

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
April 5, 2017**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chairman Tyrone Thompson at 3:49 p.m. on Wednesday, April 5, 2017, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst  
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel  
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary  
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant  
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Darryl Wyatt, Principal, Gwendolyn Woolley Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Tiarre Tenorio, representing Richard C. Priest Elementary School Parent Teachers Association, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Pam Hays, Principal, Richard C. Priest Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association  
Dr. Linda E. Young, Vice President, Board of Trustees, District C, Clark County School District  
S.S. Rogers, Pastor/Teacher, The Greater Mount Sinai Missionary Recruiting Ministries, Inc.; and representing Ministers Alliance of Southern Nevada  
Alison Clark, School Psychologist, Mario C. and Joanne Monaco Middle School, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Michelle Knopp, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Anna Slighting, representing Honoring Our Public Education, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Lou Markouzis, Principal, Zel and Mary Lowman Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Anthony Nunez, Principal, William E. Orr Middle School, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Michelle Caligone, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Fred Watson, Principal, H.P. Fitzgerald Elementary School, North Las Vegas, Nevada  
Suynn Davis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education  
Annette Dawson Owens, representing Break Free CCSD, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Maria Bivins, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Gabriela Ardon, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Dalia Jimenez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Dr. Shari Lyman, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Lindsey Dalley, Member, Moapa Valley Community Education Advisory Board  
Ignacio Prado, Executive Director, Futuro Academy Public Charter School, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Ricky D. Gourrier, Sr., Government Affairs and Community Relations Manager, Communities in Schools of Nevada

John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association  
Matthew Richardson, Secretary, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers;  
and representing Juvenile Justice Probation Officers Association  
Adolfo Ayala Alcantar, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Dr. Laura Deitsch, Licensed Clinical Professional Counselor, Crescent Counseling,  
Las Vegas, Nevada  
Electra McGrath Skrzydlewski, Community Organizer, NARAL Pro-Choice, Nevada,  
Las Vegas, Nevada  
Zoe Mansfield, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Elvira Diaz, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Vivian Leal, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Kelly Lynn Charles, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Cassandra Charles, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Reverend Sandy Johnson, Boulder City United Methodist Church, Boulder City,  
Nevada  
Jennifer Howell, Sexual Health Program Coordinator, Washoe County Health District  
Kimberly Mull, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and  
Sexual Violence  
Jackeline Duron, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Michael Hackett, representing Nevada Public Health Association; and Nevada  
Primary Care Association  
Erika Minaberry, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Michelle Sorensen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Michelle Coleman, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Sara Lemma, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Brenda Hernandez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Tod Story, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom  
Dr. William P. Tarbell, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada  
Erin Phillips, President, Power2Parent, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Andrew Caudill, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Craig M. Stevens, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs,  
Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District  
Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards  
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents;  
and Nevada Association of School Administrators  
Karen England, representing Nevada Family Alliance, Reno, Nevada  
Linda Buckardt, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Charlie Melvin, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Ashley Dyal, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Juanita Clark, Board Member, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas,  
Nevada  
Melissa Clement, President, Nevada Right to Life, Reno, Nevada  
Don Nelson, President, Nevada LIFE, Sparks, Nevada  
Sam England, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada

Dr. Juan M. Sclafani, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
William Sobalvarro, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada  
Ashley Ruiz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Krystal Minera, representing Nevada Family Alliance, Sparks, Nevada  
Mary Fechner, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Dan Holly, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District  
Patrice Tew, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations,  
Clark County School District  
Adam Johnson, Executive Director, Democracy Prep at the Agassi Campus,  
Las Vegas, Nevada  
Jake Custer, Director, Growth Strategy for Opportunity 180, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Justin Brecht, Founder, Nevada Rise Academy, Las Vegas, Nevada  
David Blodgett, representing Nevada College Prep, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Pat Hickey, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada  
Don Soifer, Vice Chair, District of Columbia Public Charter School Board,  
Washington, D.C.  
Rebekah Holder, Government Affairs Strategic Analyst, Office of Administrative  
Services, City of Las Vegas  
Ed Gonzalez, representing Clark County Education Association  
Aaron Gordon, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Frank R. Woodbeck, Vice Chancellor, Workforce Development, Nevada System of  
Higher Education

**Chairman Thompson:**

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] First, we are going to hear Assembly Bill 103. We will then move to our work session. We will take a short break and then hear Assembly Bill 348, Assembly Bill 432, Assembly Bill 447, and Assembly Bill 482.

Should you want to submit a written statement, you can do so as long as you submit it to us within 48 hours of this hearing. We will then upload that to Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). We will begin with A.B. 103. Assemblywoman Neal will present the bill, and I will allow 30 minutes of support and 30 minutes of opposition. Persons who are coming forth will be given up to two minutes. We want to have as many voices heard as possible.

**Assembly Bill 103: Eliminates the Achievement School District. (BDR 34-691)**

**Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7:**

I am here to present Assembly Bill 103. Even though the bill itself is pretty simple, it is the conversation around that issue. I do want to make a couple of introductory statements. This bill is not about me disrespecting the Governor, not having respect for his education vision, or not having respect for Superintendent of Public Instruction Canavero. When I voted no in 2015 for this particular piece of legislation, I meant it. It is a piece of legislation that I have been following since it rolled out, and I tried to be on record as much as I could saying that it was a measure of last resort, not a first.

When I started the process of whether I was going to bring a bill to eliminate and basically repeal the Achievement School District (ASD), it was based on the fact that when I attended a meeting at Richard C. Priest Elementary School in my district, I was with 500 parents of all colors who were confused because their school had just become a turnaround school. They had a new principal, and the school had only been there for about a year and a half. They liked their principal and their teachers, and they liked that culture. I thought about it and knew I was just setting myself up for a battle, but I never back down from a fight. I decided to bring the bill to repeal it because I have two schools in my district that are affected—Clyde C. Cox and Richard C. Priest Elementary Schools. Cox is about 20 feet away from Gwendolyn Woolley Elementary School. Woolley is a turnaround; Cox was put on the ASD list. The principal at Cox had recently been removed and they did not have a principal for six weeks. Principal Darryl Wyatt was pretty much running both schools because he had been successful at Woolley in producing a turnaround.

Because I had served on the reorganization of schools over the past two years, and I was deeply embedded in what was the right thing for schools, I strongly believe that schools should remain publicly run, but the interventions that we apply to those schools are super, super important. Just because it was—all of a sudden—decided that the privatization of public schools by a private charter was a good idea, that did not mean that I did. I am here to represent District No. 7. I am not here to do anything beyond that scope. I was elected to represent them, their issues, their thoughts, and their feelings; and that is what I am going to do today.

What you have in your assortment of information is the result of my reaching out to Tennessee. Tennessee was one of the states, outside of Louisiana, that was cited as using ASD as a model. I wish I had Dr. Sharon Griffin on the phone, but I was unable to do that. Dr. Griffin has actually been a part of schools in Tennessee who have proven that public schools work ([Exhibit C](#)). The reason I uploaded this information is because Tennessee adopted ASD in 2010. I am putting this information out to prove that public schools work if you do the right things: the appropriate interventions, fund the teachers, give flexibility, and allow the teachers to lead. You will actually find yourself in a different situation.

I put in the record a study from Vanderbilt Peabody College that basically reviewed the schools in 2012, 2013, and 2014 ([Exhibit D](#)). What was interesting is that they found out in that Vanderbilt study that the Innovation Zone (iZone) schools outpaced the ASDs. Sharon Griffin is the chief of the iZone schools. When I saw that study, I realized that if Tennessee can do it—take the bottom 5 percent and raise those students up—then I know that reorganization and turnaround can work in this state. We actually have the capacity not to choose the option to turn our schools over to a charter management organization (CMO) or an Achievement School District (ASD), but to allow our schools to succeed.

When you read this report, I want to highlight a couple of things because when they talk about the cohorts, and you look at the figures that are on pages 4 through 8, ([Exhibit D](#)), the study looked at 82 schools in total, 65 that were non-ASD and 11 that were iZone.

What you can see is that in figure 1, this was a particular cohort of schools that said they were part of the 5 percent of schools that were underperforming. When you turn the page and look at figure 2, you can see that the effect of the iZone schools showed a significant increase in reading, math, and science. Figure 3 in the study breaks down Nashville, Memphis, and Chattanooga. There were a total of 26 schools that were taken by iZone, and a total of 33 schools taken by ASD.

What this study shows, with a comparison of pre-ASD, is that they are in the middle. They were given 5 years to run these schools. When you look at figure 4, it shows the estimated effect of ASD schools was potentially no growth. In the first year, they had a super high turnover for teachers and an influx of students who walked through the door. Then in the second year, they had an influx of students that walked out of the door. That is why this study is relevant. When you look at figure 5, this was the comparison of schools by the cohort, meaning that it could be an ASD or CMO.

Then you look at figure 6, which is the one that is the most telling. When you look at cohort 1, which is 2013, they actually had 3 schools that in the first drop off were allowed to be under the ASD. Then they allowed in 11 schools—8 run by CMOs, 3 run by ASDs. Then in cohort 3 in 2015, they added 8 schools. What they tried to do is compare, by management structure, how they were succeeding and how they were growing. If you look at the ASD-run math, you see that there was some growth, but that growth was in the 2015 cohort 1. When you look at cohort 2014 and 2013, there are very distinct differences. As you go further into cohort 2 and 3, what the study said was that the academic achievement was very inconsistent; they could not catch a flow. They could not create or produce academic achievement over a consistent period of time for three years. Yet the iZone, which was Nashville, Memphis, and Chattanooga, was able to get some growth.

Going back to figure 3, Chattanooga only did five schools. Chattanooga had a mix of elementary and middle schools out of the five schools. Memphis, which is where Dr. Griffin is, is the subject of all the articles I sent you. Dr. Griffin actually had the bulk of

the schools. She had the schools that had the highest need outside of Nashville—the schools had been at the 5 percent level for years. Then she came in and proved you could take a publicly run school district, transform it with an infusion of dollars, a change in leadership modeling, how you treated the teachers, and what you put in as resources.

When I talked to her, I asked her how much she spent per school to turn these schools around and get them to the point where they now rank at 25 percent—she spent about \$600,000 per school. That is a lot, but she needed to invest a lot because she needed to take the bottom of the bottom and prove a point that a publicly run school could succeed. She did so well with the 26 schools that she was just given an additional 127 schools to turn around this year and was promoted to chief of the whole iZone movement. After I talked to her, I decided to bring the bill. If it gets vetoed, at least I tried.

My only goal is to prove that public schools do work. When you give up on kids, when you say that public schools cannot work, and teachers cannot teach, you have to start asking yourself, when did the state of Nevada properly support the districts? We can go back to 2006 and find the adequacies study, which proved that we were not adequately funding the kids. We are having that fight here today. You are doing a weighted funding formula discussion because it is inequitable. You are having a conversation about how to make schools work, but then we struggle. We are proving—if you actually invest and do the interventions—it will allow the reorganization of schools and the turnaround model to work. The turnaround allows you to literally go into the schools. That is a publicly run intervention. It allows you to go in, take the principal out, and retrain the teachers. It even allows you to reshuffle some things, but it allows you to put in more money, infuse dollars into those schools, and offer more supports.

What Dr. Griffin did in Tennessee was to create longer school days and hours, so those kids could get in there and learn. She gave the power to those teachers, which is what we are trying to do under reorganization—to get in there, do the work, be supportive, and change those children's lives. I am so strongly against the privatization of public schools that it is to the point when I drive my district I realize that if they fail, such as what we are seeing in three years in the consortium, I am not willing to take that risk with our children. I am not willing to let somebody walk in as your CMO and then prove that you cannot change a student's academic success. The consortium proves that.

I put the State of Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury Achievement School District Performance Audit Report, August 2016, in the record ([Exhibit E](#)) because the achievement school district could not manage their finances. They did not have the processes and control. They were giving people raises. I am not saying that is going to happen here, but the audit is a lesson learned about what happened in Tennessee when they took it on. The audit proved that they had some serious issues between the CMO and the ASD. The ASD schools received \$77 million in federal, state, private, and public funding. The bill we passed in 2015 had that same language that you could flex your funding, and you could figure out how to make it work. They had the \$77 million and, if you look at the chart on page 5 of the audit ([Exhibit E](#)), the state general fund is now the largest contributor to those schools.

That is something that if it happened here, I would start my own campaign against ASD. I strongly believe in the reorganization of schools. I believe in the turnaround model. I believe that if we actually do the right thing, then we will be just fine.

I have two principals that I would like to bring up because I want them to talk. I want Dr. Wyatt to show what he did when he got money for Woolley. I promise you that you can go to Woolley and Cox, which are just a hopscotch away from each other and see how Dr. Wyatt went in and changed Woolley. Now we are going to do the same thing with Cox. After that, I want the Priest principal to come to the table. I want them to talk about what they are doing when we actually invest in the turnaround model, how they are changing and what they are doing in regard to their interventions.

I am only here to say that I believe so much in what we can do as a publicly run school district, and that if we invest, and do everything that we can, we do not even have to think about a CMO walking through our doors and taking over schools. The 33 schools that were taken over in Tennessee did not show success in reading. They did not show success in math. One of the cohorts showed success in science though. However, our core pieces are reading and math. If you cannot teach a child to read, no matter if we give you money, teachers, and autonomy, and you cannot turn those kids around, but a publicly run school or iZone can, I think there is a lot of evidence out there that says maybe we should take a step back and really think about what we are doing in our interventions.

I know this has sounded like a lot of rhetoric, but I did not intend for that. I am going to let these two principals speak for me. I will talk about the bill and say that I am repealing it—I am flat-out repealing it. That is what I want. We can get into the bill, and you can ask if there is a portion that I like. No! You can ask if there was a reason why I would have voted yes in 2015? No! If I could have pressed the button six times, I would have. If I could have worn a shirt saying, "No to ASD," I would have in 2015. However, we did not have the votes or the power to remove it.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will ask for the principals from Las Vegas to please come to the table. Do you have two or three principals?

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I have two. One is from Richard C. Priest Elementary School and Dr. Wyatt is technically still the principal of the other two schools. There was a new principal hired who has been running both schools for six weeks, but that will be finalized this coming Friday, so I would like Dr. Wyatt to speak. The chart that you have of the year-over change is from his school ([Exhibit F](#)).



**Darryl Wyatt, Principal, Gwendolyn Woolley Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Gwendolyn Woolley Elementary School is a sister school to Cox Elementary which was on the original ASD list. We share an attendant zone and, therefore, serve the same students. I would like to speak out today in support of A.B. 103. The Clark County School District's (CCSD) Turnaround Zone, led by Dr. Jeffrey Geihs, has identified effective strategies that help underperforming schools. The Turnaround Zone offers strategic staffing, additional funds, and the autonomy to establish effective structures and systems. For Woolley, this formula has been very successful. I call your attention to the Evaluate Proficiency data sheet that you have in front of you ([Exhibit F](#)). In each and every grade level, from second through fifth grade, in both reading and math, we have seen double digit increases in our year-over-year Evaluate Proficiency scores. This is very positive news for us as a recent study conducted by Catapult Learning showed a 0.83 correlation alignment between the Evaluate data and Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) data. I would like to point out one correction on this sheet, however, on fifth grade English Language Arts (ELA). The increase was 28 percent, not 48 percent. If you look at the data, you will see that those are big jumps year over year and it is for a short amount of time. We are well on our way to having good success on the SBAC.

Last year, our students performed better in ELA than math. In ELA, they were at 30 percent, and in math, they were at 27 percent. We placed a heavy emphasis on improving our math scores this year, and I think we are on the right track, evidenced by the Evaluate scores. Based on the current information available to us, we anticipate that our SBAC scores in all categories and all subgroups will be at or above district average. As a school that was rated two stars when the latest ratings were published, we are excited about the prospect of adding one or even more stars when the ratings are published next.

The Clark County School District, by way of the Turnaround Zone and a variety of other initiatives, is better equipped to service low-achieving schools than the Achievement School District. In addition, it is more prepared to provide the resources and tools necessary to see significant gains in a short amount of time. The ASD is given six years to bring a school up from its underperforming status. The Clark County School District's Turnaround Zone has been able to do it in three years. Dr. Geihs often says that three stars are better in three years—that is our mantra, and that is what Turnaround Zone has been able to do on a consistent basis. The Clark County School District has already been successful turning schools around, so why would the state want to take an unnecessary risk on an unknown commodity? The Clark County School District and the Turnaround Zone raises student achievement in half the time ASD is given. They are a proven commodity. They have the experience and resources to get the desired results. Therefore, it is my firm belief that Assembly Bill 103 should be supported and thereby eliminate ASDs.

**Tiarre Tenorio, representing Richard C. Priest Elementary School Parent Teachers Association, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am representing Richard C. Priest Elementary School and I support Assembly Bill 103. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. I am currently serving my second term as president of Priest Elementary Parent Teacher Association. I am also vice chair of

our school organizational team, but most importantly, I am the parent of an eight-year-old student there. My daughter has attended Priest for the past three years. Our school has definitely seen its challenges, as any school might, but we have been dragged into what I feel is an unfair, profit-driven, politically motivated, lackluster resolution that just does not have powerful data to support its claims.

With that being said, I would like to express the discontent I feel over Assembly Bill 448 of the 78th Session, more commonly known as the "Achievement School District." Assembly Bill 448 of the 78th Session leaves the school, its pupils, staff, and parents with no choice; no choice for the present or the future of our school community. If you are in this room or one of the other rooms tonight, you probably know that the data from ASD or similar programs in other states, shows minimal and, in some cases, no progress. In February 2017, Tennessee's Education Commissioner spoke on the ASD, calling its results embarrassing, and basically a waste of money.

While CCSD is not leading the nation in test scores and graduation rates, we must also give our current programs the chance to prove that they are or are not working. You cannot interrupt a three-year program in its second year, shake everything up, and expect positive results from a new program. We cannot expect our staff to teach to their fullest ability if they are worried about whether they need to move, switch schools, or realign their life plans due to the possibility of being taken over by a charter. The ASD is simply not needed here.

When the first ASD list was released in late 2016, Priest was one of the many schools being considered. After doing some research, attending countless meetings, and speaking with fellow parents, Priest's ASD opposition group was formed. The group obtained hundreds of letters from parents and staff. We also attended town hall meetings and even held a small protest at our school. We felt like our children, parents, and staff were being unfairly punished and wanted to do something about it. Priest is currently a Turnaround Zone school, and interestingly enough, the same data that brought us into the Turnaround Zone is the exact same data forcing us into the ASD. Our SBAC test results were unavailable or mysteriously being withheld for two years. However, Priest is actively showing gains as a Turnaround Zone school. Our students are led by our great administration, ever-improving staff, and of course, Dr. Geihs. Priest is optimistic about the Turnaround Zone program.

In conclusion, I support Assemblywoman Dina Neal and A.B. 103. She has done nothing but be straightforward with us and show her support for our students and school community. Please repeal A.B. 448 of the 78th Session before public education is extinguished. Make enrolling into a charter a choice—not a forced play.

**Pam Hays, Principal, Richard C. Priest Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I support my Parent Teacher Association president, Tiarre Tenorio, wholeheartedly. She has spoken for our school. Again, ASD is not a choice; it is a privatization. Our school is doing well in the Turnaround Zone as shown by our Evaluate evidence of over double-digit increases in both ELA and math for the past year and a half. I support everything she said, and I can only say "ditto" to Dr. Wyatt as well.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

There is one thing I forgot to mention. There is actually a bill that is currently in the Tennessee legislature that is being put forward by Representative Antonio Parkinson that allows schools to transition from ASD. After he saw the results and changes in what Dr. Sharon Griffin was doing and that they were giving her more control, he has put a bill forward. Believe it or not, that is a Republican-run House. The bill has already moved from the Assembly and is now being heard on the Senate side of the Tennessee legislature. It is to transition from ASD if there is no performance after five years.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Dr. Wyatt, what were the three or four most significant things that you did to make the improvements? Was it policy? Was it programs? Was it a change of leadership and shifting around of staff? What were the leading things that created the success?

**Darryl Wyatt:**

It was a combination of about four things. Staffing was huge. When we entered the Turnaround Zone, we had what is called strategic staffing. We were allowed to bring in more highly effective teachers and reassign teachers that were just not getting the results out of the students. Staffing is a very critical component that helps Turnaround run effectively.

Another thing is high expectations for us—and I am only going to be able to speak to what we have done at Woolley in order to try to get the success that you see. We have high expectations and no excuses about transiency or language barriers or any of those other things. We focus on knowing and understanding the standards at a deep level, then providing the meaningful instruction that needs to go along with it.

Another piece would be resources and making sure that the teachers have the resources needed to be successful, whether that is technology, textbooks, or training, and professional development training that needs to go along with that. When you enter the Turnaround Zone, there is an influx of some additional funds; more in the first year, then slightly decreasing in the second and third years. Those additional funds provide us with the money that we need to get these additional resources.

The fourth piece would be the accountability and monitoring; the administrators working collaboratively with the teachers to ensure that the standards are taught at a high level. Teachers have high expectations for their students, and the data shows that the students are making adequate progress. We are watching the data and working with the teachers to make sure that the standards are being taught effectively and at a high level. That has made a world of difference for us at Woolley.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Do you think those same things could be done within the ASD and have similar successes?

**Darryl Wyatt:**

The things that we have done that have met with success are not magical, and they are not unique. They are good educational practices. I could not imagine why anybody could not replicate these things.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I want to say before the principals leave, thank you so much for your service and also to our PTA mom.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

I want to follow up on what Assemblyman Edwards just asked. Mr. Wyatt, are you aware if what you just described is not part of the ASD process? I was not here last session, so I was not part of the discussion, but are those same things not covered? How does this differ from the ASD model?

**Darryl Wyatt:**

I came here today specifically to speak about the successes of Woolley and address the Assembly bill. I really do not have all of the facts or the components of how ASD operates. I do understand that they bring in charters, and charters have a variety of structures and systems in place, so it would vary from school to school. I do not think there is really a set answer where you could say that yes, at every situation, these things will all be evident. What I can say is that as a Turnaround Zone, again, under Dr. Geihs' lead, we as principals often collaborate and share our information. For us, it is readily available. The things that I have talked about have been shared at other principal meetings. We are constantly collaborating and sharing among ourselves. Whether that is going to be available when other charter schools or districts come in and have that same kind of mindset, I cannot speak to that. However, I can speak to what is currently in place and working.

**Pam Hays:**

I also want to say that under the ASD, if they were to take over a school, that establishes something for a relationship. It would take time to build a relationship and a culture with a school takeover. That would put the children in jeopardy of what they are already receiving in high-quality instruction.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

In terms of the turnaround model, I understand that it also requires staffing changes and particularly leadership changes that would require that same kind of relationship building, would it not?

**Darryl Wyatt:**

In some cases, it does and in some cases, it does not. What happens is that Dr. Geihs and his team come in and do an internal and external evaluation/audit of the school and determine what the needs are. For example, in the situation with Woolley, we went turnaround last year, and there was not an administrative change. Our sister school next door is going turnaround, and there was a reassignment of the administrator. It really varies based on the

need of the school. It is not a cookie cutter approach in every situation. It is a careful analysis by Dr. Geihs and his Turnaround Zone team. Then they determine what remedy is best needed for that particular school.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

The fundamental disagreement is the ideological disagreement. The turnaround allows a publicly run intervention to occur versus a CMO or a private charter taking a publicly run building for six years and then doing an act of intervention. I am a strong proponent that the publicly run system, if provided the resources, which we have failed and historically can prove has not happened, can do the actual act of intervening for those children and turning those schools around. We will stay at an impasse between private and public, but the whole point is the turnaround is publicly done; it is not privately done. I am point blank a proponent of publicly run schools. The differences in the intervention are why I really want you to read the Consortium document ([Exhibit D](#)) because it lays it out. I can send you *Chalk Talk* ([Exhibit C](#)). It lays out every iZone intervention that has occurred, and you can see it. They laid out what the ASD performed with the CMO and compared each one—compared the publicly run with the other side. It is not a fluke. I just think you need to see that information and then have a discussion and ask if it will work. Are you willing to experiment on our kids to get a result that Tennessee bought into in 2010 and did not see the change that they hoped for? Now their own legislature is pulling back and saying that maybe this is not a good idea; maybe we should do what the iZone is doing. That is the whole point of providing all of that information to you.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I think you are missing a very crucial element. A charter school is still a public school and let me clarify and explain that.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Yes, you are going to have to clarify that one.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

A charter school is chartered by either the county or by the state. That school must abide by the charter that is approved. Therefore, whatever they do, they are simply doing through a different management approach, but they are fulfilling the charter that has been given to them by . . .

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there a question in there?

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

There is no question, but I will answer it. I would suggest that you read the Tennessee Consortium document because it breaks it down by management structure and see if this is where we differ in our thought pattern. If you are saying that a CMO and an ASD are still public, then I would suggest that you read about the management structure, and then I would

also suggest that you read the Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury Achievement School District Performance Audit Report ([Exhibit E](#)) on ASD, about their management structure, how they performed, and how well they served, using the public money that they had the ability to use to serve children. Also you can look at how they fared in trying to change the academic success of those students. I will leave it at that. I am saying to you right now, read the management structure. Then we can have a conversation and debate it.

**Chairman Thompson:**

At this time, we will open it up in Carson City for support of [A.B. 103](#).

**Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association:**

We represent 40,000 educators across the state of Nevada working to ensure a high-quality public education for every Nevada student. The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) supports [A.B. 103](#) to repeal the Achievement School District (ASD). The ASD is the wrong answer for our state's struggling schools. Conversion of public schools to achievement charters would take away control of school sites from parents and communities. During the process last year to identify specific schools for conversion, we saw unprecedented mobilization of school communities who felt that charters were being forced on them with little communication or input. This top-down approach is diametrically opposed to the work that is being done to reorganize the Clark County School District—which is about giving school communities much more say over their school site.

We know that data on Nevada's charter schools and achievement schools in places like Tennessee and Michigan show very mixed results at best. In fact, when it comes to student achievement, charter schools underperform regular public schools by almost every measure. Meanwhile, as we learned earlier this year with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) raid of the Celerity Educational Group in Los Angeles, one of only three charter management organizations selected by the Achievement School District to operate in Nevada. Lack of accountability and oversight is a very, very serious issue and very well could be the death knell of the ASD in Nevada.

Finally, NSEA is concerned about the ability of achievement charter school principals to make all decisions concerning employment at an achievement charter school. Requiring staff to reapply for their jobs only introduces more instability into our most vulnerable schools. Whether intended or not, this law has a union-busting component, putting union members in the position of having to choose between their school site and their kids or their collective bargaining agreement—if they are even offered the opportunity to stay.

**Dr. Linda E. Young, Vice President, Board of Trustees, District C, Clark County School District:**

I am here to present Clark County School District's support of A.B. 103, which repeals the Achievement School District. Over the past few sessions, the Legislature has passed a number of different reforms that schools are still implementing. Programs such as Zoom, Victory, and Turnaround schools are showing improvement in student achievement and need more time to collect evidence of their effectiveness. The evaluation provided by the Nevada Department of Education shows that these programs have been successful or are showing promise, yet some of the same schools have been identified for the ASD takeover by a charter operator.

During the 2015 Legislative Session and throughout the interim, we raised many questions about the ASD that remain unanswered. Regarding the selection process of schools, how do we ensure that appropriate schools are assigned to the ASD, and that the transfer process works in a manner that provides the least disruption for students and staff? The law allows executive directors to select any public school that is included on the list for conversion to an ASD. This provision does not take into account any of the reforms, including the turnaround process, that may have recently been implemented in the schools.

What about parent choice? How do we ensure that students in the school selected to become an ASD will be provided the services they need? Turning around a failing school means that we must improve the achievement of all students attending the school.

There is no requirement for a charter operator to have demonstrated success in rapidly improving academic results in a school where the student body has a comparable demographic profile. Without well-documented results, the state should be hesitant in investing taxpayer dollars in an unknown, unqualified, and undocumented entity.

We raise these and a multitude of other concerns that remain unanswered during the interim. For these reasons and many others, we support the repeal of the Achievement School District as noted in A.B. 103.

**S.S. Rogers, Pastor/Teacher, The Greater Mount Sinai Missionary Recruiting Ministries, Inc.; and representing Ministers Alliance of Southern Nevada:**

I am also the president of the Ministers Alliance of Southern Nevada. I am here today to present our support of A.B. 103, which would repeal the Achievement School District. We are adamantly against the ASD charter school process as indicated in A.B. 103. We feel that ASD is unlawfully an aspect of the bill, and it is also discriminatory for communities of color. Achievement schools do not represent our community, and we feel that it is a hostile takeover of our students and parents.

Assembly Bill 103 must repeal the achievement school district because it is disrespectful of the school district and especially students and parents. We have many qualified people in the CCSD and the Turnaround schools without the ASD. We are prepared to fight these takeovers that prey upon blacks, Latinos, and other poor students. People in ASD are not

qualified and these charter companies do not have the talent or the background to do this business. It is only about the money. The research does not support any recordings of success of these charter management organizations or the achievement results. These schools that ASD proposes are not accurate and again, ASD is slow in showing their willingness to engage in tactics that are against the will of our community. To conclude as asked, no company can come in from out-of-town, from out-of-state, and do what we have already done in our communities. We know our communities; ASD does not.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I am curious about this. I think most of the people in this room would admit that being 50th in the country means that the people in place, in too many instances, have failed our children. Why do you think that the ASD would not be able to manage themselves, would not hire the people, would not be able to succeed when we have not even seen them? We have no information about how they would do here. We do not even know who they would be. Why are you so sure that it would be a failure; a failure worse than what we have right now?

**S.S. Rogers:**

The reason I made that statement is because no one can come into your community that does not know the community, does not know the students or the parents, and do an effective job in communicating to those who are already there. We see that in an ASD they will fire the principal and/or the administrators, and they refurbish and bring in new people. How can they reach the community just coming into the state?

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Many of the teachers are already from other communities, and if we are going to expect them to succeed, we have to have the trust that they do have the ability to do so. Quite frankly, when they did the reorganization for the school district, they brought in outside consultants to lead the way because they had done it elsewhere successfully. Being able to bring in people from outside sometimes is the right answer, and we should not preclude that as a possibility to a successful program.

**S.S. Rogers:**

We could look back at H.P. Fitzgerald and Matt Kelly Elementary Schools. The principal, Dr. Watson, turned those two elementary schools around with the people who were already there. Why change hands when you already have the best hands?

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

We can do both.

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

Did I hear you correctly that there was an FBI raid on one of the charters in California? How did that affect what happened in Nevada? Were these people allowed to continue on in Nevada after that? Were there arrests made? Can you delve into that a little more?



**Chris Daly:**

I can represent what was reported in the *Los Angeles Times* and subsequently in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Early this year, the FBI did raid Celerity Educational Group at their main offices in Los Angeles. Celerity Educational Group was one of three charter management organizations that went through the ASD process to select CMOs to run the achievement charter schools. They were the largest CMO. At least one of the other CMOs that was selected was a local, smaller enterprise. My guess is that Celerity was probably slated to get a number of the achievement charter schools. However, after the news report of the raid, the allegations of financial mismanagement, and potential fraud, the Department of Education and the ASD did send a letter to Celerity saying that they had been removed from consideration. Maybe in the same letter, or shortly thereafter, they also announced that the ASD conversions would be suspended or put off into the future.

**Alison Clark, School Psychologist, Mario C. and Joanne Monaco Middle School,  
Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a school psychologist at Mario C. and Joanne Monaco Middle School. Monaco was on the short list at the end of 2016 to be turned around. Fortunately, at the Department of Education meeting, the board members took note of our amazing support for students and significant achievement gains, and they voted to take us off that list. The reason Monaco got taken off that list is because of all the fine work that our teachers and support staff do. We are located in the poorest neighborhood in Nevada and designated as a Victory school. Our principal hired highly-qualified, licensed teachers, provided rigorous professional development and collaborative opportunities for all staff members, created a positive culture and safe environment for students, and invested in evidence-based curriculum and teaching practices, evidence-based interventions, and monitored evidence-based outcomes. All of our practices are research based and systematically delivered. Our instructional decisions are data-based. If we are expected to implement evidence-based interventions and use evidence-based outcomes to make decisions, why can Nevada not do the same?

Charter school takeovers of failing public schools are not effective as evidence-based interventions. In fact, the evidence indicates that when student backgrounds are accounted for comparably, students in charter schools perform significantly lower than their counterparts in public schools. Other states that have implemented ASD have halted programs because of significantly poor achievement gains, fiscal mismanagement, and poor care of facilities. Research simply does not support forcing public schools to become charter schools as an effective intervention. Would the state force practices that are not research-based on the medical profession? That would be absurd. It would be like creating a goal for inner-city county hospitals to have 100 percent of patients leave the hospital healthy.

It is reckless to not have licensed personnel teaching children in high areas of poverty and high need. We need to embrace these communities, not kick them out. We need to provide extended supports and services. Please make the right decision, the evidence-based decision, and repeal ASD.

**Michelle Knopp, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I urge you to support the elimination of the achievement school district, or at least delay its implementation.

I am a specialist in gifted and talented education and currently work at two schools. One of my schools, Lois Craig Elementary School, a Zoom school, was on the list of schools threatened to be taken over by the ASD. I am deeply relieved this will not happen, at least for now. If it were to happen, I would be troubled by the implications for our students.

I would like to give you some background information on my school. We have had a couple of turbulent years due to a teacher shortage and could not fill 18 positions. When this happens, a long-term substitute is placed in the classroom until the position is filled. Test scores tend to go down. Last year, the number was whittled down to seven, and this year, only two unfilled positions remain. In addition, we have a brand new administrator. He has only been with us since July 2016. These circumstances are not going to be taken into consideration when the achievement school district makes its selections.

I believe our school is, at the present time, the best option for this community. We are currently a staff of 95 percent highly-qualified teachers. I have heard stated today that charter schools could do what we can do, but charter schools are not even required to hire people who have been through an education college. We have programs such as gifted and talented to serve students with special needs. Charter schools are not required to have such programs. We are essentially a different school now and deserve a chance of at least a year to turn things around. Thanks to Celerity's fraudulent activities, we will get that opportunity.

Furthermore, charter school takeovers are not about school choice. They are not private schools. They are neighborhood schools, and the communities they serve have no choice in the matter. Many families do not have the means to transport their children to another school, and although they may not be happy with such a turn of events, they do not know how to make their voices heard.

Finally, I believe ASD was about money and politics rather than what is best for communities and students. Please support A.B. 103.

**Anna Slighting, representing Honoring Our Public Education, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I represent HOPE, Honoring Our Public Education. I am speaking today in favor of A.B. 103. I want to make it clear that we are not opposed to charter schools. We are very clear that charter schools are a part of public education. What we are opposed to is the takeover of existing schools by charter schools.

We see it at HOPE, but we would prefer that our schools are adequately funded so our per-pupil amount is large enough to attract many quality charters to our states. We would like a robust amount of choice included in our urban core for all of our families.

Choice to us at HOPE means choice to remain at zone schools or magnet, career and technical education (CTE), select, and charters. Choice is not a takeover of an existing school. We would like to see achievement school repealed. I will reserve the remainder of my comments for Assembly Bill 432 for more conversation on charter schools. Thank you.

**Lou Markouzis, Principal, Zel and Mary Lowman Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the proud principal of Zel and Mary Lowman Elementary School. I am actually here today representing one of my parents who sits on my site-based team, my School Organizational Team committee. It really speaks to a lot of our families, not only at Lowman Elementary School, but to many of our families that certainly have struggles in their lives and are truly afraid to be in this kind of position to speak out publicly at the state level, but certainly enjoy love of their community. I have a letter written from that parent, Maria Salgado, that I would like to read at this time.

My family has been a part of Lowman community for a few years now. I have had two children that went to Lowman and my youngest is going there now, so three kids. Before Mr. Markouzis and the Turnaround Zone came, Lowman was in bad shape with many new teachers coming and leaving the school. My kids talked about the violence and how little work they did at school, but that all changed when Mr. Markouzis and the Turnaround Zone came to help. I will admit I was a little skeptical, but every day, I noticed a difference. The administration was always visible, greeting parents and kids in the morning. Families were welcomed at the door to volunteer in a child's classroom. Most importantly, great teachers who cared about my child and my friend's children were everywhere in the building. My kids feel safe and are happy to go to school every day.

I decided to run for a position in our school organization team. I have attended almost every parent meeting, and I want to help Lowman be even better. We, are so happy to have a parental voice with our school. When I heard about the ASD and them taking over our school, it made me sad and frustrated. We as a parent community, asked Mr. Markouzis, "Don't they see all of the great things that have happened since you came? What about the great teachers? Our kids and families love the changes. I understand the state wants to help, but help already came for our community." The Turnaround Zone and Mr. Markouzis have made families proud to send their kids to Lowman. We should let the experts in our school district that have fixed our schools for the last five years continue to do the work and have the state support of communities.

**Anthony Nunez, Principal, William E. Orr Middle School, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Today I speak in favor of Assembly Bill 103 because I believe that the Clark County School District already effectively treats its underperforming schools by migrating these schools into the Turnaround Zone, led by Dr. Jeffrey Geihs who is in the audience today.

As part of the Turnaround Zone, schools are provided with additional resources and strategic staffing in order to create precise structures, functions, and processes that promote rapid increases in student achievement. The result of these schools that have received treatment through the Turnaround process has been exceptional. I am going to restate our elementary results, but I do want to highlight that all high schools exiting the Turnaround Zone have achieved graduation rates of 60 percent or higher. In fact, the average class of 2016 graduation rate for the five high schools that exited the Turnaround Zone between 2013 and 2016 is 75.22 percent.

I can speak from personal experience that the Turnaround Zone provides schools with great opportunities to transform the quality of educational and social services provided to the communities they serve. For the past two and a half years, I served as principal of J. E. Manch Elementary School and led the school through its initial years of turnaround. In addition to rapidly improving achievement, it recreated a strong positive culture.

Today, discipline referrals have decreased by 50 percent, and teacher retention is more than 80 percent—close to 90 percent. All of the previous helped to ensure that Manch Elementary School did not appear on the list for migration to the ASD. As the newly-appointed principal of William E. Orr Middle School, a school that was initially on the list to migrate into the ASD, I look forward to leading the school through the turnaround process because I know the process works. I know that the outcomes will be both increased student achievement and a stronger, more positive community culture.

**Michelle Caligone, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a parent of two Clark County School District (CCSD) students who are with me now. I am in support of A.B. 103, and I am in opposition to Assembly Bill 448 of the 78th Session. There is nothing to choose from the ASD. My loyalty is to CCSD and the Richard C. Priest Elementary School staff. I will continue to support every effort to keep my school and any other school as part of the district in which they belong, which is CCSD. The ASD currently does not provide parental choice for strong instructional practices, and no parent should have state demands forced upon them simply because of old data and structures. There has been no new data since 2013-14 to use as an accountability piece for this decision-making.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Could you please have our two little supporters state their names for the record?

**Michelle Caligone:**

Say your name. [My name is Linda.] The other one is shy. Her name is Jada.

**Fred Watson, Principal, H.P. Fitzgerald Elementary School, North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am speaking in support of A.B. 103. During the 2015-16 school year, my second year as principal, Fitzgerald was designated as a turnaround school due to its steady decline in student achievement. This designation allowed us to reassign ineffective staff members and receive extra funding to make the changes necessary to increase student achievement.

and eventually reach our goal of becoming a high-achieving school. As we complete our second year in turnaround, our Evaluate data indicates that Fitzgerald has made tremendous progress as evidenced by more than 40 percent growth in student achievement for math and more than a 20 percent growth in reading. We also received Victory funding which allowed us to transform our school with new programs and initiatives, including reading intervention programs, a 3D Virtual Lab that was featured on the Channel 8 news, and a violin program.

Despite this progress, schoolwide, the ASD sees charter school takeover as a solution and that is exactly what it is—a takeover. However, the ASD is not the answer for Fitzgerald or any of our schools. Under the leadership of Dr. Geihs, we in the Turnaround Zone are held accountable to reach specific student achievement goals, and the success of schools going through the turnaround process is well documented. Charter schools have always been about giving parents another choice and another option. The ASD process is simply to impose charter schools on communities against their will, giving them no choice.

I am here representing hundreds of Fitzgerald parents and community members who support Fitzgerald. They have made their choice, and it is a resounding no to ASD and a resounding yes to A.B. 103.

**Suynn Davis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the mother of 3, the grandmother of 17, and the great grandmother of 1. Eight of those students were students at H.P. Fitzgerald. I have to say that since Dr. Watson came to H.P. Fitzgerald and his boss, Dr. Geihs, has visited the school many, many times, you can see that there is an opportunity for growth. I have been in this community for many years. I have children who have gone to Green Valley High School, to Coronado High School, to Arbor View High School, and to Durango High School, from H.P. Fitzgerald who are now on honor rolls. I know it began with them learning to read before age three. I appreciate the program for three- and four-year-olds because it gives the children an opportunity to know how to read by the time they get to kindergarten, and then they are extremely successful and ahead of the game when they get to kindergarten.

We appreciate that somebody wants to come in and give us an opportunity, but when you give us an opportunity, you have to give us a choice. Just like yesterday, you had a choice of whom you wanted to be the new mayor for North Las Vegas and for him to sit. It was not done with a takeover. It was done by a vote and choice.

I am here to say that the Achievement School District [Celerity Educational Group], the night before they were raided in Los Angeles, had a meeting with us parents at Doolittle Community Center and said to us, "We do not take three-year-olds and four-year-olds." The Governor has a program that he wants the students to Read by Grade 3. If the three- and four-year-olds are not there by kindergarten, they will be behind. This school is an amazing school. I know you are all from Carson City, but maybe you need to visit the schools before you make a statement, and we are in support of A.B. 103.

**Chairman Thompson:**

At this time, we will move to opposition for Assembly Bill 103. We will start in Carson City.

**Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

I am joined by Deputy Superintendent Brett Barley, who in his capacity as Deputy Superintendent, also serves as Executive Director of the Achievement School District. You have a number of documents, including some conceptual amendments ([Exhibit G](#)) as well as a graphic ([Exhibit H](#)) and some performance data ([Exhibit I](#)). On Monday, April 3, 2017, the Department submitted its Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan—what we are calling a New Nevada Plan—to the U.S. Department of Education. Within that plan, we have articulated a goal to become the fastest improving state in the nation. To achieve that goal, we have outlined three key strategies, one of which is, of course, improving our lowest performing schools ([Exhibit I](#)). We cannot become the fastest improving state in the nation without dramatically improving the schools serving our most vulnerable students. Some is no longer enough. Our state has some great schools for some students and the result for some is a wonderful learning experience. Our ultimate goal is that every Nevada public school student that sits in every classroom across Nevada has the opportunity to bring their dream to life.

We, the adults and policymakers, have an obligation to take responsibility for our students by holding a clear line of accountability. This is why the Governor declared in his 2015 State of the State Address that we must draw a line in the sand for underperforming schools. Close to 60,000 students in our state attend an underperforming school where one in ten perform math at grade level and only two in ten read at grade level. Our underperforming schools enroll a disproportionate share of African-American and Hispanic students where we graduate approximately one out of every two African-American students and three out of five Hispanic students. As long as I am your State Superintendent, I will not accept this. This should be unacceptable to all of us. When we do see progress in some areas, we have to reject the notion that we "got this." We do not "got this." Collectively, we can get this perhaps. We have talked about the Turnaround Zone today, which is a local intervention. They serve roughly 19 to 23 schools. The Clark County School District identified 90 schools in their first list of schools that may be eligible for the ASD.

Over the past two years of implementation, we listened, and we learned a lot. There are some conceptual changes and Mr. Barley will cover the key changes.

**Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education:**

As we have been moving through this process, we have been listening to stakeholder feedback over the past year, and we have learned more about what an ASD for Nevada could and should look like. There is a document that has been provided to all of the Committee members and it is 29 pages of all of the public feedback from districts and families that we have heard over the past year ([Exhibit J](#)).

Some key themes in the feedback that we have learned are that first, it is incredibly important to maintain that really clear line in the sand and have consistent accountability for our schools. Every year, the Department has put out an underperforming schools list, and this was the first year that we really saw the attention that these schools need generated by the publication of that list. We believe it was because there was some sort of action associated with it this year. Our challenge, as we think about this, is how to turn that action into positive momentum and change for Nevada kids.

The second piece of feedback that we have learned is that it is important that we all think about protecting our most vulnerable kids. The schools that end up on this list every year are the schools that are in the neighborhoods of our most vulnerable families. We have to keep that in mind as well.

Third, we have heard a lot about what it means to empower parents in this process. That is why we have included in our draft regulations that went before the Interim Legislative Commission, an opportunity for parents to petition into a school improvement plan, if they are either not selected for the ASD or if they are a low-performing school that does not meet the statutory requirements and would like to identify a school improvement plan ([Exhibit K](#)).

The fourth thing we have learned is about honoring local interventions. We have heard about some of the very good work that is happening in school districts across the state today. That is why we have developed the concept of a student performance compact which would allow us all to put our commitment to kids in writing, and we would get to three stars in three years.

Finally, the plan is to ensure that we have collaboration across the district, the state, and our families. We have to do this together.

**Assemblyman Flores:**

My question pertains to charter schools. I would like your input on the performance of charter schools in Nevada. Are they performing a lot better than our traditional public schools? My other question is, where is CCSD now? I know we keep saying 50th, but I think we have had conversations where we do not agree that that data is exactly accurate.

**Steve Canavero:**

With regard to charter schools, it is important to note a couple of things. This body tried, in 2009 and really in 2011, to set a course for high-quality policy that would establish high-quality charter schools. From 2011 until after the last session, we have one of the strongest charter school laws in the nation. Strongest charter school law is not to just simply open up more charter schools, it is a measure of accountability and autonomy. By providing the flexibility to operate the fundamental premise of charter schools is that you need to be accountable, and you operate on a six-year shelf life traditionally—a six-year shelf life that can be closed at any point along that span.

With regard to the performance, the portfolios of charter schools that have opened under the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) throughout this process have performed incredibly well. I have not looked at the number of schools in that portfolio compared to the noncharter counterparts, but the public charter schools that have opened dramatically lean to three, four, and five stars. The SPCSA is taking action to ensure that all of their schools, under their authority and sponsorship, are held accountable for results. I know that right now, if I remember correctly, they had put notice of closure to three charters to improve or to be subject to the ultimate accountability.

With regard to 50th, there is, of course, a number of different ways to rank states and Nevada is ranked across a number of different national indicators. The Quality Counts report, which is likely the one being referenced, contains a number of factors that are general well-being, including education, family employment, stability, finance, et cetera. On that, we are ranked last. If you look at education alone, I believe it is more like 38th. I forget some of the other measures. If we look at our national average ACT ranking of all of those states, of which I think there are now 18 who assess all of their students in ACT—again, this would be an apples to apples comparison where, every 11th grader is assessed in ACT—our average score is last.

We have significant room to improve, and what we have been advocating for is a real honest and transparent view of our performance. I am not going to sit here and continue to hammer that we are not where we need to be. We are not where we need to be. There are indicators that we are making progress. We are fourth in the nation in graduation rate improvement. We are behind some of the states that actually have utilized the ASD as part of their platform to compete for the fastest improving title. We have been recognized for narrowing the gap in 8th grade science on the National Assessment of Education Progress. There are bright spots, but again, we are making progress. I want to honor that progress, but we are also still seeing disproportionate and disparate outcomes for students across our state that we have to address.

[Assemblywoman Joiner assumed the Chair.]

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

When you say a commitment to the kids—making a commitment to the kids sounds strange when you are basically saying, "but we are going to hand you off to someone else." I have concerns about the true commitment to kids. In using the phrase accountability and autonomy in the same sentence, we know that charter schools are not held accountable to the same degree, but they are autonomous. If the belief is that the charter schools, because of their autonomy, can perform better, even though that is not what the data suggests, and we also know the tremendous successes that Zoom and Victory schools are making, then why not empower our schools and our leadership to allow them to have the same type of autonomy and institute the same type of programs and do it from within without having outsiders from other states come in and take over our schools.

[Assemblyman Thompson reassumed the Chair.]



**Steve Canavero:**

For me, it is always an "and." The ASD can only convert up to six schools a year. It is not "the" solution; it is "part" of the solution. The more we can put out as solutions to the pernicious challenge in our state, as an "and," not an "or" or a "versus," the faster we will improve as a state, and the faster we can serve our kids. The autonomy for accountability is the fundamental quid pro quo around charters. As we have done in our law, we will provide autonomy and flexibilities to them, but in return, they are going to deliver results. You have installed in your law a performance compact—a contract, if you will, that is modeled after the nation's best. That fundamentally says that these are the measures that the charter schools must hit, and if they do not, they can be in breach of that contract and lose it. Charters are the only sector of our public education system that do not exist in perpetuity.

Ultimately, at any point during that six-year initial contract and subsequent six-year contract, that is the shelf life. Upon renewal, they can be closed. They are held to a high standard, and I just evidenced that the challenge the SPCSA is currently working through is ensuring that the folks they have entrusted with the commitment to kids are actually honoring that commitment. I think it has been three notices of closure that they have issued to just begin a process to work with their schools to improve or lose their contract.

**Brett Barley:**

When we talk about recruiting high-quality charter schools to Nevada to serve Nevada kids, we mean it. There have been ten applications over the past two years. There have only been two schools that have been approved. If you come to Nevada and try to serve Nevada kids, there is a very high-barred entry with us. I would reiterate the idea of scale that Dr. Canavero spoke about. It is an all-hands-on-deck situation where we have to come up beside the school district and partner with local community organizations and with local government. We all have to be in this together to provide the type of opportunities that we know our kids and our most underserved schools need. Again, it is not an either/or, it is an and/but.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

You say it is a solution. Why do we not empower and allow the schools to currently do it? I have seen a lot of research and numbers that say that charter schools here in Nevada have graduation rates at 40 percent, yet our public schools have graduation rates at 70 percent. How would that be a solution?

**Steve Canavero:**

That is, in fact, why the charter authority is taking direct action on their schools. You have installed in your law a threshold of graduation rates that if a charter school gets below, they are subject to closure. That is one of the reasons why we have a strong charter school law. Can you repeat your first question?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Why do we not just allow . . . ?

**Steve Canavero:**

So, as part of the conceptual amendment and perhaps even in the flow chart we do, in fact, lay out a path and a way to honor and provide that type of flexibility. In the last session, Senate Bill 92 of the 78th Session passed, which is a principal empowerment model where the principal has significantly more authority over some of the decisions that are offered in the Turnaround Zone as a way for the state policy framework to allow for more innovation and control at a particular school site.

Under the revisioning, and based on the feedback that we received, we have a number of ways that parents and school sites can agree to petition into a particular intervention and that intervention is then codified in a compact that you heard Deputy Superintendent Barley speak to. When we put our commitment to kids in writing, we say, "Here it is. It is going to be three stars in three years and at some point along this way, our commitment to you is that if you are making progress and you hit your annual targets, then you are not eligible for the achievement school district." People have said they want time; they have an intervention.

Here is a way to codify that clearly under an agreement. Things like empowerment schools, autonomous schools under S.B. 92 of the 78th Session, other evidence-based interventions, other state and local interventions, or nonprofit partnerships are just a few that we have listed here that could be utilized for schools and families to agree to and to be an intervention that would ultimately yield the outcomes we would track and monitor. If they were making progress, then they would not be subject to the ASD review upon their initial nonselection.

**Brett Barley:**

If I could, I would like to make one additional point to your question about why not have these charter-type autonomies for other schools. We heard the principal speak earlier regarding the Turnaround Zone and staffing flexibility, high expectations, accountability, and a no-excuse mentality. Those are a lot of the same types of qualities that we are looking for in the high-quality charter operators that we hope to recruit to the state—that type of mindset. I bring this point up because some of that staffing flexibility that we heard about earlier in the Turnaround Zone is a charter-like flexibility.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

If nothing else, it is fantastic that Assemblywoman Neal has continued to keep the spotlight on this subject. One of the things I get from all of the testimony we have heard so far is mostly fear; fear of a takeover. If I am understanding correctly, if the school under scrutiny starts to turn around and starts to see improvement, they are no longer eligible to be taken over. Can you explain to me how that process works, please?

**Brett Barley:**

Part of the idea around the student performance compact that exists in the regulation that we shared with the interim committee before session started was this idea around shared commitment to students and a plan to improve. We think that every school that is identified as eligible for the ASD should have a plan to get better. There were 47 schools that were eligible this year. There were two schools that are going to open up in the fall.

That leaves 40-some schools that need something. They need a plan to get better. The performance compact allows everybody to agree on a school improvement strategy and map progress year over year to three stars in three years. If a school is on track and hitting its targets and delivering for kids like we want to see, we have the opportunity and the power to pull that school back from consideration and allow it to continue to do the good work that is happening at that school. Then we can focus our attention on those that need more help or are having trouble meeting their goals.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

In this session, I have heard the terms, "evidence-based this" and "evidence-based that" in so many discussions. I agree that we should always have as much evidence as we can, and sometimes we do not have as much as we would like or as much as we need, but I do find it ironic that in all of the discussions of evidence-based, there are so many who are ready to declare the ASD a failure before it has even gotten started. That kind of plays with what Assemblyman Pickard was talking about that there is a lot of fear, a lot of misunderstanding, and a lack of information that may be causing much of this fear. The charter schools have not been here for very long, and yet, there was only one of them that was a one-star school last time, which is far better than what the rest of the public school system had. What is it that stops the current administrators, the current school board, and the current principals from doing exactly what Dr. Wyatt has done at his school? There is no law that I know of that stops them. There is no policy from us that stops them. Why are the school boards and the superintendents not already doing the same principles that Dr. Wyatt talked about?

**Steve Canavero:**

I do not know if I am in a position to answer your question, sir. It might be a question for a member of a school board or a superintendent. They would be able to get much more specific in terms of the details that you are asking for.

**Assemblywoman Woodbury:**

It is no secret that our state has been 50th in seemingly any measurable category for as long as I can remember. We have data that shows 85 percent of our schools that are in the bottom 25 percent performance-wise, have been there for many, many years—longer than three years. To me, this is about student performance, and that no child should be in an underperforming or a failing school. Can you tell me why we would have allowed that to go on for so long? Why have they been in the bottom 25 percent for so long?

**Steve Canavero:**

The biggest challenge and the most pernicious element that we have as a state is not the achievement school district or these battles that we have regarding specific interventions or lists, but I think it is a culture of simply accepting what is and continuing to perpetuate that it works. We have to be honest that these schools have been on the list for a long time.

We have to be honest that, frankly, something needs to change for these students. The leadership demonstrated in the last session obviously kicked off with the Governor's vision to finally put a line in the sand because there never was one before. The Department of Education had language to do some of this work, but chose not to, and chose to pass that which was more amenable and more agreeable to people.

I think the result of that approach is kind of where we are, which is where we have been. I think 2015 is a watershed for us and I think before us we have an opportunity to continue, and I really appreciate Assemblyman Pickard's comment about honoring Assemblywoman Neal's keeping this conversation going. As difficult as the conversations have been, at least we are talking about outcomes for kids, honest results, and about the economic consequences of students who are not prepared to engage in the Nevada economy, as well as the personal, human spirit and dignity that tends to erode as a dropout or a student who is underprepared. I am thankful for the continued conversation. I think we recognize that these schools have been on a list for a very long time. We have been prepared to do something about it, and we are prepared to continue to do something about it and that is one of the reasons we oppose this particular bill.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will go to Las Vegas for opposition of A.B. 103.

**Annette Dawson Owens, representing Break Free CCSD, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am an educator and a parent, and I am for both charter and district schools. I am for every good thing and every good tool that we can use to move education forward. I am not afraid to bring on great things for us and our students in Nevada. The whole point of this reorganization is to turn things around as fast as possible for our kids. For just a moment, I would ask you to do a little mind shift. Think about yourself being a kid sitting at a school and right across the way is this awesome charter that you would love to go to, but you cannot get into it because it has a wait list of 3,000. On the other side of the street is an awesome CCSD school. You cannot get into that one either because you are not zoned for that one, but that school has an amazing principal that did some amazing, empowering things. You are stuck at this school.

At Break Free CCSD, we recently did a reorganization video that is approaching 10,000 views. On the way over to this meeting, I honestly had a school call me and ask, "How long would it take for us to do this thing that we often hear about?" I told them that it might be a year at least, if it is even possible. They said they might be able to keep their principal and hold out that long.

We are in favor of choice. The community is in favor of choice. We can bring in great models and move education forward, which was the whole plan of the reorganization. We need to not be afraid. We are not these other areas. We are not Tennessee. We can make our own path. Strembinsky, the father of empowerment, said to us that when this reorganization works well, what he saw in Canada was that these charters folded back into the district, so do not be afraid. Let us bring on every great tool that we have.

We talked about how the Turnaround Zone maybe serves 20 of our schools; we have 365 schools. The ASD was maybe going to have an impact on 6 schools, so why not give them 20? Thank you so much for all of your hard work. I appreciate everything you do for our kids. Let us just keep that in mind.

**Maria Bivins, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have four children. I have a preschooler, a 7th grader, a 10th grader, and a 20-year old who graduated from a CCSD high school. Me and my husband of 22 years started our family very young. We were 18 years old. We got the opportunity to move to Nevada in April 2009 because we got the opportunity to purchase a home. My oldest son was in the 7th grade and at the time, he was taking geometry. When we moved here and enrolled him in school, they told us that geometry was not taught until high school in the 10th grade. My son had to dumb himself down for three years. By the time he was in the 10th grade, he was so disinterested in school, he just barely passed. He graduated, but did not learn much more than he already knew.

That is very sad. That was my fault. I did not do the research. As I stated, we were young and had three children at the time. We did not know you could research how the schools were doing and how they were scoring and what position they stood in. I think that the ASD coming to this is a blessing because it has forced our schools that scored so low and got one and two stars to work harder to improve our children's education. Why? Because they do not want to lose their schools. I believe that all children have a right to a good education regardless of their color, gender, Zip Code, race or privilege. Our education needs to get better. It needs to improve now, not in a year, or ten years; more like ten years ago. It should not matter how the change comes, whether it is from the ASD charter schools, private schools, or our neighborhood schools here in CCSD. All of us hear that what we should be fighting for is that the change comes. Thank you. I will also be assisting two mothers here for translation.

**Gabriela Ardon, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Testimony presented in Spanish.]

**Maria Bivins:**

Her name is Gabriela Ardon, and she is going to be speaking on behalf of her and a few parents. For a long time she has been trying to find a good education for herself and her children, and it has taken anywhere from six to seven years. When she found out about charter schools, she tried to enroll her children, but it was very difficult because they have a long waiting list. She finally got the opportunity last year to enroll three of her children into a charter school. One thing that has not been mentioned here is that charter schools start from pre-K up until the 8th grade and some go all the way through 12th grade. This has given her the opportunity to volunteer at her children's school; therefore, she can be involved in what her children are learning.

The differences that she has noticed between CCSD schools and the charter schools is a lot. The classrooms in charter schools have no more than 27 children in the classrooms. Since elementary, all of the children have four teachers which they alternate throughout the day for different classes. This helps the children, and with all due respect, to not see the same teacher all day every day. Her children are in a very good academic place right now, which she considers very high. Her 5th-grade student was actually invited to a university in California for a week to take part in a camping trip there. Her daughter in the 9th grade, who is no longer in the charter school, is actually in very advanced classes with the 9th and 10th grade students, up until the 11th grade.

Putting her children in the charter school was actually very far from their home, so her and her husband made a decision to rent out a home closer to the school even though it would put sacrifices on their family. She is very happy and honored that she has been at a school this year that is putting an emphasis on education. She is very frustrated when she sees the news and sees that Nevada is in the lowest place for education. It is time for us to turn around and start looking at our children, find a better education for our children, and to inform parents of the reality of what charter schools really are.

**Gabriela Ardon:**

I speak English very well, but I tried to speak Spanish for representing other parents.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We thank you so much.

**Dalia Jimenez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Testimony presented in Spanish.]

**Maria Bivins:**

She just wants to clarify that she is not here either in favor or against charter schools. She is here in favor of education for all children.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will ask her to come for neutral. Is there anyone else in opposition to A.B. 103?

**Dr. Shari Lyman, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have been involved with the Clark County School District (CCSD) all through my primary and secondary education. I have been a community member and a member of the Moapa Valley Community Education Advisory Board, and I am also a professor at the College of Southern Nevada (CSN). I am a parent of a student in CCSD. I agree wholeheartedly with Assemblywoman Neal that public schools work if you do the right thing—fund students, programs, and schools whether it is a public school or a private school. Funding has to be directed at students, programs, and schools.

Unfortunately, for many schools in CCSD, the budget has been eroded away particularly in our rural areas to the point where we lose teachers. When we lose a teacher, we lose an entire program, if not more. I understand that right now it is considered a takeover, but the option available to students, communities, and schools of having a charter would actually benefit some of our schools; again, particularly in the rural areas. Currently, our public schools are eroding away and not benefiting our students for now or for the future.

We have felt that the budgets have been misrepresented as far as enrollments. It is more expensive to fund a rural school and its programs than it is in the urban areas. We need to fund all students—urban, suburban, and rural. We also need accountability. We need to stop rewarding bad behavior. We need to have accountability and oversight, a full accounting of CCSD's public budget, both restricted and nonrestricted. We have that accountability to see where the money is so that if we need to ask for a charter, we have that option.

**Lindsey Dalley, Member, Moapa Valley Community Education Advisory Board:**

Moapa Valley is within the Clark County School District (CCSD). Some of you may or may not know that the CCSD is the largest rural school district in the state of Nevada. We need to make sure that we do not overlook the children in our schools in the rush to solve Las Vegas' issues and problems. I have been active in our Community Education Advisory Board for 15 years. I know the district inside and out, and there is more to CCSD than schools in Las Vegas, which is 60 miles away.

I am against Assembly Bill 103. If A.B. 103 passes, that ignores us in Moapa Valley and puts us in the same situation that Assemblywoman Neal's schools are in now. We want the ASD to be able to function. The issue here is force and parental voice, not whether the ASD is good or bad. Do not pit our kids against those kids. Give our parents the choice. We want Assemblywoman Neal's parents to have their choice as well whether they can go in or go out. We want the flexible benefits offered by the turnaround schools. We do not have that option right now in Moapa Valley. Is that fair?

The ASDs would provide us some of those options. We, in Moapa Valley, do not see the ASD as a negative, but a positive. We would like the opportunity to increase educational diversity and improve our public schools by joining the ASD. We see the ASD as an opportunity to elevate our parents' voices to preserve our public schools in our community by forming our own public community charter; not bring an outside charter in. That option is a great possibility, and that is possible under the ASD. We want our schools run by our own community, and we are prepared to do that. We would like to see that parents have a petition option in the ASD just like we would like to see parents having the ability to petition out. Limiting the ASD denies us the opportunity to petition into our own public community charter. Please give our parents that voice.

**Ignacio Prado, Executive Director, Futuro Academy Public Charter School, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

This is one of the schools in the Achievement School District's current portfolio. We are doing a Fresh Start School in east Las Vegas. We are going to be located at Lamb and Washington Boulevards beginning with kindergarten and first grade next year and ultimately growing to eighth grade. Our mission is to educate all of our scholars to excel in elementary school into middle school, through high school, and to the college and career of their dreams.

I do oppose this bill and the delay bill. As the founder of this organization, which was started here in east Las Vegas and is part of the ASD, I am a first generation American. I was undocumented for a period of time, which actually interrupted my ability to get college financial aid. When I was finally able to do so, my expected family contribution was zero, and I clawed my way through college. What led me to education was the transformative experiences I had with my teachers who showed me how important education was and how transformative it was for myself that would cause the peace of mind that it afforded me in a tough economy when I graduated in 2010.

As a school, right now we have recruited more than 100 parents. Today, we have 108. We are looking toward progress in registration next year. A full repeal without concern for the details, as much as I appreciate this being an ideological point, would be a severe blow to those families who are all excited and committed about this option that has been presented for them. They have taken several steps and come to several meetings and confided in us their hopes and dreams for their children. Our vision matches that and theirs that they have selected us as their school for next year.

I was a teacher in CCSD for several years, and I always told my students that the loudest person does not win. We always have to look at the entire picture. I would implore you to take a look at all of the information. For example, today it has been suggested that for some reason, charter schools do not have to hire licensed personnel. That is incorrect. It is in the statute that we have to hire licensed personnel. I will just say look at the entire picture and look at the statistics. We do have a very long way to go, and the ASD is a modest reform for a very large system in Nevada that could use a lot of improvement.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will open up for neutral for A.B. 103. We will go to neutral then we will ask for people to stand for opposition and for support.

**Ricky D. Gourrier, Sr., Government Affairs and Community Relations Manager, Communities in Schools of Nevada:**

We are the largest dropout prevention organization in the country. I wanted to come here to clarify some comments that were made earlier. Neither Communities in Schools of Nevada, Dr. Tiffany Tyler, nor myself have a position on this bill or this issue. We are neither in support nor opposition and just wanted to make sure that was clear.



**John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association:**

I represent 18,000 Clark County education-licensed employees. I am here speaking as neutral and for a reason I will outline in a minute. What I want to make very clear was that in the 2015 Legislative Session, we opposed A.B. 448 of the 78th Session, the Achievement School District (ASD), and as it is today, we still oppose it and do not think it is a proven good policy to address the particular needs for the school districts.

However, we are here because we think we should have a robust policy discussion on this. We are concerned that simply repealing this bill, with the outlook that it may ultimately be vetoed by the Governor, does not move the ball down the court in terms of addressing the kids. The underlying issue addressed by the ASD program is systemically underperforming schools. The school district has a great turnaround school program, but at the moment, it can only address 25 schools. There is a capacity issue. When the regulations were introduced to the school district, there were up to 90 schools that potentially could qualify for underperforming that could be subject to this.

There is a capacity issue, and we really should be looking at how we can take this piece of legislation and change it into legislation that can address some very, very significant issues that are facing the district, and those are the systemically underperforming schools. I have no doubt that teachers are committed to progress and administrators have done great jobs in some of these schools. I was at several different schools where hundreds of parents came out and wanted to own the responsibility of their children's education. I think simply repealing this without having an opportunity to offer up solutions that can address the systemic underperforming is not the solution.

**Chairman Thompson:**

At this time, I would like to go back and ask everyone in Las Vegas to stand to be counted for support for A.B. 103.

**Darryl Wyatt:**

We are waiting on the count from the overflow room.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will move on then. Assemblywoman Neal, please come up for closing remarks.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I am here representing District No. 7. I heard all of the comments. I am not fearful of change. This is my choice to be in opposition to this particular management or structure. I served on this Committee as a freshman in 2011, and again in 2013. What I know to be true is, yes, there were schools that were in a state of underachievement for several years. I want anyone in this room to prove to me that, first, they received the funding they needed and second, that they received individualized differentiated support. Prove to me that they got a highly-qualified teacher in the classroom. More often than not, the urban schools ended up with novice teachers.

We found out that—in the two years that we sat on the reorganization committee—we had more substitutes or teachers who had one to five years of experience placed into those schools. These are not the highly-effective teachers. More often than not, that money was shifted and would go somewhere else into the CCSD budget, and those students were left with teachers who had the least amount of experience to take on the most challenging students.

I also want to point out that if anybody can show or prove to me that we actually had money in the remediation account for schools from 2007 forward, I would love for you to prove it. When I walked in the door as an elected person in 2011, we did not have that money. When I walked in the door in 2011, we were still having a conversation in CCSD around the Gary Orfield report, which was discussing the desegregation and lineage from 1977 to 2011 forward in those communities of color. Nobody can tell me that somebody stepped in and did what they needed to do.

The whole purpose of my opposition is that we did not do what we needed to do. I understand what occurred in 2015. In 2013, we got Zoom schools. We continued Zoom schools in 2015, and then we got Victory schools, and we started the reorganization. We started turnaround in maybe 2011. There were some schools that were able to start that process. All I want are all of the interventions that we have put in place to function and work the way they are supposed to. It is my choice and my option. I am here representing District No. 7, and they do not choose ASD. They are not in fear, they just want what they have. They want the turnaround. They want reorganization. I want reorganization in schools, but I also want people to be honest about the fact that we did not do what we were supposed to do as a state for those children. I can prove, and put millions of documents in this record for years, that we did not serve those children.

To come in on a white horse and say that now you want to save them and the last resort is ASD, I disagree with that because what you should have done is the right thing; serve those students, provide quality instruction, fund those children, and provide support services—which you never did. Now, all of a sudden, we have wrap-around services, and now we want to deal with this issue. They needed wrap-around services in 1999. Yet, we were not at the table. We were cutting that money. We cut that money in 2007. We cut it again in 2009, and we walked our behinds right back in here in 2011 and cut that money again. Then, all of a sudden, when everything changes, we want to sit around and say, "Well, I want to save them." Well, you should have wanted to save them before 2011, 2009, 2007, and 2005. We have systemic issues because "we" failed.

I have never come to this table saying that I have the option, and I want to fail students. I will fight for the students in CCSD. I have been in those schools since 2003. I was at Charles West Middle School when it was an Edison Learning-operated school and they did not have any doggone books in the classroom for English. I know for a fact that we have not served these children. I am not here saying that I am allowing failure to exist, because that has never been by modus operandi. I have always been an advocate for education. I need everybody to be crystal clear, I am just saying that District No. 7,

who I represent, is making the choice that we choose "not" to have ASD. I would also suggest that you read the data from Tennessee because Dr. Griffin is somebody who cares about public schools, and she is doing everything that she can, and it is a good story that we need to learn from.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 103 and move into our work session.

[An unidentified speaker indicated that the opposition did not get counted.]

**Chairman Thompson:**

I think it was not clear that people understood which bill I was referring to, and I think people stood up for a different bill. I will be able to look at the list. Please make sure that everyone that is there signed in properly on the list. For the next bill, I will do the standup.

[Same unidentified speaker states that ten people from Moapa Valley had driven an hour to testify and wants it noted for the record that they are against A.B. 103.]

**Chairman Thompson:**

If there is any written testimony, please leave it so we can upload it to our Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

[([Exhibit L](#)), ([Exhibit M](#)), and ([Exhibit N](#)) were presented but not discussed and are included as exhibits for the meeting.]

We will begin our work session with Assembly Bill 64.

**Assembly Bill 64: Revises requirements for receipt of a standard high school diploma for pupils with disabilities. (BDR 34-251)**

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

As a nonpartisan employee, I do not advocate for or against any legislation.

Assembly Bill 64 provides that a pupil with a disability who does not satisfy the requirements prescribed by the State Board of Education to receive a standard high school diploma may receive a standard diploma if the pupil satisfies the requirements of his or her individualized education program (IEP), and if his or her IEP team determines that the pupil demonstrates proficiency in the standards of content and performance established by the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools ([Exhibit O](#)).

There was an amendment proposed by the Department of Education, and there is a mock-up attached in the work session document. There are several changes. The first is that it revises the language regarding how a pupil with a disability who does not satisfy the State Board requirements for a standard diploma may receive such a diploma. Under the amendment, the student may receive a standard diploma if he or she demonstrates, through a portfolio of

work, proficiency in the standards of content and performance established. The amendment also adds an alternative diploma option for students who have a significant cognitive disability and who pass an alternate assessment prescribed by the State Board of Education. Finally, the amendment provides that a student with a disability who is less than 22 years of age and has not been issued a standard high school diploma on or before the effective date of the bill (July 1, 2017) is entitled to a standard high school diploma if he or she satisfies the bill's criteria regarding standard diplomas for students with disabilities, as revised by the proposed amendment.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 64.

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 64.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN DIAZ AND WOODBURY  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Anderson will take the floor statement. The next bill on the work session is Assembly Bill 127.

**Assembly Bill 127: Revises provisions relating to emergencies in schools. (BDR 34-196)**

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 127 makes various provisions regarding emergencies in schools ([Exhibit P](#)). Among other provisions, the bill requires each school district in a county whose population is 100,000 or more to designate a full-time employee as an emergency manager. It requires school districts and charter schools to consult with certain emergency or law enforcement personnel before designing, building, remodeling, or purchasing school buildings or related facilities or acquiring sites for such facilities.

It requires Nevada's Department of Education (NDE) to conduct a conference on school safety at least once a year. It directs NDE, to the extent money is available, to provide block grants to school districts and charter schools for contract social workers and other mental health workers in schools with identified needs. It requires consultation with emergency managers, school resource officers, and chiefs of school police, as applicable, when a district or charter school committee develops a plan for responding to emergencies and crises. It requires at least half of student drills in emergency procedures to include instruction in inappropriate procedures for a "lockdown," as defined in the bill.

Two amendments have been proposed for A.B. 127. One was submitted after the hearing and that is the first one you see. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson has proposed an amendment to change language in section 7, subsection 2 of the bill to allow relevant block grants to provide for social workers and mental health workers who are employed by a school district or charter school as well as contract social workers and mental health workers. The second amendment was proposed at the hearing of the bill by Clark County and is attached. It removes the requirement that drills be conducted under the supervision of a fire chief and instead requires that the fire chief approve those drills.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 127.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 127.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will ask Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson to take the floor statement. We will move on to Assembly Bill 484.

**Assembly Bill 484: Revises provisions relating to the Commission on Postsecondary Education. (BDR 34-912)**

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 484 moves the Commission on Postsecondary Education to the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) ([Exhibit Q](#)). The bill provides that the Division's Administrator appoint a Deputy Administrator, who replaces the Administrator of the Commission on Postsecondary Education and is assigned certain powers and duties that were previously assigned to that individual. The bill further provides that the Deputy Administrator serves as an ex officio member of the Commission on Postsecondary Education. It removes one of the two public representatives from the Commission. Finally, A.B. 484 authorizes the Director of DETR to accept and to adopt regulations or establish policies for the disbursement of money appropriated to Nevada by Congress for use in connection with the workforce development and adult education programs of the State. After the hearing, an amendment was proposed by the Commission on Postsecondary Education to revise the definition of the term "accredited." There is more explanation of that in the attachment to your work session document.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 484.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 484.

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will ask Assemblywoman Krasner to take the floor statement. We will close our work session and transition to our next bill, Assembly Bill 348. We will take a short break [at 6:08 p.m.]. [The meeting reconvened at 6:27 p.m.] We will open the hearing for A.B. 348.

**Assembly Bill 348: Revises provisions governing courses of instruction in sex education. (BDR 34-285)**

**Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Assembly District No. 24:**

This measure will update our sex education system in the public schools in Nevada. People have asked me why we need this legislation. We already provide for sex education in our schools. The answer is simple. Right now, there are students in Nevada who are not receiving a basic education in sex ed. Those who do receive some education experience a wide variety in the quality and completeness of the information they are provided. This past year, I discovered that even in the school districts that have strong sex-ed curriculum, sometimes at the school level, the classes are just not being taught. Other students who are receiving sex ed only receive part of the information that they actually need to avoid pregnancy or sexually transmitted infections (STI) or diseases (STD). This bill addresses shortcomings in the information that we provide to our students about how their bodies work and how they can stay healthy. This also ensures access to this essential information for all of our students in our public school system.

Nevada's statistics relating to teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases continue to be dismal ([Exhibit R](#)). We have the seventh highest teen pregnancy rate in the country, and the seventh highest rate of syphilis. Young people are the most at risk. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that youth ages 15 to 24 make up more than one-quarter of the sexually active population, but they account for half of all new sexually transmitted infections. According to the 2015 Nevada Youth Risk Behavior Study (YRBS), of high school students surveyed, nearly 40 percent have had sexual intercourse, and 10.5 percent of those have had at least four or more partners. Whether we like it or not, our students are engaging in activities that put them at risk of pregnancy and diseases.

Many of them do not have the knowledge they need to make safe decisions. The consequences of unintended pregnancies and infections are devastating to students and their families. They also cost us, the public, in real dollars, in both Medicaid spending and in our public services.

As Committee members we have received many emails about this bill, both in favor of it and against it. Many of the emails in opposition I believe are well-intentioned. Unfortunately, many of them are based on misinformation about what this bill actually does. I do not want to discount the arguments that opponents are making because, as a parent, I can tell that many of them are heartfelt, and they have the same goal in mind that I do: to ensure that our children are safe and healthy.

For that reason, I have broken my presentation up to discuss the concerns that have been voiced by some as I walk you through the bill. Rather than talking about all of my arguments at the front as we sometimes do in bill presentations, I would like to delve right into the bill, go section by section, and discuss some of the issues that have come up.

I will begin with section 1 of Assembly Bill 348 by saying that currently in Nevada, each local school district establishes the curriculum and the course of instruction for sex education. To be very clear, this bill does not change that. Opponents who claim that we are taking away local community involvement in the curriculum are just wrong. The ability for parents and community members to participate in the adoption of curriculum in the local school district will remain the same. What section 1 clarifies is that the locally-adopted curriculum simply must comply with basic minimum standards set by the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools. These standards are outlined in the legislation. Other than those minimum standards, there is wide discretion left at the local level because the content and the curriculum are developed at the community level. This bill also reinforces that the curriculum must be age-appropriate. To be clear, this age appropriateness is also going to be determined by the local school board of trustees who are elected from their communities in the same way that happens now.

Section 1 also adds details to categories of instruction that are already in law. This is needed because in teaching about the human reproductive system, which is in the current law, we find that some students at this time are receiving a complete education while others are not. There is basic information that should fall under each of these categories. That is what this legislation does; it just lists out those basic topics.

You can see that section 1 is long. It is actually most of the bill, so I will keep using subsections and paragraphs while talking about it. The list of what would be required under each of the current topics in law continues and is in section 1, subsection 1(d) through (l). In looking at this list, I want to make very clear that these topics are not new. This is another misconception that opponents are seeing this list of language and thinking that it is new information that is going to be required to be taught. This list actually came from some of our best curriculums that are already in place in the state. The reason that we took them and applied them to the law is because districts or some schools are simply not providing them.

It is not like we invented a new list. Many of our students are already being taught these topics. We saw them as good topics, things that are part of a complete education, ones that we think all students should have access to.

I would also like to point out that on page 3, line 11, is another area of misconception of this bill. This included, as a standard, teaching the importance of abstinence as the most effective method of preventing unwanted pregnancies and STDs. I intentionally left that in. Abstinence and refraining from sex is a key component of what needs to be taught. There were people who asked me to take this out, but I very consciously want to be clear that I support abstinence education. This bill requires that abstinence be taught, and I agree that it is the only foolproof way to not get pregnant or not get an STI or STD. We also have to acknowledge that some students are still going to engage in sexual activity as we heard in the statistic earlier, but it cannot be the only thing we teach.

If you will look on page 3, line 31, which is section 1, subsection 2, this section further ensures that local control of the curriculum will happen. It requires the school board of trustees in a district to periodically revise the content to ensure that it is current and age-appropriate. That happens right now as we are seeing Washoe County School District (WCSD) going through that procedure.

On page 4, subsection 4, the text states that the local school advisory committees also remain in place. We are actually improving them by adding the option of up to three members who are representatives of the community. That local advisory committee advises the board of trustees on the instructors, the content of materials to be used, and the appropriate ages for each subject.

Page 4, line 34 [subsection 7] contains a new provision that I would like to clarify because it has been the source of some concern in the emails that we received. I think there is a misunderstanding about what the intent is, so I want to make sure my intent is clear on the record. This new section authorizes a district board of trustees to approve other instructors who can demonstrate the same level of competency as the teachers, counselors, or school nurses who currently teach these classes. Some seem to believe that it will allow anyone, including organizations with an agenda, to come in and teach our students. I am open to suggestions for amendments if this language needs to be stronger, but the intent was because some of our smaller school districts or overcrowded schools have expressed concerns in the past that sometimes it is hard to find appropriate staff to teach these classes.

Sometimes it is expensive to have those staff in the schools. Understanding that, and knowing that there are often federally qualified health centers or community health nurses in the community that would be willing to teach the class, is why I added this provision—to allow the school district to tap into the resources they have in their community, to not add additional strain on their finances, and to be able to find someone who is equally as competent as a current employee.



Keep in mind that the school district will ultimately make the decision as to whether someone is qualified to come into the classroom, and a district could decide to not allow anyone at all, except the nurses, the current licensed personnel, and the teachers.

Subsection 8 is probably the most contentious part of the bill, and I want to spend some time on it. This is the opt-in versus opt-out. There is a lot of misinformation about this section. There have been many accusations flying around that this bill is going to take away parental rights or force kids to have sex ed against the will of the parents. This is simply false. I am a parent with a soon-to-be fourth-grader in our public school system. There is no way that I would remove parents' rights to opt their child out of this curriculum if they prefer to teach those topics at home. I respect that families have different values, cultures, and religions that guide how they want to talk to their children about these issues. This bill absolutely preserves the right of the parent to not have their child in these courses without penalty, just as it currently is, and they have the same rights that they have today. The only thing that changes is the procedure by which those parents make their wishes known. Parents' rights do not change under this bill.

People have asked me why I just do not leave opt-in the way it is. Right now in our system, we have opt-in. You need a parent's signature to participate in sex ed. I believe it is essential that we change our system to opt-out because right now, we have a group of students who do not receive sex education at all—not because their parents do not want them to—but simply because they did not return the right paperwork. For example, according to recent statistics by the Washoe County School District (WCSD)—and it varies depending on the year and when in the year you look for this data—between 5 percent and 10 percent of our students do not return the permission slip. That means that up to 10 percent of our kids may not have a full understanding about how their bodies work and how they can stay healthy because they may not have a caring adult at home to fill that gap in knowledge. In my mind it is not acceptable to leave those students' education to Google and cable, which is what they have to resort to.

Unfortunately, we know that we have too many students who are homeless. We know that they are couch surfing. We know that they are living with boyfriends and girlfriends. Or we know that they have parents, especially our students in poverty, that might have two and three jobs and are not around very much. Arguably, the students who are the most at risk are the ones that do not have an actively involved parent or an adult to talk to at home. They are the ones missing out on the vital information. They are the reason we must have opt-out in our state. These students are being left behind. This bill ensures that every student has access to this vital information.

I have heard the concern that with opt-out, our parents may not know that their kids are going to receive sex ed. I sympathize with this. As a parent, I absolutely want to make sure that our parents know that their students are going to have this course in their school.

I want to call your attention to page 4, line 43. It says that the parent or guardian of each pupil to whom a course of instruction is offered must first be furnished written notice that the course will be offered. You will notice that much of that provision is current law. Written notice must be given to the parents before the student is given this course of instruction. That does not change.

Along with that written notice, you will see that it must include the opt-out form. There is no way that a parent is not going to know where to find the form or how to opt their child out. It is going to be very clear. The current written procedure is there, and it will include the form for them to opt-out their child.

There are many other ways that we can notify parents. I would welcome any suggestions or amendments that make that even better. I have had informal conversations with people from districts asking that, as parents, the next time they register their child for the next school year, can they do it online? Could we give them an additional notice? Could we make a link to the form? I am open to ideas on how to make sure parents know this is available. I absolutely want them to know that they have a right to opt their child out. On this opt-out issue, the last thing that I would say is that this is workable. This is feasible to inform parents and educate them and give them the opportunity to opt-out because every other state that requires sex ed does this except us, and there are only three of us that require opt-in. In my mind, it is a very old archaic system that assumes that kids have a parent at home, but that is just not the reality. Those are the kids that I am worried about, that we do not want to leave out.

Section 2 is the next point I would like to make. This adds sex education to the list of topics that the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools must adopt, and it conforms to what is in section 1. It basically says they are the ones who are going to be setting the standards based on the content of this bill, in the same way that they set the standards for English, mathematics, science, social studies, and health. Sex education would fall under health for those purposes.

I have gone through all of the sections of the bill. I do have a couple of presenters with me that I would like to come up before we go to questions.

I would like to close my personal remarks by saying that we cannot delay in updating our sex education program in Nevada. Those of you who have been around know that we had bills in 2013 and in past sessions—in fact my predecessor, David Bobzien, brought up a sex-education bill in 2013. Many of the provisions in this bill are similar to what he proposed because stakeholder groups have been working on this for a very long time. Many of our students are facing life-changing decisions and engaging in behavior without complete information and without a full toolbox of skills in which to make those decisions. I am open to suggestions for how to improve this legislation, and I truly hope we can make progress in ensuring that all of our students have access to this vital and accurate sex education information.

**Matthew Richardson, Secretary, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers;  
and representing Juvenile Justice Probation Officers Association:**

I am here in support of Assembly Bill 348. I am a juvenile probation officer and have been in this capacity for the past 11 years. There is an extreme need for sex education among our young people. The group of children that I work with on a day-to-day basis usually have to fend for themselves. They usually do not have the healthy relationships with their parent or guardian that most of us are accustomed to. Hence, that is why they wind up in the court system. These young people are normally in a situation where their basic needs are sometimes met by individuals who are caretakers, but these caretakers can barely make it on their own before trying to nurture the child under their care. Thus, these children will seek advice, guidance, and mentorship from teachers, probation officers, and service providers. They simply do not get most of the basic survival skills from home. They get it from without.

Las Vegas is known as one of the hot spots in sex trafficking in the United States. Due to the high prevalence and the problems of human trafficking and prostitution in Nevada, we should be on the forefront of sex education. There are approximately 120 to 150 sexually-exploited youth that come through the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada per year. This sex education instruction will provide basic survival skills to these youth in the areas of domestic violence and sex trafficking. Assembly Bill 348 will provide education that will help prevent the number of sexually-exploited youth cases from going up. Our youth need to know how to avoid becoming victims of domestic violence and sex trafficking.

Currently, I work in the Intensive Supervision Unit. We supervise youth that are victims of sex trafficking and engage in prostitution and that are under court supervision. I want to briefly share one case with you. A 13-year-old girl was arrested on a robbery charge. During her incarceration, it was discovered that she was pregnant. She did have a healthy baby before her 14th birthday. We referred her to programs to assist and educate her on how to parent her baby along with sex education. However, these were done after the fact and these were services that were, and still are, very few and very limited.

Sex education is a proactive approach to the problem of domestic violence and sex trafficking. The education for the youth, coming from the classroom versus the street, is a better option for the youth today ([Exhibit S](#)).

**Adolfo Ayala Alcantar, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I attend Procter R. Hug High School, and I am currently a senior and president of Hug's Equality Club. I am here to show my support for A.B. 348. I will begin by telling you about my freshman year.

I was in my Sexuality, Health and Responsibility Education (S.H.A.R.E.) class. We were going over statistics on sexually-transmitted diseases when the portion for rates of infections and same-sex sexual intercourse came up. The teacher quickly clicked away from the slide. This small act confused and upset me. I do not understand why she would skip over information on the slide. It could have been because she was not allowed to go over the

information, or because she saw the material as unimportant, or maybe she just felt uncomfortable talking about the topic. It made an impact on me that has followed me all through high school.

I was just beginning to figure out my sexuality during that time and that experience led me to expand on the emotions of self-hate that I had already felt before. I felt trapped and lost. I felt like I could not be myself at school because I did not want to deal with any negative reactions. I was not able to connect with my teachers the way other students could because I felt self-conscious, and my grades were low, and I had suicidal thoughts. I was extremely lucky that I had teachers who cared and talked to me about how I felt. I feel a lot more comfortable with my teachers now. I had nothing to fear because teachers are there to help. It is the school's job to make their students feel comfortable. While advocating for this bill, my grades have improved immensely. Just thinking that this bill might pass has given me hope that no one will be in the same situation as I was and that students in other schools will feel comfortable and safe.

Our schools need more Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Asexual (LGBTQA) content in our sex education programs. The LGBTQA community struggles from high suicide rates and a high risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases. We are not given the same education to help keep us safe. We rely on second-hand information, which can be unsafe and medically inaccurate.

Bullying occurs in our schools, and the LGBTQA community faces discrimination at work and in many aspects of our daily lives. If this bill passes, it will educate the youth of the state. Many diseases and situations can be prevented. The biggest problem we face is ignorance and fear. The solution is not to hide and to avoid the topic, but to talk about it. Our Equality Club is made up of students from different religions and backgrounds. We have come together to advocate for this bill and to put aside our differences for a greater cause. Sex education is important, because with the right information, you will be able to make responsible choices. We will learn ways to keep ourselves safe and healthy. It will teach us about healthy relationships, and we will be aware of the options and support that are available. This bill will affect my classmates, relatives, and one day, maybe even my children. I hope you will support A.B. 348 and provide us with the necessary education and resources needed to succeed. Thank you for your time.

**Dr. Laura Deitsch, Licensed Clinical Professional Counselor, Crescent Counseling,  
Las Vegas, Nevada:**

As a mental health therapist who works primarily with survivors of sexual assault, specifically teens and trafficked youth, I can share firsthand how important real sex education is to our community. I have an 18-year-old client who has been trafficked since she was 12 years old. She recently graduated from a Clark County public school with her high school diploma. She also just recently experienced her second pregnancy. She lamented that people were wrongly accusing her of not using protection. She explained to me that the condom broke. I asked her why she did not go get emergency contraception or Plan B One-Step? She had no idea what I was talking about. After I explained it to her, she looked at me like

I was crazy, saying that she did not believe it was real, and if it was, why had she not ever heard of it. She promised me that none of her friends had heard of it either. She and her baby will survive, thanks to public assistance, likely for a very long time.

From a mental health, public health, and fiscal point of view, it would have been a lot better for her and our community if she had gotten real sex education during her time in school. It is also pretty unlikely that her mom would have been present enough in her life to have signed a permission slip. It would be great if it were a given for sex ed to be offered to everyone.

The mechanism is in place for parents to opt-out a child if that is their preference. I am unconvinced as to the risk of the proposed policy. For me, it boils down to a perception that some kids' lives are worth less than others. I think they are all worth the same.

In working with assault survivors, I spend a lot of my time explaining anatomy, basic reproduction, and disease prevention. That should not be my job. I am a therapist. I spend time describing healthy relationships, consent, and assertive communication. Dating violence is preventable and can be reduced with good education, role-playing, and lots of other stuff in a real sex ed curriculum.

Yes, our teen pregnancy rate has gone down over the past several years, both here in Nevada and nationally. It is due to a number of factors including better methods of contraception and access to care. However, if we look at the YRBS data, we see a disturbing trend among youth who engage in sex. Condom use has dropped more than 12 percent from 2007 to 2015. Only 56.9 percent of sexually active youth reported having used a condom during sex the last time they had sex. From a disease prevention standpoint, this is scary. We owe it to our youth to provide all of them accurate, complete, real sex education, so they can be healthy and successful. Please pass A.B. 348 for the sake of our kids.

**Electra McGrath Skrzydlewski, Community Organizer, NARAL Pro-Choice Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a mother of two daughters, the wife of a Clark County School District (CCSD) educator, and a community organizer for NARAL Pro-Choice Nevada. Among those things, I am also a steadfast supporter of public education. In each of these roles, I take my responsibility to fight for a better Nevada very seriously. I am here today to testify in full support of A.B. 348. My 13-year-old daughter is a 7th grade student this year. She has often communicated to me how poorly equipped many of her peers are to make safe, healthy, and confident decisions for themselves when it comes to matters of identity, bodily autonomy, sexual and reproductive health, and intimate relationships among other issues. She wants to be a good steward in her community and to be seen as a resource for others who may not be able to have frank and loving conversations with people they trust about things like human anatomy, physiological changes during adolescence, sexual orientation, gender identity—the whole gamut of issues.

Chief among those things are what keeps our children safe from dangerous circumstances like not being able to identify challenging situations with intimate partners where they might be in danger, trafficked, or conditions where they are vulnerable to date rape or other instances of sexual trauma and violence.

My daughter can discuss those things because she has a family that also discusses those things and seeks out resources for her to know more tomorrow than she does today. However, we also discuss how privileged she is to be able to have those conversations with parents who prioritize those types of lessons, but we recognize there are thousands of young people in Nevada who have never had these conversations, much less with their own parents. We communicate to her that, despite her eagerness to step up and help, she may not be the most appropriate messenger in the eyes of her peers' parents. She asks for my advice on how to support her friends that are operating from a place of limited knowledge, engaging in or considering engaging in behaviors that are not without risk. She wants to know how to communicate to them the consequences of their decisions, so they can make the choices for themselves from a place of empathy and understanding. Also, she wants to know how she can educate herself about complex sexual health issues when there is so much confusing and conflicting information available depending on who you talk to and what their preferences are.

Please understand that while my daughter is a particularly bright young person, she is not alone in feeling this way, wondering about these things or trying to solve problems for her friends, and the young people growing up around her. Whether we like it or not, our young people will make decisions about their lives from any information they can absorb. I believe that in this community we have an obligation to make sure that they are well-positioned to discern fact from fiction, benefits from consequences, and reject ideologically-motivated impositions that interfere with their ability to learn how to advocate for what they want and need.

Do not just consider what students need and want, but also what educators need to feel confident that they are providing a quality education that they can be proud of, regardless of the subject matter. As fifth-grade teachers, my husband and his colleagues are tasked with teaching the growth and development unit to students in their grade level. For years, my husband shared with me how frustrating and discouraging this experience has been for him and his students. Year after year, these students have valid, intelligent, and sincere questions that fall beyond the scope of the curriculum he can teach. He watches their faces sink when he has to tell them that the questions left unanswered should be asked of adults they feel comfortable with and trust. This is a disappointing answer to have to give to young people who may only have been brave enough to ask these questions in the school environment where they can be submitted anonymously.

The state can do better to help provide resources for families who may be struggling to have these conversations at home by bringing our curriculum into the twenty-first century and providing age-appropriate, medically accurate, evidence-based, LGBTQA and

gender inclusive, opt-out, comprehensive sex education that utilizes innovative, interactive, and nontraditional teaching methods to educate students about sexual health. I believe A.B. 348 is the way forward to better serving our young people's needs in sex ed in Nevada.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Right now, we have 90 to 95 percent response with the opt-in forms. Do we know how many percentage-wise across the state actually participate in the programs? How many of the parents say yes versus no?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I believe the school districts are here, and they may have more current data for their own districts. I did have access to a few of the numbers and tried to cobble them together. Right now, it appears that the parents who opt-out are only about a half-of-one-percent as far as saying no on their permission slips. Again, I am from Washoe County, so those are the numbers that I see. They can correct me later if that is different. What we find is that about between 5 percent and 10 percent of the students end up not returning the permission slip.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

That would be great to get that information from the other districts. All of the districts are currently required to teach HIV and reproductive system diseases. This is just expanding on that requirement. They are getting the education, but your concern is in deepening the level of what they are now receiving.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I am not actually interested in deepening it. Some of our best programs already have these specifics. What I am trying to do is codify them, so all students receive the same basic information. There is not a clear definition in law for "human reproduction system." Some students are getting almost nothing on that—just a few sentences—while other districts are having full-blown, complete conversations about it. We took the best pieces from the curricula that we thought best covered those topics and said, statewide this is the minimum that students should be getting.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

There was quite a bit of testimony in regard to sexual abuse and trafficking, which is something I am incredibly passionate about. I served on the task force for child sexual abuse prevention, and it is important to make note for the record that Senate Bill 394 of the 78th Session was passed unanimously. Currently, the Department of Education is adopting content standards to address those concerns on child sexual abuse, trafficking, domestic violence, and all forms of abuse.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

That was definitely part of our conversation in looking at what to include. We had a large group of stakeholders interested in what should be included in this bill, and I was the one who pushed really hard to have that in here. My thinking is that it is a really important program, but on topics that important, when you are talking about relationships and

sexual behavior, it does not hurt to add it again. We know that repetition leads to learning. I felt very strongly that it does not hurt to reemphasize it. We want to make sure these children have the most information they can about how to avoid trafficking situations and abusive relationships.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Since I spoke about evidence-based stuff earlier, I am going to be consistent. Can you provide me with what the current curricula is? It has been a while since I was in high school, and I do not know what they are teaching. I would like to see what it is, so that I do not assume what it might be.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

The simple answer is that it depends on what school you go to. Every district is different in what their standard curriculum is. For example, in Washoe County School District, we have the S.H.A.R.E. program. The S.H.A.R.E. recently went through a community advisory process and now has a curriculum online that people are providing comments to. I can easily provide you with a current draft of that. It has not yet been adopted by the board of trustees. They are still in the mode of getting feedback. Part of the reason for this bill is to standardize sex ed, say everyone needs it, and to have the curriculum not be varied so widely.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I would appreciate whatever you could provide.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I would absolutely be happy to find you drafts of various districts, if that is what you are asking for.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

How are the parents chosen to get on these committees to review the material in the local community?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

If you are specifically talking about "advisory," please see page 4, line 4, which says, "Each board of trustees shall appoint an advisory committee consisting of . . ." That is current law. There are advisory committees now. This bill does not change that appointment process or that there is an advisory committee. It actually enhances it by adding that there may be more community members. It is the board of trustees who appoints the members. There is an application process. I am sure the districts can speak more to that and how they do that right now in their districts.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

I have a request as well as a question. You mentioned that as much as 10 percent of students or their parents do not return the forms. I am assuming, for the sake of argument, the assumption is that none of those students are getting their education from their parents



or elsewhere, or from a place their parents are making sure they get it. I am wondering what those numbers are. Do we have any evidence to show that the 10 percent that is floating out there are actually kids that are not getting instruction at all?

As a newly-minted lawyer, and I try to view things through that lens, my concern has to do with the fundamental rights of the parents. The U.S. Supreme Court has, in a long line of cases, determined that the parents' right to choose the education for their children is fundamental under the *United States Constitution*, which is superior to the *parens patriae* position that the school takes. My question is how do we reconcile a default position, which says that the school decides if the child is to receive this expanded scope of curriculum, unless a parent first decides or asserts their right against their superior right to choose first? As I see it, the fundamental right has to be the first decision. In my view, they cannot, constitutionally, make that decision for the parents. The parent has to be the one to make that choice. How do we reconcile the parents' fundamental rights with the inferior rights of the school that they are trying to assert first?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I have multiple responses to that. The first is that we require a lot of topics to be taught in school and parents have the option of homeschooling, for example, so we provide them that ability. I would also say that most states are opt-out. To my knowledge, they have not been challenged in the Supreme Court, so I do not think that there is a legal problem there. We are doing what most states do by adopting this measure in the bill. I would absolutely reemphasize that the parents have a right to have their child not have this curriculum.

Your first question regarding how many of that possible 10 percent are actually not getting education is a concern. We do not know. Of course, there is no way to know that. I would say that currently on the permission slips in WCSO, a parent can say "yes" or "no." There are parents who check the "no" box. If a parent is engaged in that child's life, and they very clearly tell the school district, "No, I do not want my child in this program," they are checking the "No" box. My concern is that those kids who are not returning the slip, for the most part, do not have the influence at home or anybody filling that gap, besides cable and Google, which none of us want.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Everyone who is in support of A.B. 348, would you please stand? [There were 17 in support in Las Vegas, 24 in support in Carson City.]

Those in opposition to A.B. 348, would you please stand? [There were 101 opposed in Las Vegas, 11 opposed in Carson City.]

Those that are neutral on A.B. 348, please stand. [There was no one.] We will open for support of A.B. 348.

**Zoe Mansfield, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am here in support of A.B. 348. I have seen the consequences of inadequate, noninclusive sex education programs. The stigma surrounding sex education is a very apparent reality, and it is the reason so many young people are not informed. When students are given inaccurate or incomplete information on consent, safe sex, STDs, and gender and sexuality in their sex-ed classes, it can have serious repercussions. The sex education that I have had has failed to address those important topics. I did not learn what consent meant. The only lessons on safe sex were based on heterosexual sex, and gender and sexuality were not discussed at all. This is not an isolated event. My peers have had the same experience, and it was apparent. I started high school not knowing that women had to or had the ability to use protection during homosexual sex. I knew teen moms. The topic of consensual sex was widely misunderstood as well.

In most sex ed classes, LGBTQA related questions were actively avoided by teachers. When I asked questions, I was told by my teachers they were irrelevant to the topic. I was one of the few openly LGBTQA people in my school at the time, and the reason for that was understandable. People were terrified to come out because it meant that they could be socially ostracized and mocked by both students and teachers. Very few people talked about what it meant to be transgender, gay, or bisexual because there was no space to openly and earnestly discuss and ask questions about this topic. They were treated as taboo subjects by sex ed teachers and that kind of attitude toward LGBTQA topics keeps important dialogue from being started.

If we do not approach sex ed from an inclusive, medically accurate perspective, the issues that stem from neglecting it will continue to affect young people. Now, the problem is that sex ed is not nearly as inclusive as it should be, especially in regard to gender and sexuality. Having the opportunity to be in a program like those being proposed in A.B. 348 would have been immensely beneficial for me and my peers. Stop the culture of intolerance that plays into and perpetuates . . .

[The Chairman stops the testimony because of the time limit. Testifier concludes with closing remarks.]

**Elvira Diaz, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

This is my little, beautiful baby that I had at the age of 42. My mom never talked to me about sex, so I did not know about sex when I got married. When my baby became four-and-one-half-years-old, I learned that my baby was a transgender person. That was the first time I had ever heard about transgender. Six years ago, I came here to advocate for him. He was so confused. He almost failed in school. He did not care about ABCs, but the school district passed a policy to support transgenders. Last month, my son was on the honor roll. I just went to the Infinite Campus, and he has all As. I think this bill is going to support, not just him and all moms like me, learning what transgender is, but also his colleagues. One of my neighbors who knew Christian before, thought that the little girl he used to swim with was a boy. He got so mad that he wanted to kill my son. If this little kid has the

education to learn that people are born transgender, people will understand more. This is a reality. We just need to teach and educate. I wish my mom, who is in Heaven right now, would have taught me more about sex. I would like to learn more.

**Vivian Leal, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am here in support of A.B. 348. Nevada's young people deserve accurate information, not perilous ignorance.

I grew up in religious communities that prided themselves on their compassion and educational opportunities. However, information about our bodies, our reproductive systems, contraception, or what consent means were systematically kept from us, especially from the girls under the guise of protecting our virtue. True virtue is when you make good choices based on your values and information. What they did is keep us ignorant and make us victims of those who would gladly provide a so-called "education" to young girls.

As teens, we searched for information amongst each other, in the library encyclopedias—there were no sex ed books—and from people we should never have trusted. Some of my friends became pregnant, some sick. My husband and I have three young adult girls, and we have made sure they have information and, as they have grown older and if they wish it, judgment-free contraception.

However, so many young people in our state still do not. Our pregnancy, gonorrhea, and chlamydia rates are embarrassing. I added the CDC report ([Exhibit T](#)) for your information, so no one should have any doubts about where that information has come from. We are on the record as absolutely shameful. Clearly, we have a problem. With appropriate information, our young adults can have bright futures, promising careers, nurturing relationships, and responsibly planned families.

I understand some families do not wish their children to participate in sex ed classes, often in the belief that the information would encourage promiscuity. Reality proves quite the opposite, but it is their choice for their minor children. For our state, however, sex ed must be opt-out, not opt-in, because ignorance cannot be Nevada's choice for all our children. [Prepared text was submitted that included additional testimony ([Exhibit U](#)) and data ([Exhibit V](#)) that will become part of the record.]

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will go to Las Vegas for support of A.B. 348.

**Kelly Lynn Charles, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here as a mother, educator, and a woman of faith. All Nevada students deserve an education that meets their needs in all of their classes. Currently, all of our sexuality health classes do not meet the needs of all of our students. A few years ago, the Nevada Legislature put into place the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). The NEPF is how teachers are held accountable. In the NEPF, the Nevada Legislature regulated that we

provide all students with an education that meets their needs in all of our schools; all, meaning all. We do not provide one math class for boys and one for girls. We do not provide different biology classes, government, or drivers' education classes based on outdated gender beliefs. We do not allow teachers to skip bivariate data in math class because of their personal feelings. We should not be allowing old, incorrect information to be delivered in our sexuality health classes because of a teacher's comfort level or because they just do not want to teach it.

Nevada has had a 126 percent increase in syphilis cases since 2014. We have the fastest growing rate in the West. Governor Sandoval even declared a health crisis in Nevada because of it. Students are having sex. We do have LGBTQA students in our classes. In Nevada, 16- and 17-year-olds can consent legally to have sex with another 16- or 17-year-old regardless of their sexual orientation. We are failing our students by not providing them all age-appropriate, medically accurate information that meets all of their needs.

I would also encourage expanded teacher professional development on our standards to ensure that teachers are comfortable with the content that they are legally required to teach our students. Please pass A.B. 348. We should not be leaving any of our students behind.

**Cassandra Charles, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I represent the Nevada Teen Health and Safety Coalition. I have been testifying and lobbying for an updated sex ed curriculum for the past two years and that is two years too long. As someone who has grown up in Las Vegas, I have personally seen the effects of our sex ed curriculum. In middle school and in high school, my friends had to come to me for answers about sex and sexuality when their health teachers were not able to provide the answers. This current curriculum is doing a disservice to our students. By not passing this bill, you will be saying that it is okay that our students are getting pregnant in high school; that it is okay that our students are contracting STIs; and that it is okay that our students are staying in unhealthy relationships. All of these things can be prevented with education.

I would like to highlight that there is a small flaw with asking everyone to stand up in support and opposition to the bill because the people here today are able to afford to take off work to come here and oftentimes, those are not the families we are waiting for. Those are not the families we are worried about. I am sure everyone here is going to teach their child. We are worried about the kids who are not able to have that access. With this, I not only urge you to vote yes to pass A.B. 348, but I urge you to stand up for the youth that will fall victim from lack of knowledge.

**Reverend Sandy Johnson, Boulder City United Methodist Church, Boulder City, Nevada:**

I am the mother of a 13-year-old bisexual son who attends Clark County School District. I am also an ordained elder with United Methodist Church and serve the community of Boulder City. I am here today to testify in favor of A.B. 348, changing the policy for sex education in our schools to include a more broad-based curriculum that will include all students.

Several years ago, through my work with Parents and Friends of Lesbian and Gay (PFLAG), it was brought to my attention that our current sex education programs do not include any mention of specific issues related to LGBTQA students. I was frankly appalled. Today, I am so glad to see this revision being put forth, especially because my son came out to me within the last year. As a straight parent, I frankly need help in educating my son. It is not just my son who needs this education. A study published in August 2015 by YouGov found that one in three young Americans did not identify as strictly heterosexual. Although the study was done with people over 18 years old, I believe it is fair to say that this trend is true for our students still in school. One-third of all our students would benefit from the changes proposed in this legislation. I feel it is time to include the necessary education so all students are fully informed, including our LGBTQA students. I do not want my son or other students to learn about their sexuality through a Google search or through personal experience, which often means it is too late. Please support this bill and students like my son, Cameron. It is time we fully educate our students and give them the tools that they need to be healthy in their personal and sexual relationships.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will now come to Carson City.

**Jennifer Howell, Sexual Health Program Coordinator, Washoe County Health District:**

In the interest of brevity, I will just ask the Committee to review my testimony ([Exhibit W](#)). I do want to make one point that I think has been missed in the discussion and that is the cost of STDs and unplanned pregnancies on our public funding sources. More than \$16 billion a year is spent for direct medical cost for STDs—and that does not include HIV treatment in the United States—and \$9.4 billion for unplanned pregnancy costs. I really feel that money could be used elsewhere if we do better prevention, which is always more cost-effective than mere reaction and treatment. That was the only point I wanted to emphasize. The rest of the people testifying will emphasize the importance of involving parents, et cetera. Thank you.

**Kimberly Mull, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:**

We are here today in support of A.B. 348. I was not anticipating speaking more than coming up here and saying "ditto" on behalf of the coalition, but as people have been talking about child sex trafficking and other issues, I feel the need to speak directly to that issue.

As most of you know, I am a survivor of child sex trafficking. I was trafficked at the ages of 11 and 13 by a national child pornography ring. The first time I thought I was pregnant I was 12 years old. I vividly remember sitting on the floor of my bedroom holding my teddy bear and punching myself in the stomach trying to make a baby, that was not actually there, come out. My parents did not talk to me about sex until two years later when I started high school. Essentially they told me that my virginity was sacred and was for my husband only. Little did they know that was not an option for me.

I want to be clear. Sex education will not prevent victimization of students. There will always be another child who the abuser can go after. As Assemblywoman Tolles brought up, victimization education is needed, and we want to make sure that these subjects are taught in every school in Nevada. If they are taught again, in sex ed, we are fine with that. We just want to make sure that it is very clearly identified that victimization is a crime, not a part of sex or a relationship. However, sex education in schools and having that additional step of having to opt-out of it, will benefit students such as myself who are being victimized.

**Jackeline Duron, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a senior at the University of Nevada, Reno. I had the pleasure of growing up in Sparks and receiving my K-12 education in the Washoe County School District. I am here in support of A.B. 348. Growing up, my single mother worked two to three jobs to support me and my siblings. She rarely had time to help me with my homework, let alone to teach me sexuality education that she herself was not taught in her country of origin. She relied on the schools to do that. I only received two weeks of sex education in my K-12 years; one week in fourth grade and one week in my junior year of high school. In fourth grade, I was taught about the menstrual cycle and abstinence. In high school, I was shown pictures of severe cases of STIs, and that was it. Comprehensive sex ed is more than that. We need to teach all young people, regardless of Zip Code, how to make decisions about their own bodies and how to be healthy. That includes condom use, healthy relationships, boundaries, consent, and anatomy. Those topics, of course, should be age-appropriate.

I myself am a survivor of childhood sexual rape. My rapist was not much older than me. Our education system failed both of us in teaching us how to respect boundaries. I never heard the word "consent" until I got to college. As a queer woman, I was not taught how to practice safe sex with same-gender folks. I was not even taught how to properly put a condom on a penis. Things like that are essential for our young people. Sex education is a matter of public health and not teaching comprehensive, medically accurate, sexuality education to our youth is a disservice to our youth, our community, our society, and our future.

**Michael Hackett, representing Nevada Public Health Association; and Nevada Primary Care Association:**

Both of these organizations strongly support measures that improve population and individual health. Both of these organizations would like to join other leading public health and medical groups such as the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecology that support evidence-based, science-based, age-appropriate, medically accurate, comprehensive sex education as a way to promote sexual responsibility and reduce teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections.

To touch on a point that was raised by Assemblywoman Joiner and again by Ms. Howell, according to a 2015 report, 60 percent of publicly-funded births in Nevada are unintended. The approximate cost to the state to pay for these births is roughly \$37 million per year. There is a direct and distinct impact on the state for this.

In closing, our position is that A.B. 348 is a common-sense policy that will reduce the public and individual health care burden. Thank you. [Written testimony, ([Exhibit X](#)), was submitted but not heard.]

**Erika Minaberry, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I live in Washoe Valley. I am a Reno native, a beneficiary of Nevada's S.H.A.R.E. program, and of abstinence-only education.

In my early 20s, uninsured and uneducated, I became pregnant. At that time, even though I was in my 20s and an adult, both my partner and I had no idea about when, in a woman's cycle, she is fertile and when she is not, even though that is a basic human function. We were never educated about such things. I was 29 when I learned that I could not take hormonal birth control for medical reasons and had to seek out other methods of reliable, attainable birth control. By this point, I already had three kids.

Now I am a 33-year-old single mother, student, and birth doula. My children and I are on food stamps and Medicaid. I have been going to college for eight whole years and counting because it is almost impossible to propel my life into the next income bracket while taking care of my kids. My three-year-old is with me today, for example.

As a birth doula, I work with young women in the same category that I was in, who had received the same quality of sex education that I received. Many of my clients find themselves unexpectedly pregnant without support, except for that which most of them receive from the government. These women do not have time to show up at legislative meetings because they spend every moment of every day trying to stay afloat and to figure out how to be a parent in a world that refuses to teach them. These girls, much like myself, might not have the privilege to take time off work to come here. However, I am here to tell you that we need better. Our community needs better evidence-based sex education, and we are rapidly becoming aware of this fact. We are your constituents, and we vote ([Exhibit Y](#)).

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will now go down to Las Vegas for those in support.

**Michelle Sorensen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I live in Assembly District No. 15. I am here in support of A.B. 348. I am a mother of four daughters, all of whom have attended public school in CCSD. One is presently attending junior high school.

I was sexually assaulted at age 14, but never came forward because I felt ashamed and did not know who to talk to. I became pregnant with my first child at age 17. If the type of program proposed in A.B. 348 had been available to me, it would have made things a lot easier for me to avoid or at least appropriately address my situations. Although I am very open in talking to my daughters, there may be things that they are embarrassed to ask me about. I want my children to have the education that I did not receive. I urge you to pass A.B. 348. Thank you for allowing me to speak today.

**Michelle Coleman, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I live in Assembly District No. 20. I am here in support of A.B. 348. I am the mother of a 15-year-old boy who attends Chaparral High School. I have always wanted to teach my son real-world facts about sex and related issues. He would rather not talk to me about these things. Yesterday, I told him about this bill, and that I intended to come here. I talked to him about it and asked him what he thought. Was he more open talking with me as I have always tried? Or, would he rather be taught in school? His direct answer to me was, "School, of course!" He did not even want to have the conversation about me coming here because it was about sex. He was not willing to have the conversation with me because he is not comfortable. I think A.B. 348 is great because it provides information that is accurate and age-appropriate. I encourage you to vote in favor of this bill.

**Sara Lemma, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I support the passage of A.B. 348. I began serving as a parent member of the Clark County School District Sex Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) in 2014 and was appointed again for a second term in 2016. My role as a parent combined with my unique academic background in public health allows me to contribute to this committee.

I have an 11-year-old daughter and a 27-year-old stepson. It is important to me that my daughter receives age-appropriate, medically accurate, evidence-based, LGBTQA and gender inclusive, opt-out sex education for many reasons. The main reason is because my husband, who did not receive sex education at home or in school, became a father at the age of 16. Becoming a father at such a young age imposed on my husband, and subsequently on my marriage, many financial, emotional, and logistical challenges over the years. Although my husband tried to parent my stepson the best way he knew how, he was still just a kid himself. This had lifelong implications for my stepson. My stepson has struggled to find his way in life and has often had to rely on government programs. I want my daughter, Eliza,



to have opportunities that my husband did not. I want her to have the sex education that my husband was not afforded. Eliza is a fifth-grade student at an elementary school in CCSD and will soon attend her first sex education classes. As a parent, I believe it is imperative for parents and teachers to work together in all areas of education, including sex education.

I respect that people have many individual morals and beliefs about sex education, just as I have my own. It will remain my job to tailor that information and pass on my beliefs and my values to my daughter. Assembly Bill 348 is not taking away parents' rights to teach morals or values. Assembly Bill 348 will enable our teachers to give our students medically accurate, evidence-based, lifesaving information to ensure our young people, living in Nevada, are prepared to make safe and healthy decisions.

**Brenda Hernandez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here in support of A.B. 348. I am a sexual health educator, and I have been an advocate for sex education for a really long time. I am also a public health graduate student at University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) School of Community Health Sciences where I have done extensive research on this topic. Pretty much every homework assignment I have turned in revolves around sex education. I would like to share some of the information that I have found.

Real sex education is effective, and it does not promote sexual risk. In fact, research shows that medically accurate, age-appropriate, and inclusive sex education to be highly effective. Some of the behavioral outcomes include delaying the initiation of sex, as well as reducing the frequency of sex, the number of new partners, and reducing the incidences of unprotected sex, as well as increasing the use of condoms and contraception among sexually active youth. Despite the concerns of parents who think sex ed encourages sex, evaluations of evidence-based programs of HIV and STI prevention programs show the opposite. They do not increase the rates of sexual initiation. They do not lower the age at which youth initiate sex, and they do not increase the frequency of sex or the number of sex partners among sexually active youth. Based on my experience, sex education empowers young people to make safe and healthy decisions for themselves.

There is also a myth that abstinence education is effective. However, through the research, I have found that abstinence-only programs are dangerous, ineffective, and inaccurate. In fact, the Society of Adolescent Medicine recently declared that abstinence-only programs threaten fundamental human rights to health information and life. According to Columbia University researchers, virginity-pledged programs actually increase pledge takers' risks for STIs and pregnancy.

We cannot continue to ignore the existence of LGBTQA youth. They deserve the right to be heard and to be present in these sex-education programs. I urge you to support A.B. 348.

**Tod Story, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

We strongly support A.B. 348—the bill we refer to as the Nevada Healthy Students Act. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nevada has consistently advocated for policies that advance reproductive health and well-being, support good decision-making and health practices, are inclusive, and ensure healthy outcomes. If passed, A.B. 348 will guarantee evidence-based, age-appropriate, medically accurate, and LGBTQA-inclusive sex-education instruction for every Nevada student.

Youth who face prejudice and discrimination, such as youth of color, LGBTQA youth, immigrant children, and those from low-income families, experience disproportionate rates of teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. A strong sex education curriculum can help to prevent these problems and is necessary to ensure that students learn how to make informed decisions about their sexual health.

Assembly Bill 348 will further provide guidelines for continuity of instruction across school districts. Our organization, through a series of public records requests in 2013 and 2015, discovered that each school district had vastly different policies and curricula and that, in some counties, the course materials were so out-of-date that they were not medically accurate, were sexist, and were discriminatory. Two examples we discovered in 2013 included, "Girls, if you have sex, you will get a bad reputation. If you have a reputation for having sex, it will lead to predators looking for you. If you have sex and you are a boy, then you are looked at as a cool person." One district also said in its programs relative to human growth, development, and sexuality, stated that its programs ". . . shall not represent homosexuality as a normal or acceptable lifestyle."

Additionally, only two school districts reported that their course of instruction included LGBTQA specifics. Some school districts have updated their sex-education policies and curricula because of our engagement with them, and we commend them for it, but the majority of school districts are still teaching archaic, inaccurate, biased information. We encourage your support of A.B. 348 ([Exhibit Z](#)). [([Exhibit AA](#)) was submitted but not discussed.]

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will close the support for A.B. 348 and open it up for opposition.

**Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:**

I am a grandmother of 14 children, 4 of whom are in Washoe and Elko County School Districts. One of the problems I have with this bill is that it mandates a one-size-fits-all program. We take a lot of care in this building to be sure that different counties have the options that they need in their own counties. This removes that. Removing the opt-in also alienates parents. I am very concerned about that. This bill mandates areas of sex education leaving local counties with few options. One of these is in the bill. It says, "All options authorized by law for family planning in the event of a pregnancy . . . ." That includes abortion. We are concerned about how this will be taught, especially when we remove the

requirement that it be taught by a schoolteacher or a school nurse because this opens it up for the philosophies of Planned Parenthood in the classroom. We have long promoted the safeguard to keep those philosophies out of the classroom.

I am also concerned about the diluting of the requirement of religion by adding spiritual acts. Spirituality could mean almost anything, including New Age or Wicca philosophies on that committee, so that real religion would not even be represented.

One of the things we take for granted is that teenagers will be responsible. Well, we all know that they are not. Studies bear this out when they show that availability of contraceptives and abortifacients do not reduce pregnancy rates because it takes responsibility to use that information in a responsible way. Often times, teens are not mature enough to use that.

A further concern is that it adds the requirement of sex ed to comply with the course of study by the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools. This board is unelected, inaccessible, and unaccountable to parents. The purpose of the local school advisory committees was so they could respond to parents. This bill further dilutes that by putting in additional members of the community.

**Dr. William P. Tarbell, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:**

I am a retired Presbyterian minister having served about 45 years across the United States. I want to simply point out a couple of things. I have a lot of questions regarding the definitions. Is this intended to be a mandate for all of the school districts in the state? Is that the purpose of this bill?

**Chairman Thompson:**

This is the time for you to make a statement. If you need to do an offline discussion with the bill's sponsor, I would like you to do that.

**Dr. William Tarbell:**

I am going to assume it is intended to be a mandate then. I have a problem with the definitions regarding gender identity and sexual orientation. First of all, in terms of orientation, if this term means sexual orientation, you mean a fixed, permanent orientation in personality; there is no science that supports that. None. If you find it, I would be glad to see it. I have never been able to find it in 40 years of looking at the issue.

Over the past 50 years, I have run into young people through what I call a macro orientation. A young man I talked to in South Carolina in middle school, a 12-year-old, looked at me one day and said, "I have a right to have sex with anyone, anytime, anyplace I choose, and you cannot tell me what to do." I have run into that attitude all across the country, throughout all of the various people groups I have served. That macro orientation is something that simply changing the sex education in Nevada will help.

Finally, I want to talk about another orientation. That orientation has to do with the one I assumed as a child, beginning at the age of one. That orientation has to do with my faith, but deeply personal orientation to what should be or should not be done. That orientation is the one that steers all of my decisions, sexual or otherwise. Until we can focus on that central orientation, we cannot stop or change what is happening in our society.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I want to clarify again, that when I get on the microphone, and I say please finalize your statement, I really would like you to finalize your statement. We have been very respectful as a Committee.

**Erin Phillips, President, Power2Parent, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a licensed Clark County foster parent. I am also the mother of five children. I run a nonprofit called Power2Parent. We know that the idea of parent engagement is the number one indicator of success for students in school. We have also seen studies that showed that income level has no bearing on that. Regardless of your income, parental engagement is highly important. I want to challenge a little bit the numbers that we have heard from Washoe and Clark County School Districts where the numbers are 95 to 97 percent return of those permission slips. Because of my experience in being a foster parent, I have seen the opt-in option. If you see the number of students who are not actually returning those permission slips, it gives you an opportunity to highlight some of those students who might be falling through the cracks. If we were having the opportunity to maintain opt-in, a parent would get one phone call that they previously would not have received. I think students need more parental engagement, and they need teachers to help them figure that out. It is important for us to maintain opt-in, and that is why I am against this bill.

**Andrew Caudill, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

This proposed law will force every school district in the state of Nevada to adopt a sex-education curriculum similar to what has been proposed in the Washoe County School District (WCSD). The WCSD curriculum says that fourth grade students will be required to complete a Parents and Friends of Lesbian and Gay (PFLAG) exercise that teaches them the rainbow flag is at the same level as the flag of the United States of America. This activity is disrespectful to all of the men and women who have served and who currently serve in our Armed Forces of this great nation, especially to those who have given their lives. This activity has nothing to do with sex education and serves as propaganda while pushing a social issue onto fourth graders.

Beginning in sixth grade, kids will no longer be referred to as boys and girls. Boys will be referred to as penises or those with a penis. Girls will be referred to as vulvas or those with a vulva. This is extremely inappropriate to refer to our kids in such a way. Sixth graders will also be encouraged to explore their lives as the opposite sex, which is an inappropriate topic that does not belong in sex education. When abstinence is explained to sixth graders, the sugar analogy is used. The kids are told that when people want to diet, they may abstain

from eating sugar for a period of time. Then, they might start eating it again in small amounts. That lets them enjoy dessert without experiencing the negative consequence that can come from eating too much. This disturbing example teaches sixth graders that occasional sex will come without consequence.

Kids in seventh grade are told they cannot get STDs from their dog, cat, or any other pet if they choose to have sex with it. The idea of this being brought up to seventh graders is disturbing. These seventh grade kids will be asked to complete an activity that has them role-playing, asking another person to have sex with them. Heterosexual kids will be asked to role-play as homosexual couples. This is another example of a social agenda being pushed on our kids.

Planned Parenthood is advertised as a place to go to receive service without parental knowledge. This curriculum is serving to advertise for special interest groups that lobbied for it without any care given to the rights of the parents of these kids. Many citizens do not want their kids exposed to Planned Parenthood. This organization supports the murder of the unborn, and it supports policies that are anti-parent. This organization has no place in the public school system paid for by the public. Please do not support A.B. 348.

**Craig M. Stevens, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Government Affairs, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

The Clark County School District (CCSD) is in opposition to A.B. 348. The trustees of CCSD voted on September 8, 2016, to update the district's sex education curriculum and part of this included support for the current law, which requires active consent by parents to have their child participate in CCSD's sex education program. This decision was decided after several open meetings were held and hundreds of concerned parents and community members participated in the discussion with the trustees. Therefore, CCSD is in opposition to A.B. 348 as it does not align with the board's decision.

**Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards:**

We have surveyed our districts and every district has a different policy and view on this issue. Every district has a different way of administering their policy on sex education. They would like to remain with some local control over the way they administer that, and the resources that they have. That is their concern. I look forward to working with Assemblywoman Joiner, and I know she has been working hard on this issue.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators:**

I first want to thank Assemblywoman Joiner for being so open to meeting and talking about this issue. I know she has worked very hard on this bill. I would agree with her that much of what is outlined in the bill as part of curriculum is already being taught in several of our different sex ed classes throughout the state. As far as the rural districts are concerned, we have schools that opt-in and we have districts that are already in the opt-out position. They would like to maintain that local control and keep the opt-out or the opt-in if that is what they have.

**Karen England, representing Nevada Family Alliance, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a resident in the Washoe County School District (WCSD) where they are considering current curriculum, which A.B. 348 would mandate on every single school district throughout Nevada. Like WCSD, school districts currently have the option to expand their curriculum to include what A.B. 348 includes. There is no need to mandate it. While some of these requirements seem straightforward, possibly uncontroversial, the actual application might be well beyond what legislators and parents would expect.

Assembly Bill 348 requires instruction regarding human reproductive systems, which the schools are already doing. However, it expands into gender identity and gender expression. The language in A.B. 348 will lead to controversial gender instruction, taking radical gender theory out of the college classroom and into the elementary schools because again, this removes the age limit. Assembly Bill 348 requires that sex education be factual, evidence-based, and medically accurate. I am going to read some "factual," evidence-based, medically accurate proposals that are currently going on in WCSD, and the S.H.A.R.E. Committee has approved for parent review.

First, I want to apologize, I do not usually speak like this, but if we want to mandate this curriculum on all school districts, then it is important that we talk about how this translates into what WCSD is now promoting.

First is the term "medically accurate." This is two truths and a lie. Abstinence never fails. The teacher's guide says that is not true. Abstinence can fail. For example, it can fail if the person is under the influence of drugs or alcohol and does not stay abstinent. That is like not implanting an intrauterine device (IUD) and saying that an IUD is effective for birth control.

There is the term "age-appropriate." This can include mutual masturbation for our seventh graders and anal sex. Using a condom is considered low risk. It specifically tells sixth graders to refer to girls, not as girls, but people with a vulva. I want to encourage you to not let Planned Parenthood transgender allies into the classroom but keep the parents involved.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We are going to Las Vegas for those in opposition to A.B. 348.

**Linda Buckardt, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have master's degrees in education and in English as a Second Language (ESL) K-12, and a minor in Spanish. I am first generation American. I have extensive experience in teaching Latinos and Southeast Asians for 20 years and have worked on refugee resettlement for a total of 32 years. I am here to represent people who do not understand the content of A.B. 348 and the consequences due to language barriers. There are many people in this room who have a language barrier. This bill is void of cultural and religious sensitivity. The only rights promoted are those of the 3 percent of Nevada children who are LGBTQA. Heterosexuality is not covered in the sex-ed bill. I support all of the comments made regarding the content of the curriculum.

There are cultures entering this country who prescribe the death penalty for a person who is LGBTQA, yet this bill ignores the consequences of those teachings. If they know where their child has learned this, would they come after the teacher? Get the wrong person? Many cultures out there have no value whatsoever for women and other cultures value rape.

There is an article that the LGBTQA community is indoctrinating children titled UN LGBT Czar on Indoctrinating Children: "The Younger the Better," by Alex Newman, dated April 4, 2017. Under the UN Secretary-General António Guterres, taxpayer dollars are being used to wage a global war on religious liberty, much of it under the guise of protecting LGBTQA activists from stigma and discrimination. This is not the difference between boys and girls but homosexuality, fornication, and gender confusion. This is a UN mandate, and it does not belong in our curriculum. Please give parents the freedom to choose.

**Charlie Melvin, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have four children, two of whom are in the Clark County School District (CCSD). I am also involved in the community outreach for the Power2Parent organization. We also support medically accurate, fact-based, and age-appropriate sex ed. Districts who have not taught sex ed or updated it are breaking the law. There are many different aspects of this, which teach that there are conflicting medical opinions regarding several subjects proposed in this bill. Therefore, if this bill is to pass, it would be to pass medically inaccurate information. It either is medically accurate or inaccurate. In the medical community, there is no consensus. We have participated in many CCSD board meetings where parents came out in huge numbers and expressed over and over again that they were not okay with changing to the opt-out status. We would like to keep our opt-in status, and we ask you to please do not sidestep parents and to listen to what the people and the parents of CCSD want. Please oppose A.B. 348.

**Ashley Dyal, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

As a parent, I have been involved in this sex issue in Clark County School District for several years. During those years, I have been told that I do not support sex ed, and I do not want children to be educated on matters regarding human anatomy, sexuality, or protection. I have been called names not limited to bigot, religious intolerant, and that I do not know what is right for my child. None of those things are true. None of those people know me at all, and they are attacking me based out of fear. I have reached out to several people who oppose my views in an effort to come to an understanding of common ground and to present our common-ground opinions to our school district board of trustees and have been rebuffed repeatedly. My concerns lie with the fact that I am continually being painted into a corner where I do not belong, and I am being marginalized as a parent. This bill furthers that end by taking parents out of the majority on advisory committees and takes the liberty of assisting students in setting and meeting goals regarding their sexuality. That is not anybody's responsibility but my own as a parent to assist my student in setting our own sexual goals. I am tired of being painted as some horrible person who does not care about kids. I do care about them; I am not misinformed. I am very well-informed and highly-educated on this issue. I wish proponents of comprehensive sex ed were more amenable to working with

parents rather than acting as though we were the enemy. I wish that this fear-based argument could have a common sense conversation and come to a common ground between proponents of comprehensive sex ed and parents who wish to be more involved. Please oppose.

**Juanita Clark, Board Member, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We want to commend Chairman Thompson and Vice Chair Joiner for being here and being tolerant of all of this. We must urge you to vote no on A.B. 348. It is the parents' right to decide and tell their child about sex education, and it certainly would not include much of the material that does not seem to be available to parents or to guardians. It is not the duty of school district personnel to use materials that are not available to parents. No one gets pregnant without knowing how it happens or what must take place to get pregnant. If someone believes that, then they need more education themselves.

The vote of the people clearly shows that we, the people, do not like, want, or support this bill. I have sat in a meeting for many hours at a school here, and the parents who were there promised that they would also fill up the Thomas and Mack Center if the school board was willing to wait. They were working on trying to do the opt-in rather than the opt-out. I was proud to see so many here today for this bill. On page 5, lines 4 through 11, it states that a student can opt-out without penalty, but then on page 6, lines 17 and 18, it designates that you have to have this class to graduate. That is not without penalty. That is certainly mandatory. Please vote no, the will of the people, regarding A.B. 348. This letter is signed by our president, June Ingram ([Exhibit BB](#)).

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will come up to Carson City for those who are in opposition to A.B. 348.

**Melissa Clement, President, Nevada Right to Life, Reno, Nevada:**

We are opposed to A.B. 348 as written, unless abortion is explicitly excluded. The bill mandates that sex-education programs in Nevada will include abortion counseling and explanations on how to get an abortion and where to get legal assistance. Assembly Bill 348 says that sex education courses will provide information regarding the identification and explanation of available counseling and legal and medical information concerning health services including, without limitation, and it goes on. This particular issue is combined with the fact that we currently have a glaring hole in Nevada law where an underage girl can get an abortion without a parent ever knowing. These two things, the schools providing information about where and how to get an abortion, plus the fact that parents are not able to even know, obviously is a concern.

If children cannot receive aspirin or other basic medical services without parental consent, and if children cannot go on school field trips without parental consent, school sex education programs should not be providing counseling or information about access to these invasive surgical procedures like abortion.



Any sex education plan would have to include abortion because of the language that is in this bill. The use of such words as "family planning" indicates that abortion would be a part of it. We have a concern with that as well as any teaching about abortifacients. Please oppose A.B. 348.

**Don Nelson, President, Nevada LIFE, Sparks, Nevada:**

We are opposed to A.B. 348 as written for the following reasons. We concur with the comments of Melissa Clement of Nevada Right to Life. With the definition in A.B. 348 of sex education and the requirements that ". . . the course of instruction must include evidence-based and, as applicable, medically accurate information regarding: . . ." these health services will require that abortion be included. Any discussion of abortion would likely be unacceptable—absolutely unacceptable—to pro-lifers and deemed to be not medically accurate, especially if led in or provided by abortion advocates teaching the class. Any medically accurate information on abortion would need to include information that abortion has serious life-changing as well as emotional and physical consequences. It would need to include how the procedures are performed; what happens to the unborn; the physical characteristics of the unborn; the vast number of studies indicating serious psychological and physical consequences of abortion; the physical and emotional impact on subsequent children in regard to having an abortion; adoption services, available legal and financial resources as well as legal rights for girls who want to keep their babies.

The other thing we would add to the testimony of Melissa Clement is that A.B. 348 would allow personnel from Planned Parenthood or other abortion advocacy groups to teach the program. We would oppose anyone related to Planned Parenthood or some other abortion advocacy group that could benefit by access to children. No group profiting from the sales of any abortion or contraceptive products should be available to mine public schools for new customers. Given that Planned Parenthood is the leading abortion company performing more than 300,000 abortions a year, and they are the world's leading abortion advocacy group, along with the ongoing investigations into the outrageous behaviors of Planned Parenthood, they should not be able to mine the Nevada public school system for new customers or teach or counsel for abortion.

**Sam England, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I am going to hit some of the highlights of A.B. 348 that I am concerned about. In section 1, subsection 10(b) the definition of evidence-based says, ". . . at least one evaluation to have a positive outcome on behavior." This is a scientific topic we are discussing. Nowhere in any scientific journal will you say it worked once, and then is therefore evidence-based. That is almost laughable. You need to tighten that up and make sure evidence-based truly does have some very robust evidence-based backing.

Below that, you have a number of groups—Center for Disease Control (CDC), American Academy of Pediatrics, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)—that have a lot of information available for what S.H.A.R.E.-type curricula should have. Unfortunately, when you allow these to be so open-ended, you have groups, as in WCSD right now, called Advocates for Youth. They are allowed in, and under this bill the

way it is written, they would be allowed into our schools as well. The problem is organizations like Advocates for Youth, which is a political not a medical organization, actually go directly against what ACOG says, and directly against what the pediatricians are currently saying. They are going against the CDC. Unless we tighten up this group and say only a certain number of organizations will be allowed to give truly evidence-based guidance, then we are going to allow people like these advocacy groups to get in here. That is very dangerous.

Also, regarding no more than three members representing from the community, we have already discussed how this could allow groups like Planned Parenthood to come in. This is a very controversial issue and the intent behind it, which seemed to be very pure, but what is actually going to happen, is what I am concerned about. Not what was intended, but what this bill will allow. This will allow for Planned Parenthood to be in. Please, if this bill does go forward, at least take some of these sections out. Change them so this is not so controversial. Thank you.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We have ten minutes left, so we are going down to Las Vegas.

**Dr. Juan M. Sclafani, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here to oppose A.B. 348. I have been a Clark County resident for almost 30 years, and I have raised, together with my wife, four children. I am here to ask you to oppose A.B. 348 because it goes against our core moral values. I cannot accept the view of those who want to impose school curriculum—that goes against my moral values—to be allowed to impose it on our children in the public education system that I am supporting with my tax dollars. The natural law of truth is that individuals have children and not institutions, and we, the parents, are solely responsible to teach them how to face life and instill in them moral values so they can be productive citizens. Why do so many of us adhere to moral values, moral purity, sexual abstinence, and wait to have sex until married? First, we believe that we are not animals that have evolved to a higher mental state, but that we are human beings made in the image of God. Our Creator endowed us with the ability to know the difference between right and wrong and made us responsible in this life, and in the life to come, for the decisions we make either in disobedience or in obedience to Him.

Secondly, we believe and know that moral promiscuity and the teaching of sexual activity to children is a super destructive force that takes away the chance to know more of purity and abstinence, respect of the body, and respect for other people's bodies. Knowing and practicing sexuality at a young age distracts their minds from growing and corrupts their soul, creating in them an insatiable hunger for more and more sexual expressions. This is not a good thing for them or our society. The statistics are there to prove it. The only way out of STDs, unwanted pregnancies, and the murdering of children through abortions is to go back to the family and have the parents work with their children in the instruction of these moral values. Please listen to those of us who are the majority and oppose A.B. 348.

**William Sobalvarro, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I am very thankful for what your intent is, and I am sure many of the parents are. Many of the points you are proposing are good. We can understand the good points of the things you are trying to do with the children that need the help. There are many that can use the help. The only problem is that we, as a nation, show that ever since our education system has taken over our children in just about every area, it has failed. We have a lot of the corrupt mentality of paganism coming in. We should not have to apologize for being a Judeo-Christian society. We became the envy of the world, and we have been until 30 years ago when we threw it out. We threw that main teaching for our children, the Bible, out of the schools. Now, you are trying to impose that pagans teach our children who do not even believe what made us great. You want them to take over?

I oppose A.B. 348, not because it is totally bad, but because of what the results we can see in our nation and the nations that follow us because we are the leader of the world. We still are, thank God. If you want to keep it that way, do not continue to put out bills where our children are under the teaching of pagan people. They do not believe that what made us great is the believing in the Almighty God that gave us the word that teaches us how to have good relationships including sex, and how to know whether you are a man or a woman. We know which bathroom we need to go to.

**Ashley Ruiz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am currently attending Silverado College Preparatory and Career Technical High School in the Clark County School District as a 14-year-old freshman. I am the oldest sibling of a total of five children in my household of seven, including myself, will be attending elementary and high school next year. I am in resolute opposition of A.B. 348.

As a U.S. citizen and a current student studying in a CCSD school, I find it outrageous that you wish to implement a system that will corrupt and destruct our society in such a way. You want to tell me that you will take away my parents' rights to teach their children these things at the age that my parents deem appropriate? Need I remind you—and no offense—that you are neither the mother nor the father of my siblings or any other children. You do not reserve the right to corrupt them in such a way. You say you want to help your education program? Well, by implementing this bill, you will be incorporating it into science curriculum. There will be no need for philosophy because you will already be teaching students lies.

You want to help us? Get Nevada off the ranking of 50th place on the list of education with the poor levels of education it has. Do not corrupt it even more. Do not corrupt my siblings and other children at the ages of five, six, seven, and nine. My siblings and other children do not need to learn about sexual orientation or how to put on a condom.

It is a school's job to prepare them academically and teach current core classes and leave the rest to the parents' discretion which falls under the parents' right to teach their child what they do or do not want them to know. I recall that religion was removed out of schools because it was deemed offensive, but you want to implement this. I do not see how implementing this

into the curriculum will not offend somebody. I am beyond offended by what this country and state deems correct. Our moral structures are no longer stabilized, and we have changes in bills like this one to thank for it. Of the ten years I have been in school, I was never taught the proper decorum used in courts and other formal places, but you want to teach me more in-depth about how I should have sex. Maybe that is why we are 50th in the education ranking. Somebody before me said that parents have a right, and by implementing this bill, you take away that right. Oppose this bill. Thank you.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will come back here to Carson City.

**Krystal Minera, representing Nevada Family Alliance, Sparks, Nevada:**

I am here to represent several different pastors' associations—a little more than 48 pastors and their congregations. I have a request that you look at the current curriculum to really get familiar with it. Many of the people who have previously spoken on both sides, continually mention that they did not receive sexual education on consent, human reproduction, and diseases which the current curriculum does provide. I believe that we could go a little more in-depth and cover them as well and keep them as updated as possible. I will mention, and again, request that you go over the newly drafted curriculum that is being proposed by the Washoe County School District. If you go through it, you will see that it does not add any kind of lessons in regard to those topics as far as consent, sex trafficking, human reproduction, or diseases. It actually adds lessons that I would not deem as sexual education. Rather, it goes into other topics that do not fall under that category.

The other request that I have is that you would look into the parent opinion that has come up during this proposed draft. At the last meeting, we had more than 267 parents' voices through emails, forums, or just signatures that said that they were in opposition to the new curriculum. There were roughly 50 who were in agreement with the bill. I ask you to become more familiar with the drafted curriculum because it would match up with A.B. 348 perfectly. In case I did not mention it—I am in opposition.

**Mary Fechner, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I am in opposition to A.B. 348. My concern is in changing the opt-in to opt-out. It was discussed how many students do not bring the papers home for a signature, and my question is how many students would neglect to bring the paper home to their parents so that they would sign that they wanted their child to opt-out? A lot of those papers would get lost, and parents would not be aware that this would be occurring in their schools. If they want this signed, perhaps every parent should know that this would be taught in the schools, and perhaps, at the time that their children are registered, they would have to sign something like this, so that every parent is aware of the curriculum and can opt-in and opt-out rather than having the students conveniently lose their piece of paper.

The other concern that I have is the school district moving from sex education to medical advice. I am concerned about some of the things that are specifically mentioned in here such as safe methods of contraception and contraceptive devices. There is a lot of controversy out

there about what is considered safe. The best people to be discussing this with students and young people are medical professionals. When such things come up as discussions about pregnancy, again, that is something that should be discussed with their medical professional, their parents, and themselves. I urge you to consider the medical consequences that the school district could get into by giving advice.

**Dan Holly, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I oppose this bill. I am 70 years old and I have listened to a lot of junk tonight on the school system and how it does not function right. This bill will just add to your problems. I am from Bakersfield, California. I moved out to Death Valley when I was about 14 years old. I met my wife out there when she was 11 years old. We went to high school together. I taught her how to drive, and I got her pregnant when she was 15 and I was 17. I did not ask for help. I asked for two jobs. I buckled down and took care of my family, which nobody talks about today. I think that this bill introduces sex to a set of children in our society, which are our children, and they are not mature enough to learn or to understand it. This bill will just influence them for what it was not intended to be. I believe it is demonic. I am a Christian man, and I know I am a man because all I have to do is look between my legs, and all my wife has to do is look between hers. We do not want this bill to pass because, if you really look at the situation tonight, why are these people here? Why are there so many here that are for this bill? This is the most important bill that you will pass for this area and Nevada itself. I ask you to vote no and really wake up.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will move to neutral for A.B. 348.

**Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District:**

I am only here this evening to clarify a few things that you have heard today during testimony. I wanted to make it clear that the Washoe County School District has not adopted any of this curriculum at this point. We are going through the local process where our advisory board has put this out, and we are getting parent feedback. I just want to make it clear that we are listening to that parent feedback and adjustments will be made based on what we have heard from our families, but that is a long process. We do not expect this curriculum to be adopted anytime in the near future. We were moving ahead with this process before this legislation was introduced, but we want to make sure that we do not get ahead of ourselves if this were to go forward, and then we would have to change something. Nothing has been adopted. All of the current curriculum materials for our sex-education program are available online anytime for parents' review, and the proposed curriculum materials are currently available online or hardcopy at these meetings for parents to review. Again, I wanted to make it clear that nothing has happened at this moment to adopt the curriculum you have heard about tonight.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

Could you get us a copy of what is being circulated and then can you tell me how this bill, if it passed, would change or affect the process that you are going through right now?

**Lindsay Anderson:**

Absolutely. Like I said, all of the curriculum materials that are being floated are available to anyone. I would be happy to get that to the Committee for your review. In terms of how this would change, that is really difficult to say given that the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools would have to adopt these things, and I cannot predict what it is that they would adopt. I can tell you that a lot of what has moved forward in the Washoe County School District has been based on some national standards. Assuming that they adopted some national standards, not very much would change, but I cannot speculate on that.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone neutral in Las Vegas?

**Patrice Tew, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

It was not my intent to be neutral, but as a former trustee having been through this sex education process for the past four years, I would like to offer some facts. You can draw your conclusions. Several questions have been asked about the opt-in/opt-out, and how many parents have not returned their forms. Let me give you some information from the Clark County School District (CCSD). We have 49 high schools, and only 4.76 percent did not return their permission slips. That is, on average, 23 individuals per high school. One of the things we have been anxious to have done is to create that network of support for families. It is uncontested how important families are. A phone call would make a connection to that family to ask if they are aware that their child has the option of being in this class. I have seen middle schools do that. We have 59 middle schools. At the middle school level in CCSD, only 3.3 percent did not return their permission slips. That is 11 phone calls per school. That is a doable thing. Rather than setting off parents, we are going to bring them in and engage them.

I have some facts about the Sex Education Advisory Committee, page 4, lines 4 through 15. That is pretty much standard, but there is the addition of lines 17 and 18 which is not necessarily an improvement to give three more representatives from the community. Right now, lines 11 through 15, the medicine, counseling, religion, and teaching are already members of the community. It has always been the intent of the Legislature that parents, who are the most significant stakeholders because it is their children and their children's lives, were to have the majority in the say of what the voice is. To add those three additional community members would upset that balance. In terms of having people understand parents and that voice, then in light of A.B. 384, which is the reorganization giving voice to parents, there may be an irony . . . .

[The Chairman stopped the testimony because of the time limit.]

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I have been listening and I have been taking a lot of notes, and I want to thank parents and community members on both sides of this issue who came out tonight. I meant it when I said earlier that I am looking for a way to make this bill better, so anyone who is currently in opposition who has good ideas on how this can be improved, I am really open to that, and I would encourage you to reach out to me.

I would like some legal clarification, please. There were a few statements that were made that, just for the record, I would like to have clear. There was a statement made that this would be required for graduation, and that would be a penalty. My understanding is that the way it is drafted it is not a requirement for graduation. There is not any additional penalty; it is no different than it is currently. Could our legal counsel clarify that for us?

**Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel:**

On page 5, lines 7 through 11, the text reads any course of instruction offered pursuant to this section—this section would be a course of instruction in sex education—is not required for graduation from a public high school.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I would like to reiterate that. The comments about parental involvement being key, I agree with. I wish every child had that involved parent at home, but I am concerned about the kids who do not. Those are the ones who slip through the cracks that this legislation will help provide access to.

I would also like to emphasize that all of the examples you have heard, in addition to Ms. Lindsay Anderson's comment about how the S.H.A.R.E. program is not finalized yet. All of the examples you heard about activities or curriculum or things that people are opposed to; those are absolutely currently held and handled at the local level. That is where those types of decisions are made. This bill would not change that. The actual content, curriculum, and activities in any of those programs remain with that local school district, the Advisory Committee, and the public forums that are taking place. This bill does not change that, and it does not require particular curriculum, content, or activities. This merely sets the basic standards of what needs to be addressed in any of those curriculums adopted at the local level. That is really important to keep in mind because a lot of the comments were very specific to local curricula that are not mandated by this bill.

Finally, I would just say that, again, I am open to hearing from people, and I will go back to see if there are changes that can be made. For example, I agree with the comment that the definition of evidence-based could be improved. In fact, it was a late conversation about how that should be defined. If it should be stronger, I can definitely look at that. I am open to suggestions and hopeful that we can move forward in updating our sex ed, which is really what this bill is all about.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will close the hearing for A.B. 348.

[([Exhibit CC](#)) and ([Exhibit DD](#)) were presented but not discussed and are included as exhibits for the meeting.]

[Assemblywoman Joiner assumed the chair.]

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

We have three bills left tonight. We may need to limit testimony as we have been doing all evening. I would like to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 432.

**Assembly Bill 432: Delays the implementation of the Achievement School District.  
(BDR 34-1036)**

**Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17:**

I am proud to represent individuals and families in North Las Vegas, the city in which I was born and raised. I want to thank Vice Chair Joiner and the Assembly Committee on Education for allowing me to present Assembly Bill 432. This bill in its original form requires the delay of the implementation of the provisions relating to the Achievement School District (ASD). You can tell, based on the testimony from our first bill [Assembly Bill 103] that Assemblywoman Neal nailed it. She made it very clear what the concerns were from the community; what some of the issues around performance were; dispelled some of the myths; and just laid it out with all of the concerns.

Assembly Bill 423, as I read it, was to delay the implementation of the provisions by the end of the next Legislative Session—the 80th Legislative Session. I will briefly share with you why. In 2015, when we had the reorganization bill—I do not want to reference the number of the bill—but when we had that bill, it was an opportunity where we did not get a lot of input. We did not have a chance to vet the process. It was determined in pretty much the last hour of our session. At that time, I voted against that bill because I did not have enough information. I did not know how my community felt about it, and I felt like that was the opportunity where we were going to further divide the haves and the have nots.

Session ended, and what do you know? We had the opportunity to properly vet that. We had more than 30 meetings. We established two different types of committees, and even though I voted against it, I was able to meet myself in the middle and say, "You know what? We can make this work." That is the spirit of us as legislators. That is how we need to approach some issues. It is not always going to be black and white for us. Ultimately, we want to see student achievement—student achievement across the board.

Fast forward to the Achievement School District, and I feel like we are basically in the same situation where we have active legislation, and we have not properly vetted it with the community and certain stakeholders. Whenever you have something where there is so much opposition to it, you have to take pause and figure out what is going on. That is why I have



brought forth A.B. 432. For those of you who know me, I try to have as much of a compromising spirit as I can. I am very glad that the Department of Education came to me. As you see on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), they have a proposed conceptual amendment ([Exhibit G](#)). I would like you to follow along with me briefly, the one with the graphics ([Exhibit H](#)). I do not want to get into all of the details, but we had a conversation around it.

My concern was about the rising stars list, which is the list of up to six schools that are the lowest of the lowest performing. I had questions about not allowing those schools to go directly to the ASD. What if we went to the lower right hand side of the chart, and we entered into a performance compact and improvement plan where we included four different groups of people? We had the voice of the Department of Education, the actual school, the school district that it aligns with, and the parents.

Even though I know this is going to be continuing a conversation, I want to say that it seems like we all kind of shook our heads on that. I appreciated that because we need to have that extra step in there, and we need to put time in there too. We cannot just say it is going to happen in a year. It is going to take time. My understanding is that with the ASDs, we want to get every school to at least three stars. Think about it. If there is a school at one star, the testimony was there in the first hearing, these schools have been like this for ages. How can we honestly expect that a one-star school is going to jump to a three-star school in one year? That is where the discussion is going to go. I am veering more toward two years or so. I just wanted to share that with you all. I will be coming up with an amendment to work with the Department of Education. My colleague, the chair of the Senate Education Committee, Senator Denis, and I are going to be talking at the table with the Department of Education so we can see what we can make of this.

One thing I do want to point out, because we were talking about charter schools taking over, is the vision I have with this. If we were to do two years with a performance compact, if that school did not raise by one star, then there is the possibility of going into the ASD. Hear me out, before you frown. We would have some options added on. If it were to be that school with the charter school concept, that may be doable, but not for six years. They also have to prove themselves to our students. We would give them the same situation where they would have two years to move that school from a one-star to a two- or three-star school. If that does not happen in two years, we are not going to keep that school in ASD.

Now, we need to think of what the third option is going to be. Every single time we move a school we are going to have those four different parties that I talked about involved—the Department of Education, the school, the school district pertaining to that school, and also the parents. I wanted to share that with you. You see the visual; you have heard my vision for it. Again, it talks about student improvement regardless of whom or what is doing that student improvement. That is what matters for us. That is a kind of compromise, but we have the opportunity, within the next few days, to try to figure out something and get some opinions from stakeholders.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

Do you have anyone else you would like to present?

**Chairman Thompson:**

No.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

Do any of the members have questions?

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I am intrigued by the vision that you are working toward. I would like to meet with you and talk more about it.

**Chairman Thompson:**

I do want to say for the record that it is based on the Department of Education. I cannot do those graphics. What I can appreciate is that we came to the table, and we started the discussion. Thank you.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will open up for support of A.B. 432. We will begin in Carson City.

**Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations,  
Clark County School District:**

As you heard during the discussion on A.B. 103, we have expressed numerous concerns over the past two years with Achievement School Districts (ASD). We support changes to the law that would allow more time, more input, and more data to make decisions that impact the lives of so many. In addition to the potential amendments mentioned by Chairman Thompson, we ask that the Committee include provisions that remove the requirements to allow charters to use CCSD facilities without compensation, and mandate that CCSD pay for capital expenses. We look forward to working with the Chairman as well as other members who are looking at this legislation and to look at all of the provisions that could be changed. As mentioned, there must be parity. If traditional schools are provided a certain timeframe to get to three stars, then the charter operator must be provided the same amount of time.

I also want to provide some clarity about a comment that was made about our turnaround process on the earlier bill [A.B. 103] discussion regarding limited capacity. Right now, our capacity is limited more by funding than anything else. The turnaround process requires a substantial amount of support, and with additional staff, we could potentially serve all of the schools that are on the rising star list with the turnaround process. I wanted to put that on the record as well.

**Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association:**

I will not reiterate too much of the testimony that I gave on A.B. 103, but I will say that I would like for the points that I made to be reflected here in this bill. I would also like to say that it is not inconsistent to support a piece of legislation like Assemblywoman Neal passionately brought here to this Committee that is a principled piece of legislation that may or may not be able to pass into law, and also support legislation that is more measured in its approach at the same time. I trust that leadership will do what they need to do to engage through the process to get the best possible result for public education in Nevada.

Briefly, on conceptual amendments, the Nevada State Education Association does support choice within the public education system. The framework that Chairman Thompson presented is fair. We are interested in working with the sponsor on this conceptual amendment. I would say that educators, teachers, and support staff are also important members of the school community. When school communities get to take a look and assess where they are, what their options are, and where they want to go, I hope that educators are a very big part of that conversation in the decision-making process.

**Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District:**

I am here primarily in the spirit of compromise and wanting to have a seat at the table as this moves forward. One of the things that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) has been saying during the ASD process where some of our schools were considered, is the critical nature of having three year's worth of data before we identify schools to be taken over. Given the fact that we have had at least one delay could potentially get us to that three-year mark where we could be looking at true growth data from the same tests and not the apples to oranges situation that we are in at this moment. I think that is something that we would ultimately support.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Las Vegas, go ahead.

**John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association:**

I am here in support of A.B. 432. It is music to my ears to hear Assemblyman Thompson speak of compromise. I was fearful of A.B. 103 and the attempt to just repeal without having constructive discussion about what we can do. This is really about systemically underperforming schools that have been around for a long time. The district does not have the capacity to meet that challenge. There needs to be other resources. I like the performance compact. We have had multiple conversations with the Department of Education about this. You have also heard our ideas on it. We definitely want to see any kind of amendment that is proposed where parents ultimately have a vote on whether there is a transfer to a charter management organization (CMO) overseeing it at some point. We also want to ensure that educators are protected in this process. Under the old bill, Assembly Bill 448 of the 78th Session, it created an atmosphere of insecurity, and we think that should be addressed.

I want to speak about one thing; recruiting high-performing charter management organizations. One of the drawbacks of A.B. 448 of the 78th Session was that it attracted what we would refer to as bottom feeders in the industry. If you are ultimately going to have some kind of CMO come in and manage the turnaround of a school, then they have to have a proven success record, and they have to have the type of resources to invest in this market. It warrants a serious discussion about how that recruitment takes place—what kind of standards we are looking for, and what kind of expectations we can try to achieve, so we do not have the result that we had in this previous situation.

I have never believed, and I want the record to show that the Department of Education has never attempted to try to look at A.B. 448 of the 78th Session through the regulation process to try to amend it and to listen to and hear the interests of the community, educators, and as the school district. It is good that they are involved in this right now. I appreciate, again, Assemblyman Thompson for his efforts, and we look forward to seeing conceptually how these amendments appear in writing. We would also like to work with the sponsor of the amendments as well as with the sponsor of the bill to make this something that truly will address the systemic underperformance of schools and build the kind of capacity that our school district and all of our kids really need.

**Anna Slighting, representing Honoring Our Public Education, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am speaking in favor of A.B. 432. We would rather not have the ASD at all, as I mentioned in my testimony for A.B. 103, but if it does move forward, we want to put on the record our amendment suggestions ([Exhibit EE](#)). Thank you, Assemblyman Thompson, for looking at moving all schools to three stars rather than just talking about the lowest 5 percent. That was something that really bothered us two years ago. There is always going to be a lowest 5 percent. Talking about raising the star rankings is a much smarter goal.

At HOPE [Honoring Our Public Education], we have four asks if the ASD moves forward ([Exhibit EE](#)). The first one is adequate funding as I mentioned in A.B. 103. The second is no takeover of current schools. We want to put on record that we are fine with the ASD models of partnership and Fresh Starts. We are just not in favor of the takeover model. The third is that we would like parents to have the power to vote for a transition from a traditional school to starting a charter school. There should not be a simple Google form to vote. This should be done with ample opportunity to educate the community on the pros and cons, as well as the opportunity to have plenty of public input. We suggest an amendment to require the specifics of this type of parental transition.

Last, if the parents do vote for transition to a charter school, we would like to see an amendment to address the recommendations by Clark County School District's (CCSD) bond oversight committee. We hope that these recommendations would be followed by the inhabiting charter regarding capital management and maintenance of the CCSD building. This work already mentions some of these, and we hope they are seriously considered as an amendment.

We would like to consider our conversation with our parents and with you, the legislators, if this moves forward. Thank you.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

Is there any more support for this measure either here in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there anyone in opposition?

**Lindsey Dalley, Member, Moapa Valley Community Education Advisory Board:**

I do appreciate Assemblyman Thompson's willingness to look at more issues. I need to look a little deeper into what is being proposed. My concern is that what he said sounded good, and I could support those things and our community could support them, but I want to make sure that these discussions include schools other than failing schools. We do not have failing schools in Moapa Valley, but we do have schools that are being ignored and the parents know that if we were given similar resources to what the district is spending in our schools, we would be able to improve our schools immensely. That is the issue that we have. We are constantly fighting central bureaucracy and our children are being punished for it. That is the issue that we want to bring to the table, and we are willing to look at various options to do that. I emphasize the fact that we want to allow and to require any school that enters the ASD to have a parent petition, so it is a win/win. This adds educational diversity for cultures and communities underserved by CCSD. While we are underserved, our parent population is very engaged, and we are not failing. There is a gap here that needs to be filled, and I am not sure whether to support or oppose. I definitely would love to engage to ensure that the baby does not get thrown out with the bathwater.

**Adam Johnson, Executive Director, Democracy Prep at the Agassi Campus, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Many of the parents and students have come to call us DPAC [Democracy Prep at the Agassi Campus], as a member of the Democracy Prep Network, which is a 100 percent publicly funded charter management organization (CMO). Our mission is to educate responsible citizen-scholars for success in the college of their choice and a life of active citizenship. To date, Democracy Prep has a 100 percent college acceptance rate among graduating seniors. Ninety percent of our alumni are enrolled in four-year colleges, and 30 percent study at top tier universities like Dartmouth, Yale, Duke, Princeton, Brown, Boston College, and Kenyon. Over the past few months, videos of Democracy Prep High School seniors have been circulating around the Internet where viewers see the emotional reactions of students reading their college acceptance letters. One story in particular was exceptionally moving. Winston Gutierrez, a senior at Democracy Prep Harlem High School, recently learned that he had achieved his goal of gaining acceptance into an Ivy League school when Cornell University accepted him as a freshman for the fall of 2017. As the son of an immigrant mother who moved to the United States to provide better opportunities for herself and her family, Winston's personal story is similar to many families at DPAC, in Clark County, and across the state of Nevada.

The current reality of many students who are from low-income households and graduate from a Nevada high school is that they do not matriculate into a four-year college, much less Ivy League colleges. According to the Department of Education, between 2011 and 2014, only 54 percent of Nevada high school students from economically disadvantaged homes entered college within 16 months of graduating. Our work at DPAC will center around ensuring that all scholars are able to fulfill their potential and enter into and successfully graduate from the four-year university of their choice. The work ahead will be challenging, but we are thankful for the opportunity to partner with committed students, families, and community members who are dedicated to maximizing their potential and unlocking various life opportunities made possible by the vehicle of education.

All of us at Democracy Prep are incredibly grateful for the work the ASD has done to help bring Democracy Prep Public Schools to Nevada and make a partnership with Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy possible. We firmly believe our partnership with Agassi Prep will serve as a blueprint for leveraging resources and best practices to accelerate excellent academic outcomes for students. I hope the ASD will continue to partner with other Nevada communities to provide vibrant, high-quality, in-neighborhood, educational opportunities across our state. As DPAC's systems and procedures are refined and we see a shift in the academic trajectories of our students, DPAC will serve as proof of how innovative interventions and legislation can significantly improve student achievement outcomes for children in our highest need communities.

The entire DPAC community is thrilled to be one of the first schools in the ASD that will help create the New Nevada Plan. The hundreds of families who have already engaged with us during this process reaffirm our belief that families want great neighborhood school options for their children. We are proud to be an option for families in West Las Vegas who can leverage to help their children achieve their own academic potential and be a reliable resource to our community for years to come.

Thank you all for your support of education in the state of Nevada and all of the hard work you do to provide excellent educations for our state's children.

**Jake Custer, Director, Growth Strategy for Opportunity 180, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here in opposition to A.B. 432. We know that 83,000 students in the Clark County School District currently attend our lowest performing schools identified as a one- or two-star school by the 2013-2014 performance framework. We also know that the majority of these students are black or Latino, and almost all are low-income. Like you, we believe this is unacceptable. Every child deserves access to a high-quality public school regardless of their race, Zip Code, or family income. We do not have to choose between supporting schools through CCSD's work or through the ASD's work. In fact, I think we would miss an incredible opportunity if we did not engage in a both-end strategy.

We know that turning around chronically underperforming schools takes time. While it is important to make improvements to our school districts, current students do not have the luxury of waiting on that change. We must look at the ASD as another solution in addition to the Turnaround Zone, and we cannot afford to waste any more time.

We are already seeing the work of the ASD pay dividends for our families in Las Vegas. We are excited to have two ASD schools launching this August—both of which you have heard about. Futuro Academy is launching in east Las Vegas, and parents are already signing up and enrolling. They are demonstrating that they want in, and the school building is not even complete. Democracy Prep, that you just heard from, is launching at the Agassi Campus. We work for the well-respected set of individuals at Agassi who determined that Democracy Prep would be best suited to lead that school.

If we delay the work of the ASD, we would not be giving Democracy Prep the opportunity to demonstrate the great academic gains that they have achieved all around the country and in other cities.

All families deserve a shot at a great school like Futuro or Democracy Prep. If we choose to delay or dismantle the work of the ASD, we would be choosing to widen the achievement gap, and we will postpone access to great public schools for our children who need them the most. There are too many students attending low-performing schools to rely on one form of intervention. We have a moral responsibility to do whatever it takes to provide great public education to all children.

**Justin Brecht, Founder, Nevada Rise Academy, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a former educator in the Clark County School District (CCSD) for 12 years. In 2014, I was named the Las Vegas Review-Journal Teacher of the Year, and last year, I was the recipient of the inaugural Smith Center Heart of Education Award. The recognition I received was a direct result of the program I started at my school that allowed parents an option in how their child was educated. In just one classroom at one school, the demand from the community resulted in a wait list of over 50 percent of the total grade-level enrollment.

Inspired by this demand, the success of the program, and the opportunity provided by the initiatives in Nevada, including the ASD, I decided to leave the classroom and found Nevada Rise Academy, a proposed kindergarten through fifth grade charter school focused on placing students on the path to college. This is a path that too few students in Nevada are currently on and why we cannot wait.

We are planning to apply to the ASD as a Fresh Start charter school hoping to open in 2018 with 140 kindergartners and first graders. We are inspired by the mission of the ASD to offer quality education options for students currently enrolled in struggling and underperforming schools. The focus of offering seats to students who do not typically have access to such opportunities is a necessary entity in Nevada as a part of the solution to provide equity to all students.

Currently, I am engaged in the community, talking to parents and community members to help inform them of our work to meet the needs of the community we intend to serve. This exciting work is required by the ASD charter application and has been a welcome conversation to every parent I have talked to so far. This requirement demonstrates the unique elements of the ASD to offer a quality school that is reflective of the community, and one that will provide transformative change and opportunities to the students it serves.

I encourage you to keep the ASD as a key component of the solution to helping all Nevada students succeed, and welcome any opportunities to speak more about our opposition to A.B. 432.

**David Blodgett, representing Nevada College Prep, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the proposed school leader for Nevada College Prep. I agree with what has been said by other speakers in opposition to A.B. 103 and A.B. 432. I just have one final thought. We have heard many personal stories tonight, but I want to share one statistic that drives our team to do our work. Seventy-two percent of our students graduate from high school in Clark County, but we also have less than 10 percent, according to the ACT, that are college-ready. That is why we are determined to provide another option, another middle school option, to ensure that students and families have a choice about the school that will prepare them to succeed in high school and college. If the ASD is delayed or dismantled, proposed schools like Nevada College Prep will lose the opportunity to apply to a charter authorizer with a specific and deliberate focus on equity for our students who need it the most.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas in opposition to A.B. 432? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City in opposition to A.B. 432?

**Pat Hickey, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada:**

I am opposed to A.B. 432 as written. Like others, I appreciate the sentiment and the willingness of the sponsor of this bill to look for ways to make it work and the reasoning behind it. The main issue that I have a concern with is section 39 of this bill. The bill clarifies that any schools currently selected for conversion to Achievement Charter Schools will not undergo such a conversation. The plans that we have heard about so eloquently tonight from the executive director of Democracy Prep that Agassi Prep is transitioning into, and also from Futuro, is that those schools voluntarily entered into the ASD, and those plans would be nixed. I am not in favor of this bill, but I would hope that at the very least, if this bill should pass, that those schools be grandfathered. They have already begun the process under the current legislation in good faith and have parents, students, and teachers onboard as was discussed earlier.

We need to see just how well these experiments—these incubators of these charter schools—are going to work in Nevada. We already have schools that have voluntarily stepped up, in the case of Agassi, to make that transition voluntarily to the ASD. Let us give them an opportunity, look at the results, gauge the data, and determine if this is, in fact,



the kind of intervention that we think is good for all of our students in Nevada. For that reason, at the very least, I would hope the sponsor would be amenable to grandfathering those existing schools in that have already begun making plans and drawing from students in many of your districts. Again, the ASD is an intervention. I am personally impressed, and when I was a member of the State Board of Education, I was very supportive of the turnaround efforts that some of the schools on the targeted list have done. If nothing else, as it has been said in so many words, the shot across the bow in Nevada education that the ASD, along with some of the other 23 attempted reforms that were enacted last session, may not be successful, but let us at least give this an opportunity to see if it can be successful. I hope you will consider that in the furtherance of this bill.

**Don Soifer, Vice Chair, District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, Washington, D.C.:**

You have my written testimony ([Exhibit FF](#)), so I will just make a few points. While we are 1,500 miles away, I think our experiences might be helpful to you. I am appreciative of the Chairman's thoughtful approach to this work.

In the work we have done in the District of Columbia where we have 41,000 students, almost half of all public school students and 9,000 on wait lists, our students are as likely, and often more likely, to be economically disadvantaged. Nonetheless, they outperform the district averages on the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College Careers (PARCC) standardized tests for nearly every subject in most grades and graduate at higher rates as well.

In my nine years on the board, the accountability system that we designed and used as an effective tool to improve school quality—like yours, based on leveraging growth, achievement, and other measures of school quality—has resulted in the removal of 2,000 Tier 3 seats, our lowest tier school seats, from the charter sector and added 6,000 to Tier 1, the highest, in the time we have had the accountability system. So there is value here.

The role of the ASD is a vital one in the New Nevada Plan filed with the U.S. Department of Education. The regulations proposed by the Department also hold promising potential to benefit families served by those eligible schools.

From our experience, the intensive collaborative effort of matching transformation teams and high-quality school operators with these schools is a crucial one. Nevada communities and families are strongly positioned to benefit from the established work of exemplary charter school operators around the nation. The leadership of the ASD is well-versed and current in establishing best governing and authorizing practices like those which have produced the strong academic gains in our city and other high-performing charter sectors around the nation.

In our own work, we have seen multiple examples of how this process can work well. It is hard work, and to be certain, it is not work that can be measured in precise and equal increments. What its success can deliver for a school community and for the entire education

ecosystem in which it operates, is as strong and powerful a transformational tool as any I have seen in a government's toolbox. I hope that this Committee will give that opportunity the chance its communities deserve. Thank you.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Is there anyone else in opposition in either Carson City or Las Vegas to A.B. 432? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral?

**Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

We are neutral, but with some serious concerns as we articulated and laid out earlier in A.B. 103. We are here as neutral to give some productive conversations to the leadership and the Chairman in his willingness to listen. We have laid out a number of conceptual amendments ([Exhibit G](#)) that we would like to see in terms of moving the ASD forward that largely center around maintaining the line in the sand consistent with the Governor's vision in 2015, empowering families and parents, and the notion of a performance compact around clear outcomes. We are going to engage with the Chair, and we certainly hope that we can find some agreement. Of course, we are going to continue to work to find agreement on the critical aspects and continue to work in good faith towards those goals.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

I have a question regarding the performance framework. Is it set up like a bell curve, such that you have to have some schools in the lowest rating, the one star, or is it possible to have none in that category?

**Steve Canavero:**

Once the criteria are established, the entire curve can move. There could be a future where you have none, or if the whole bell curve moves the other direction, then you could have more. Once the criteria are established, then from year to year, the movement would change.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Is there anyone else as neutral? [There was no one.]

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

I just want to use a word; parents. We have used that term so much in this conversation. I was not going to go there, but I am going there. There were ten potential operators for the ASD; only two are still afloat. I have all due respect for my colleague and friend that is at the school in west Las Vegas, but the option for that takeover was not by parents. I did not go to the meeting, but there were more than 500 people at that meeting, and those parents did not want that operator or that change. I really have to put that on the record. I am not trying to create a back-and-forth, but I could not sit still and not bring that out. We are talking about parents having the ability to choose for their children.

I have shared this with the Department of Education, but I do not think that the ASD ever had the opportunity to come out of the gate properly. This is an opportunity. We have an opportunity to try to bring the concept—and again, we are going to do the necessary adjustments that we need to—but we have the opportunity to share what that is going to look like. Quite frankly, it did not have a chance from the get-go.

I am going to end with my beginning story. I am a product of the Clark County School District. I graduated in 1985. When I talked about the reorganization and I thought about this bill, the whole idea was that this reorganization is a major cultural shift for our community. We have to take the time. We have to give turnaround schools the time to turn around. That was the main reason I first put out this bill. We all know that no bill really comes out without some kind of amendment, so that is what we are going to look forward to. Thank you so much for your time and your attention.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 432, and we will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 447.

[([Exhibit GG](#)) was presented but not discussed and is included as an exhibit for the meeting.]

**Assembly Bill 447: Revises provisions relating to Victory schools. (BDR S-717)**

**Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17:**

This bill is in regard to Victory schools. As you know, we have come up with some great models for student success around English language learners (ELL), which was a Zoom program, and we also have the Victory school which is for our free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) students. Even though Governor Sandoval has an appropriation for Victory schools, and I have now seen a bill that actually extends Victory schools, this bill does as well. Double or triple protection is fine. We need to keep Victory schools alive. That is one thing this bill is doing.

The second thing this bill is doing is providing some options. One thing that is a little different about Victory schools is the community. The community comes together and creates the plan. They receive a certain amount of money, and the administrators, parents, students, the community-based organizations, and the faith-based community, come up with a holistic plan to help the students in that school. There have been some struggles, not just inside the school, but those elements outside of the school as well.

Working on that, you can see on my conceptual amendment ([Exhibit HH](#)) we will add language and in subsection 8, we will add paragraph (i). Paragraph (i) is going to combine three key components. It says "Provide Integrated Student Supports, wrap-around services, and/or provide evidence-based programs and services specifically designed to meet the needs of pupils who attend the school, as determined using the assessment conducted pursuant to subsection 4." Those are the two changes. The definition of Integrated Student Supports (ISS) is at the bottom of the amendment.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

The one question I have is with respect to the limitation on how we are spending that money. In various contexts, we hear, "We like to have flexibility so that the local schools can make adjustments as necessary." I am wondering if the 25 percent limitation would be burdensome to them, or if that was actually part of the original intent? Not having been here, I do not know.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

That is actually a part that is stricken out. We are striking that part out with the conceptual amendment because, again, in consulting with my principals of J.E. Manch Elementary School and Zel and Mary Lowman Elementary School—I love them; they do great work and they were actually here for the first bill—25 percent would be problematic and make it tighter for them. We wanted to move the part about the evidence-based programs and service from the secondary list and put it into the primary menu.

**Assemblyman Pickard:**

My apologies.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

I know we had a presentation at the beginning of session, so this could be a very simple answer, but in that presentation, do we have some measures that are tracking the success of the Victory schools from the last biennium?

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

We would probably have to look at the school district for that information.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

That would be really helpful. I know the whole purpose was to be able to track that funneled, categorical spending and to see what the results were on an ongoing basis. That is beneficial to this Committee.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

What I really appreciate with those two schools—I am going to use the two schools I mentioned before—is that they are right next to each other and what they decided to do with their separate dollars is to create their plan together because they are together both in the community and the neighborhood. When I went to their rollout meeting, saw our ELL parents in the house, and the room was full, it continued on with that engagement. The administrators said they had never seen that level of engagement before. I am sure the school district can get that information for you.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

I have had that same experience anecdotally, so I absolutely appreciate that. It is just helpful to have that data.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will ask anyone in support of Assembly Bill 447 either here in Carson City or in Las Vegas to come to the table.

**Nicole Rourke, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

I had already planned this as part of my testimony, but in answer to Assemblywoman Tolles' question, I am going to point to a report, *Nevada's S.B. 432 Victory Schools Report for Year 1: SY2015-2016*, that was developed by the school districts that have received Victory money and has all of the data you are asking for. I will give a summary statement because the data charts are fairly extensive. Clark County School District Victory schools have seen an increase in student achievement throughout the 2015-16 school year. We are really just talking about one year of data so far. Through a progress-monitoring tool called Evaluate, the district has been able to monitor the progress of 20 out of 24 of our schools; 16 elementary, and 4 secondary schools. Students are tested on end-of-year standards each month and alternate the standards tested each month as well. Victory elementary schools have shown an average increase of 21.59 percent in the number of students proficient in English language arts with the highest increase being 42.5 percent. Victory elementary schools show an average increase of 37.5 percent in the number of students proficient in math with the highest increase in math being 62 percent. These increases show promise in raising student achievement levels to the proficiency level, and Evaluate testing will continue for the 2016-17 school year. These data charts are available in that report as well. Obviously, we support Victory schools and want to see their continued progress.

I will add to the comments on this possible friendly amendment. In section 1, subsection 2, it says the Department of Education shall designate a public school as a Victory school. We are just asking that the Department shall designate in consultation with school districts. We also have had this discussion with the Department just to take into consideration other things that are happening in schools that may be eligible. As you have heard extensively tonight, we have a turnaround process. We have other schools that are Zoom schools, and there are other reforms that are happening. The legislation does include that those things are not overlapping. As we have planning processes for those various reforms, we want to ensure that we can consult with the Department about what that looks like in each school and plan accordingly.

**Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District:**

We are here in support. I think the Victory schools program here in the Washoe County School District (WCSD) is really interesting. We have four schools in WCSD that are Victory schools, and they are really all over the map. We have one rural Native American Victory school. We have an elementary school that has our highest percentage of students who are homeless. We have a charter school, and also a high school.

We have many different things that we are looking at. Like Ms. Rourke, we have about one year of performance data. You have heard from Superintendent Canavero that the external evaluator also recommended that this program continue based on the initial success. I think there was some comment about having better measures that we could compare across schools and is something we are exploring. My point about the different kinds of Victory schools in WCSD is that Victory is great, and it allows the schools to customize the funding to meet the needs of each particular school, which in the case of WCSD are very different. That has been a key part of the Victory funding in WCSD. We would really like to see that continue and grow. We are here in support and especially the part that the districts could be consulted in selecting those schools.

**Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association:**

We strongly support Nevada's Victory school program, and we support A.B. 447 with the amendment described by the sponsor. Nevada State Education Association's (NSEA) parent organization, Nevada Education Association (NEA), has been engaged in a significant coalition for community schools for a number of years. We believe there are about 4,000 community schools across the country, and the data from those efforts is compelling. Anecdotally, in terms of wrap-around services, it is pretty easy to see that there is a great deal of interconnectedness in terms of the academic, physical, mental, social, and emotional development of students, their families, and their communities. For example, students who have access to good nutrition at home, dental and medical services, and counseling programs where necessary, are going to arrive at school ready to learn, and student achievement simply is going to be better. We appreciate the Chairman's effort on this to elevate wrap-around service, and we are supportive of the bill as amended.

**Jessica Ferrato, representing Nevada Association of School Boards:**

I would like to echo the comments of both Clark and Washoe County School Districts. As this is a very new program, the feedback has been excellent. We have gotten positive reports from districts, as well as families, and we do like the customization we can do in our districts. Every school is different—rural, urban, and even within a district. We love that flexibility. I would also say the same thing that Washoe and Clark did regarding consultation with the districts. We do appreciate that because, as they said, funding is moved around in certain ways, and we want to make sure we are not duplicating efforts. We are in support of the bill and thank the Chairman for his work on it.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents; and Nevada Association of School Administrators:**

Victory schools have been very helpful to the rural districts as well. Nye, Humboldt, and Elko Counties all have Victory schools. It has been nicely set up, and there is a lot of community involvement. We are supportive of the bill and of the amendment that was presented by the Chairman. Thank you.

**Rebekah Holder, Government Affairs Strategic Analyst, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas:**

We support A.B. 447 and agree with Chairman Thompson's statement, "Keep Victory schools alive." We thank you for your time and we thank you for your consideration in continuing the Victory school program and the funding thereof.

**Ed Gonzalez, representing Clark County Education Association:**

We represent 18,000 teaching professionals in southern Nevada. We are in support of A.B. 447, and we especially appreciate the Chairman bringing up that conceptual amendment ([Exhibit HH](#)). Since the City of Las Vegas spoke, for you who serve on the Committee on Government Affairs, this works well with Assembly Bill 70, which allows for redevelopment funds to be used for wrap-around services, so we think this is another way to help schools.

In addition, one of the things that we have actually talked about is that we want to make sure that equitable funding is for all students. So we appreciate the Chairman as well for being one of the sponsors of Senate Bill 178 to make sure we have a weighted funding formula, so we do not leave 154,000 students behind in Clark County.

**Aaron Gordon, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here in support of A.B. 447 and will specifically focus on sections 8 and 9. Assembly Bill 447 and its provisions bring to the forefront judiciary obligations when it comes to the education of our students here in Clark County and all districts within Nevada. With this bill and the necessary funding it provides, school districts have the opportunity and the means to address overwhelming academic limitation hindering our children from receiving the quality education they need and deserve. With this reasonable legislation and the funding obligated by the Governor for Victory schools, school districts will have the means to partner with specialized community agencies, equipped with identifying and addressing limiting factors of students. We must ask ourselves, how can we expect our students to come to school each day and succeed academically if they are unable to read words written on the board due to not having the glasses needed to do so. Or, if a student is unable to concentrate due to not eating since lunch provided at school the day prior. Assembly Bill 447 gives school districts within Nevada the capability and guidelines to address these nonacademic limitations and to give every student an opportunity to receive and achieve a quality education.

[Letter in support of A.B. 447 from Educate Nevada Now was submitted but not discussed ([Exhibit II](#)).]

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 447 in either Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition to A.B. 447? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who is neutral?

**Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

We are obviously in support of Victory and the Governor's recommended budget includes an additional \$30 million to expand Victory to a total of \$80 million over the biennium to sustain and expand. Frankly, I have not had an opportunity to go through the conceptual amendments, but to wrap it up, I look forward to working with Chairman Thompson on the bill.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

Thank you for the time. We love Victory schools, and we need to keep them alive.

**Vice Chair Joiner:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 447.

[Assemblyman Thompson reassumed the Chair.]

**Chairman Thompson:**

At this time, we will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 482.

**Assembly Bill 482: Revises provisions relating to programs of career and technical education. (BDR 34-1093)**

**Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

I am joined by our director for the Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options, Chris Nelson, and Patrick Bell for any questions that you might have.

For all intents and purposes, this is a cleanup bill aligning some of the work that we are doing on the writ large workforce development and K-12 preparation for students. Obviously, this focuses on our career and technical education (CTE) program, a successful program in our state.

Section 1, subsection 5(b) is a fix related to the funding of our career technical students' organizations (CTSO). We had a need to fix this from last session, so we have included not more than 5 percent. We have budgeted \$40,000 per CTSO to support these seven CTSOs.

Section 4 is engaging the State Board for Career and Technical Education that for all intents and purposes is the State Board of Education. Just so you do not think that there are two boards, it is basically the same body that serves in two functions. The State Board for Career and Technical Education requests that the representatives be from the industry sector council. There is a clear intent here to engage representatives of the industry sector council to provide some recommendations. You will see in section 2 we are just eliminating the redundancy that we have now created by the changes in section 1, subsection 4. Section 2, subsection 2 is eliminated.



Section 3 talks about improving as well as expanding existing programs. We are proposing to strike the criteria and instead allow for those criteria to be established by regulation of the State Board of Education. As you know, regulations are established through a public rulemaking process. We feel that, in this case, it allows for some of the nimble and flexible work as we continue to improve CTE in alignment with the emerging industries and economic developments, and it is critical to have that at this stage.

Section 3, subsection 2, does the same. Section 3, subsection 3 just clarifies how we count enrollments. It gets really complicated with the duplication and definition, and it actually makes it more clear when we talk about counting enrollment of pupils in programs of CTE.

Section 4 just clarifies that the Executive Officer of the State Board for Career and Technical Education shall designate a program professional rather than someone from the State Board of Education. It would be my duty rather than the State Board of Education's.

Those are the amendments to Assembly Bill 482.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Are there any questions for A.B. 482? [There were none.] We will start in Las Vegas with support of A.B. 482.

**Frank R. Woodbeck, Vice Chancellor, Workforce Development, Nevada System of Higher Education:**

We want to express our support for A.B. 482. It provides a greater alignment with the career pathways that are being created for the industry sectors that we are going after in economic development. It tightens that particular alignment. Also, I have personally been working with the Department of Education and the CTE director regarding career pathways and the new skills for youth initiative that we have on the way. I urge your support for this particular bill.

**Chairman Thompson:**

Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 482? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition to A.B. 482? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral to A.B. 482? [There was no one.]

**Steve Canavero:**

I appreciate your support, and we will continue to move this forward.

**Chairman Thompson:**

We will close the hearing for A.B. 482. Is there anyone here for public comment? [There was no one.] Are there any comments from the Committee? [There were none.] The meeting is adjourned [at 9:42 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sharon McCallen  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Chairman

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

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of an article from Chalk Talk, dated May 2, 2016, titled "iZone chief Sharon Griffin on fixing Memphis' most challenging schools," submitted by Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7,

[Exhibit D](#) is an article submitted by Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7 from the Tennessee Consortium on Research, Evaluation and Development, titled "Evaluation of the Effects of Tennessee's Achievement School District on Student Test Scores," dated December 2015.

[Exhibit E](#) is a document submitted by Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7, from the Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury, titled Achievement School District Performance Audit Report, August 2016.

[Exhibit F](#) is a document titled "Evaluate Proficiency," dated April 5, 2017, submitted and presented by Dr. Darryl Wyatt, Principal, Gwendolyn Woolley Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit G](#) are proposed conceptual amendments to [Assembly Bill 103](#) and [Assembly Bill 432](#), submitted by Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education.

[Exhibit H](#) is a document titled "Parents in the driver's seat . . ." submitted by Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education.

[Exhibit I](#) is a document titled "Nevada's Lowest Performing School Performance," submitted by Steve Canavero, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education.

[Exhibit J](#) is material regarding [Assembly Bill 103](#) submitted by Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, Department of Education, consisting of the following:

1. A table titled "Nevada Department of Education Responses to Suggested Amendments made to R108-15 from September 7, 2016 hearing."
2. A table titled "Responses to comments presented by Clark County School District Trustees to Nevada Legislative Commission Sub Committee on November 2, 2016 regarding R108-15A."
3. A table titled "Nevada Department of Education Responses to Clark County School District Bond Oversight Committees concerns and questions on the Nevada Achievement School District, shared at a joint meeting with the Clark County School District Board of Trustees, December 7, 2016."

4. A table titled "Nevada Department of Education Responses to Suggested Amendments made to R108-15 from December 22, 2016 public hearing."
5. An informational sheet titled "Appendix A."
6. A document titled "Start of Tennessee Achievement School District."

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter in support of [Assembly Bill 103](#), authored and submitted by Seth Litt, Executive Director, Parent Revolution.

[Exhibit L](#) is material submitted by Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7, consisting of the following:

1. A document titled "Vanderbilt Study Compares ASD, I-Zone Achievement," by Bill Dries
2. A document titled "Tennessee audit critical of Achievement School District finances," dated August 17, 2016, by Jennifer Pignolet, USA TODAY NETWORK.
3. A document titled "Memphis iZone schools outpaced state-run turnaround efforts," dated February 18, 2016, by Jason Gonzales.
4. A policy brief titled "Recruitment and Retention of teachers in Tennessee's Achievement School District and iZone Schools," dated February 2017, by Gary T. Henry, Ron Zimmer, Adam Kho, and Lam Pham.
5. An informational sheet titled "[A.B. 103 Exhibits – Assemblywoman Neal](#)."

[Exhibit M](#) are letters in support of [Assembly Bill 103](#).

[Exhibit N](#) are letters in opposition to [Assembly Bill 103](#).

[Exhibit O](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 64](#), dated April 5, 2017, presented by Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit P](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 127](#), dated April 5, 2017, presented by Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit Q](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 484](#), dated April 5, 2017, presented by Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit R](#) is an informational sheet titled "Sex Education," submitted by Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Assembly District No. 24.

[Exhibit S](#) is a letter dated February 28, 2017, in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#), to Chairman Thompson and members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored and presented by Matthew Richardson, Secretary, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and representing Juvenile Justice Probation Officers Association.

[Exhibit T](#) is an informational sheet titled "Nevada—2015 State Health Profile," submitted by Vivian Leal, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit U](#) is written testimony in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#), presented by Vivian Leal, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit V](#) is an informational sheet submitted by Vivian Leal, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit W](#) is written testimony submitted by Jennifer Howell, Sexual Health Program Coordinator, Washoe County Health District, dated April 5, 2017, in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#).

[Exhibit X](#) is a letter dated April 4, 2017, in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#) to Chairman Thompson and members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored by John Packham, Ph.D., Chair, Advocacy and Policy Committee, Nevada Public Health Association and submitted by Michael Hackett, representing Nevada Public Health Association; and Nevada Primary Care Association.

[Exhibit Y](#) is written testimony in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#) authored and submitted by Erika Minaberry, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit Z](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2017 in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#), to Chairman Thompson and members of the Assembly Committee on Education authored by Tod Story, Executive Director, and Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada, submitted by Tod Story, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada.

[Exhibit AA](#) is a document titled "Opt-In vs. Opt-Out Sex Education," submitted by Tod Story, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada.

[Exhibit BB](#) is a letter in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#), authored by June Ingram, President, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada, presented by Juanita Clark, Board Member, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit CC](#) are letters in support of [Assembly Bill 348](#).

[Exhibit DD](#) are letters in opposition to [Assembly Bill 348](#).

[Exhibit EE](#) is written testimony in support of [Assembly Bill 432](#), submitted and presented by Anna Slighting, representing Honoring our Public Education, Las Vegas, Nevada, dated April 5, 2017.

[Exhibit FF](#) is written testimony in support of [Assembly Bill 432](#), submitted and presented by Don Soifer, Vice Chair, District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, Washington, D.C.

[Exhibit GG](#) are letters in opposition to Assembly Bill 432.

[Exhibit HH](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to Assembly Bill 447 presented by Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17.

[Exhibit II](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2017 in support of Assembly Bill 447 to Chairman Thompson and members of the Assembly Committee on Education, authored and submitted by Amanda Morgan, Legal Director, and Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director for Educate Nevada Now.