information with teen boys as well.

Growing up as a Latina, I did not receive this information from my parents. As a graduate of the CCSD, I did not receive it in school. Sex education is crucial for students. I encourage the Committee to support this bill.

Howard Watts (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

The Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN) supports this bill. The PLAN is a coalition of over 30 Nevada organizations. Assembly Bill 230 was voted as one of its five priority bills for this Session. We are considering this bill in light of its impact on our racial equity report card. Not only is the rate of pregnancy in Nevada high, but this rate is overwhelmingly disproportionate for our young Latina and African-American women. African-American girls are twice as likely to experience pregnancy as white teens. Latinas are three times as likely to become pregnant. We consider this bill and its efforts to combat these statistics a racial equity bill.

We are a community partner with Planned Parenthood. We recently canvassed Senate District No. 2 and questioned approximately 500 people. We provided detailed information about A.B. 230. Over 80 percent of our respondents supported this bill. In a statewide poll conducted in January, over 67 percent of registered voters in Nevada were in favor of this bill. We have collected and delivered over 2,400 signatures in favor of this bill to the Legislature. Ten percent of the respondents were unsure about this bill. They did not oppose it, but they wanted to be assured the focus was on abstinence and teaching the consequences of risky sexual behavior. This bill does these things. We want to focus on abstinence and consequences, but we also want to ensure our students have the information needed to make informed decisions.

I support this bill because teens need education about sex. We need to prevent situations in which children are sexually abused in their homes. Children need information to understand what is and is not appropriate. I assist at a camp program for students in which they are encouraged to ask questions about the

opposite sex. I have found that students in the CCSD do not know basic biology. They do not know the fundamentals of a healthy relationship. The students attending this camp find our workshop enlightening, but a group of volunteers working with 60 students at a time cannot address the problems of our State.

This bill allows each county to make its own decisions regarding sex education curriculum. We do not want to make moral judgments for students or their families. We want to provide information that allows families to make fully informed decisions.

There is broad agreement on what is to be taught under this bill. The concerns expressed focus on how instruction will be presented. Each county will choose who teaches the courses and how they will be presented. If parents are concerned, they can opt their children out of the program. This will allow children who have parents who are not involved to learn about their bodies in a safe and informed way.

Senator Gustavson:

It sounds like the agenda of Planned Parenthood, whatever that might be, is what this bill is about. What in this agenda is not already being taught?

Mr. Watts:

The paragraphs in section 1, subsection 1 comprise the agenda. I did not learn about these topics at school. I learned them from my parents. My friends did not learn about them at school, and the students attending the CCSD now are not learning them in school. We have heard testimony these topics are being taught. The WCSD is doing a better job of this than the CCSD. The WCSD has a stronger curriculum and has institutionalized more of the topics found in A.B. 230 into its program.

In the CCSD, program efficacy is based on the instructor and the school. Within one school and between schools, students can have vastly different levels of instruction. At the minimum, students view a video showing a live birth, they are encouraged to use abstinence and are told about the problems that occur from pregnancy and STDs. There is no curriculum related to healthy relationship building or preventing pregnancy and STDs.

Sex education programs are not standardized across the State. This bill would provide a baseline to ensure basic facts are presented to every student. Counties would continue to decide how to address that baseline in their community through choices of curriculum and instructional options.

Don Nelson (NevadaLIFE):

NevadaLIFE is a pro-life education and advocacy group. We do not usually become involved in sex education issues, but we are concerned about the terms "health care services" and "without limitation" as used in this bill. We are opposed to A.B. 230. I will read from my prepared statement ([Exhibit J](#)).

Research suggests a woman who has had an abortion has an 81 percent higher risk of mental health problems. Ten percent of all health problems are said to be related to abortion. We believe abortion is included in the term "health care services." We are concerned this bill will lead to a higher abortion rate for Nevada teens. The bill must be amended to exclude abortion and health care services, or abortion will be discussed in schools.

Senator Ford:

In section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (h), the term "without limitation" is used. Do you view this as implying a mandate?

Mr. Nelson:

This language could be used to mandate a discussion about abortion occur because abortion is considered a health care service. Often the term "reproductive health services" is used in legislation. That language is not in this bill, but courts have ruled if abortion is not specifically excluded from the general concept of health services then it is presumed to be included. We are afraid this language is a back door to allow abortion to be discussed in schools, and we would like it amended out.

Senator Ford:

I do not see abortion mentioned in this bill. The Assembly removed the word "reproductive" from section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (h). In section 1, subsection 4, local advisory committees are given the responsibility for advising the boards of trustees regarding all aspects of the course of instruction, including content and materials to be used in the classroom. Do you feel this section allows the local advisory committee to suggest to the school board that

it does not want abortion taught? If this is true, does it alleviate your concerns about this topic?

Mr. Nelson:

We do not know what the Council will determine as appropriate standards. It appears this bill is designed to ensure specific topics are addressed statewide.

Senator Ford:

This bill mandates specific topics of instruction. Local school boards retain their discretion to determine the curriculum used in their districts. If parents are given the opportunity to opt their students in to the program, they retain control over participation as well.

Mr. Nelson:

Certain words imply certain things. Courts have allowed the term "health services" to include abortion because it is not specifically excluded in bill language.

Mark Foxwell (Knights of Columbus):

The Knights of Columbus opposes this bill for many of the reasons previously stated. The bill expands sex education. It tells teens they should be abstinent but implies they will not, so it also provides for instruction to tell them how to have safe sex. This is similar to the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program. It was determined that student participation in the D.A.R.E. program did not decrease use of those substances, and in many cases, it contributed to an increase.

The opt-out provision allows parents to keep their children out of the program. Counseling programs are now available for teens that allow them to receive services without parental notification. This helps a child deceive his or her parents. This bill requires information about counseling be made available to students.

Mike Dang:

I oppose this bill. I do not oppose expanding the list of subjects to be taught in sex education programs. I oppose use of the terms "without limitation" and "comprehensive." This language takes power away from the local school board. These terms are too broad. If they are removed, local school boards will be able to make decisions within reason.

I am concerned about section 1, subsection 1 that requires the course of instruction for sex education comply with the standards set by the Council. This makes the local school board subject to policy coming from the Council. This diminishes the authority of the local board. I suggest changing the language in this section from "must comply" to "may adopt" when discussing the recommendations of the Council.

Section 1, subsection 3 allows expansion of a local advisory committee by a board of trustees. This would be meaningless if the authority of the board has been removed by the Council. Local school boards should have the most discretion in handling this topic.

Switching from an opt-in to an opt-out process removes power from parents. It makes it more difficult for parents to have a say in the education of their children. A parent would be obligated to track down the curriculum to review it. I suggest information about these programs be posted online for parents to review before, during and after they are presented.

Jody Osburn:

I am a parent and professional educator. Parental involvement in a student's classroom activities is important. The National Education Association states that parental involvement is the key to student success. I am concerned about the automatic opt-in process included in this bill. Statements have been made that problems related to teen sexual health occur because parents are not involved or that it is unreasonable to expect low-income parents to be involved in the education of their children. This is not only insulting, it is unreasonable. Testimony has occurred that teachers will contact parents who have not opted in and that time will be saved by not having to contact parents who have not opted out. The premise appears to be that opting in encourages more parental involvement than opting out.

Please do not pass legislation that diminishes a parent's opportunity to be involved in their child's education. Nevada is one of only three states to require opting in. Finally, we lead the Nation in something. We should look for ways to increase parent involvement in all areas of the curriculum. We do not need a law requiring the Council to define the content of our sex education programs. The local advisory committees should remain, and implementation of current law should continue. This will safeguard local control and parental influence. I ask you to vote no on this bill.

Jennifer Ferre:

I am a parent. My 8-year old has recently started asking questions about sexuality. This week, her father and I will discuss with her the human body and how it works, giving her the appropriate amount of detail based on her age. We will be open and candid about the process of procreation and our beliefs about the sanctity of life. This is my right, responsibility and privilege as a parent.

I am upset by the idea educators would know more about how to teach sex education to a child than does a parent. I find it disturbing that several young testifiers have stated sex education would have been better provided by the school system than their parents. We do not have a lack of comprehensive sex education in our State; we have a lack of comprehensive parenting.

I am concerned about the opting-out process. Other children will be spending time with my children. If the broad language remains in this bill, children will be exposed to ideas and practices that are disturbing to me. Why is Planned Parenthood interested in educating my children? I do not see the values on human sexuality I want to teach my children reflected on Planned Parenthood's Website. I do not see the word abstinence on their site. I feel they have an agenda that is suspect. I encourage the Committee to research their viewpoints.

As parents, we are capable of teaching our children sex education. I regret there are some parents who do not. There is a system in place to assist those children. It was put in place by local parents and school boards. That is what will keep our sex education safe for our children and helpful for our community.

Bruce Bayne:

I have a bachelor's degree in special education and a master's degree in educational psychology and counseling. I have been in classrooms where sex education is taught and have counseled young couples about the choices they have made about their sexual activities.

I taught sex education. The guidelines in place allowed me to address the topics outlined in this bill using a medically sound, statistically supported curriculum. In my private practice, I have seen the devastation sexual issues can cause individuals, relationships and families. Assembly Bill 230 will negatively impact the children of Nevada. There is a place for Planned Parenthood just as there is a place for sex education in Nevada, but we should not combine these

two without limitation. Limited parental involvement may allow teachers to put their own morals on the issues being taught.

I am concerned this bill does not provide an orderly direction for its implementation. This lack could lead to liberal interpretation in the classroom by free-wielding instructors and educators, undermining the purpose of the bill. The plan will not accomplish the goal.

I appreciate use of the phrase "age or grade appropriate." I would also like you to consider the emotive stage of the individuals being taught. This bill mandates students to receive information "without limitation." This does not consider the emotive stage of the student and could cause irreparable damage. Processes, practices and habits could be developed that would hinder students' ability to function in relationships, live within society's laws and standards or cause extreme emotional or psychological distress.

Consideration has not been given to the students who will opt out of the class. These students will receive information secondhand. Peer pressure will exist to discuss the courses students are taking. Students opting out will not be able to process this information. They may be bullied or made fun of by their peers. This is why opting in is the more desirable option of the two.

Assembly Bill 230 will cause more harm to the emotive and psychological development of students than the current practices or laws. Careful consideration needs to be given to the student's emotive stage of development when providing this type of instruction. Knowledge is only as good as can be processed by the individual receiving it. The intent of this bill is good, but as written will only do harm. The students I have counseled did not lack knowledge; they knew what they were doing and possibly understood the consequences. There is not a lack of information. Students do not have the ability to process the information they receive. Let our school districts continue to provide well-rounded, up-to-date sex education to our students by voting no on this bill.

Margo Piscevich (Board Member, Mar Monte Planned Parenthood):

I support this bill. Planned Parenthood does not have an agenda. Planned Parenthood has no designs to enter public schools in Nevada. It is not implementing programs in schools. I support the opt-out process for student enrollment in sex education programs. What we are doing now is not enough if

we have the fourth highest teen pregnancy rate in the Nation. I urge passage of this bill. I will read from my prepared comments ([Exhibit K](#)).

Sheila Ward (Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee, Carson City Republican Central Committee):

I oppose this bill. I prefer students opt in to the program because it allows parents to be more actively involved.

Rocio Grady:

My children attend school in the WCSD. Nevada has not served Latino families well. The majority of students who do not graduate from high school are Latino. We need to lower teacher-to-student ratios to improve the graduation rate. This bill does not address this. It does not address the other needs of Latino students. It says to the community, "We do not care how bad your schools are as long as you use more contraception and get your pregnant Latina girls into abortion clinics." Once the State is able to graduate more than 75 percent of its Latino students, I might be convinced it can do a good job of providing instruction in sex education for my children. If public schools cannot effectively teach academics, why should I believe they can successfully teach sexual values?

I do not want my children exposed to explicit sexual conduct because of State policy. I can opt my own children out of this program, but I want to speak for families that cannot be here due to immigration status.

Senator Cegavske:

What grades levels receive instruction in sex education?

Ms. Grady:

It begins in fourth grade.

Kevin Ferre:

I am a middle school counselor, a religious and community leader and a father. This bill is more an ambulance in the valley than a railing around the cliff. Morality must be included in this discussion. Correlation is not causation. Students receive information but do not always make the correct decisions. The media portrays sexuality constantly. I am concerned this legislation teaches children to have sexual relationships without taking responsibility for the outcome and consequences of their actions. Loopholes and verbiage in this bill

concern me. The bill adds to the topics now being taught, which is a good idea, but other topics are included which are not now discussed such as diversity. It is important to involve parents in dialogues about sexual choices. We cannot teach this topic without including morals and values. This is a moral issue, and the values of parents in the community must be respected.

Rebecca Affleck:

This bill is not necessary. It has loopholes, and I encourage the Committee to vote no on A.B. 230.

Melissa Clement (President, Nevada Right to Life):

I am opposed to A.B. 230. Abortion accounts for 91 percent of Planned Parenthood's services to pregnant women, not 91 percent of all the services it provides. Planned Parenthood has a vested interest in the outcome of this bill. That interest is at odds with the viewpoint of most Nevada parents. Planned Parenthood is trying to reverse the popular trend against its policies by taking over sex education in Nevada's public schools. I will give you summary information from my prepared testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).

Christle Robinson:

I attended school in Washoe County. I received sex education instruction in school and learned about STDs and AIDS. As a teen, however, I still wanted to make my own decisions and was sexually active. Being educated about something does not keep a person from doing it. I am concerned about changing the process of opting in to one of opting out. This process works the way it is now and should not be changed.

Heidi Wixom:

I am opposed to A.B. 230. At least once a year, the sex education committee in the CCSD reviews materials and updates the program. I have reviewed the curriculum, and there is nothing in this bill that is not now included in our curriculum.

Lisa Nelson:

I am opposed to this bill. Everyone who has testified wants a quality sex education program in our State, but we differ on how it should be implemented. The current program is working. There is no reason to include the specific content outlined in section 1 of A.B. 230 in statute. This content can be negated with parental input and, unless there is an ulterior motive, it is not

required. We should be having this conversation with the Council. That is the group that can make decisions about the curriculum. I have provided the Committee a written letter detailing the reasons for my opposition ([Exhibit M](#)). The diverse range of social, moral and individual personalized behaviors and preferences that pervade our society are best managed outside and independent of our formal State-funded educational system. Community outreach, churches, private and public business, and federally subsidized entities must promote their agendas on their own time, their own dime and their own property. The public is more than welcome to come to them, and must.

David Strickland:

I am the father of four children who attend school in the CCSD. I am opposed to this bill. I specifically oppose the use of “without limitation” in the bill. I understand this is a legal use of language, but it opens this topic to options we have not considered. This is one of many concerns I have with A.B. 230.

Juanita Clark (Charleston Neighborhood Preservation):

I have presented a letter of opposition from the Charleston Neighborhood Preservation to the Committee ([Exhibit N](#)). I will share parts of this letter. Section 1, subsection 5 of this bill would allow replacement of teachers or nurses as instructors with representatives from Planned Parenthood. We are concerned about who will identify the appropriate providers of instruction.

Chair Woodhouse:

Are you looking at the first reprint of A.B. 230?

Ms. Clark:

I may be looking at the earlier version.

Chair Woodhouse:

That section may be revised in the reprinted version of the bill.

Susana Taylor:

I oppose this bill. I feel I represent many Latinos in the community who are unable to attend this meeting. The community was not made aware this bill was being discussed. I am opposed to two parts of this bill. First, it does not address adoption as a choice for pregnant teens. I feel this is because of the Planned Parenthood agenda. Latino culture supports abstaining from sexual activity until marriage. We have heard statistics about pregnancy rates for

Latina youth. This rate is high because abstinence is not a popular choice for teens. It is easier to follow the crowd and not stand out than to make the difficult choice of abstaining from sexual activity. The instruction promoted by this bill shows youth sexual activity is permissible. It does not demonstrate the physical, psychological or emotional ramifications of sexual activity. It does not make abstinence fashionable.

Sheila Moulton:

I am opposed to A.B. 230. The six people remaining here in Las Vegas are also opposed to this bill.

Nicole Rourke (Clark County School District):

The CCSD is neutral on this bill. We offer an amendment to allow school boards individually to adopt opt-out policies ([Exhibit O](#)).

Senate Committee on Education
May 6, 2013
Page 50

Chair Woodhouse:

There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diana Jones,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	14		Attendance Roster
A.B. 230	C	1	Senator Pat Spearman	Texas Bureau of Statistics Page
A.B. 230	D	4	Sara Wainwright	Testimony and Supporting Documents
A.B. 230	E	4	Vanessa Spinazola	Advocates for Youth Issue Paper
A.B. 230	F	1	Vanessa Spinazola	ACLU Letter of Support
A.B. 230	G	2	Theresa DeGraffenreid	Testimony
A.B. 230	H	5	Jeanette Clark	Testimony and Supporting Materials
A.B. 230	I	5	Jeannie Adams	Presentation
A.B. 230	J	3	Don Nelson	Testimony
A.B. 230	K	4	Margo Piscevich	Testimony and Supporting Document
A.B. 230	L	5	Melissa Clement	Testimony
A.B. 230	M	2	Lisa Nelson	Letter of Opposition
A.B. 230	N	1	Juanita Clark	Letter of Opposition
A.B. 230	O	1	Nicole Rourke	Proposed Amendment