

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Eighty-second Session
April 26, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Roberta Lange at 2:09 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 2023, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Roberta Lange, Chair
Senator Edgar Flores, Vice Chair
Senator Dina Neal
Senator Fabian Doñate
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Carrie A. Buck
Senator Robin L. Titus

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14
Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jen Sturm-Gahner, Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Counsel
Kirsten Oleson, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Paul Moradkhan, Vegas Chamber
Maureen Schafer, Council for a Better Nevada
Francesca Petrucci, Clark County Education Association
Dale Erquiaga, Acting Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education

Senate Committee on Education
April 26, 2023
Page 2

Denise Beronio, Administrator, Division of Outdoor Recreation, Nevada
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Tom Clark, Nevada Outdoor Business Coalition
Sheila Bray, University of Nevada, Reno
Lea Case, Nevada Public Health Association
Nick Schneider, Vegas Chamber
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Nevada Conservation League
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Shelbie Swartz, Battle Born Progress
Hank Brown, Carson Montessori School
Renee Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs,
Nevada System of Higher Education
Anthony Ruiz, Nevada State College
Amanda Vaskov, Associated Students of the University of Nevada
Kanani Espinoza, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Lawrence Weekly, College of Southern Nevada
Michael Flores, University of Nevada, Reno
Doug Unger, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Kevin Osorio Hernandez
Amy Koo, One APIA Nevada

CHAIR LANGE:

We will start with the hearing of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 118.

ASSEMBLY BILL 118: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada System of
Higher Education. (BDR 34-127)

ASSEMBLYMAN HOWARD WATTS (Assembly District No. 15):

I am here to present A.B. 118 for your consideration. I am joined by Paul Moradkhan with the Vegas Chamber. Assembly Bill 118 was a measure that came out of the last Southern Nevada Forum. The Forum is spearheaded by the Vegas Chamber. It brings a diverse group of stakeholders together from across southern Nevada to make policy recommendations and address the issues our community faces. This bill was a recommendation from the Good Governance Committee, where I had the pleasure of serving as one of the co-chairs during the last Interim. All of the working groups are bipartisan and bicameral.

Assembly Bill 118 seeks to revise the composition of the Board of Regents. It reduces its membership from 13 members to 9 members and reduces the regent's terms from 6 years to 4 years. This bill attempts to reduce the discourse in the Board of Regents to promote increased collaboration. It does so by having a slightly tighter group of regents who can deliberate and, hopefully, come to a consensus on doing what is best for our State's higher education system.

It is also changing the term lengths to be commensurate with all other State education bodies and most other noneducation bodies. The only office that has a term longer than four years is judiciary. People in judiciary have to be at least in the legal profession as lawyers. We want to make sure we are providing a forum for regents to regularly be held accountable to the people by having more than one reelection before they reach their term limits.

Moving the term to four years would align the term with my colleagues here in the State Senate, county officers, city officers, county school board members and with the State Board of Education members.

I will not walk through the nitty gritty details of the bill. As you can see, it is fairly short. It would take effect in 2028. The goal is to make sure no existing regent's term is affected. I know there have been questions about redistricting and redrawing the districts. Because there are two legislative sessions before this bill would take effect, redistricting would be seen as a fully open and collaborative process, which has been done during our normal redistricting period. This would take place over the next few years. People would gather to have an open and inclusive process. The redrawn map would be brought to the Legislature to consider during the 2025 or 2027 Legislative Sessions.

The goals of this bill are to make sure that no currently elected regents have their term or district impacted by these changes; there is a clear pathway for this transition and all candidates would be aware of the reorganization moving forward.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Vegas Chamber):

As you heard, this bill emerged from the Southern Nevada Forum, as part of an interim activity where we heard from an entire community. As many of you know, the Forum is chaired in a bipartisan effort to bring issues forward, not just on behalf of the business community, but also on behalf of the philanthropy

community, educators and community members. It is a well-established endeavor that has occurred over the last ten years.

The Chamber has been actively involved with government reform for many years. We believe changing the Board of Regents is an important step to improve our higher education system. Employers care about the success of higher education because they hire the students. It is important to our members and employers in our community that when these students graduate from the system, they are ready with a solid foundation to start their careers. We believe reform will benefit all institutions in the State, regardless of whether the institution is in Reno, Las Vegas, Carson City or Elko. This is a good governance bill for our community and our Statewide community.

We appreciate Assemblyman Watts for bringing this bill forward. This bill is student-focused. It will support students and allow faculty to do what they need to do. We recognize some recent changes have been positive for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), but going back 20 to 30 years, there have been systematic problems that have concerned us.

This bill shrinks the regent size and the maps would need to be redrawn. It is our belief there will be no impact proportionately to one community or another. It will be systematically adjusted across the State. In terms of issues around democracy, changing the term length from six years to four years will give voters more of an opportunity to hold elected officials accountable. When someone serves 12 years, they are only elected twice. The term limit will give voters three times to elect a regent. It is important to give voters a say in elections more often.

As Assemblyman Watts mentioned, the only other position with a six-year term is a judge. The Legislature has either two- or four-year terms depending on the house. Consistency is important. This is an important bill to move forward.

Throughout the history of the regents, its size has fluctuated. About 20 years ago, the size of the Board of Regents was increased because, as a State, we thought a larger board would allow for greater collaboration. That has not been the case. At times, there has been discord and challenges. We believe a smaller Board of Regents will serve Nevada better. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIR LANGE:

As you reduce the number of board seats, I am interested in the ethnic representation. Have you looked at the current Board and their ethnicity? By deleting particular seats, which ones would be deleted?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

I might have to defer to others to talk about the current makeup of the Board. We do not have maps. Those maps would have to be drawn and, ultimately, approved by the Legislature. To the extent that we can redraw those districts, they have to be compliant with the Voting Rights Act and other laws. We need to give various communities the opportunity to have the electoral power to select their representatives.

There are not specific seats being eliminated, rather a proposed change in the number of seats. Any number of seats past nine would be phased out and reincorporated into other districts. The map will look different with 9 districts instead of 13.

Logistically, there could be regents who end up in the same district and want to compete to continue as a regent. At this point, it is hard to predict several years down the road what the Board will look like. The redistricting does not necessarily target specific individuals to have their seats removed; it is a scaling down of the Board overall. In the process of scaling down, districts will be redrawn fairly and equitably across the State to accommodate a 9-member Board, as opposed to a 13-member Board.

SENATOR NEAL:

My question piggybacks on the previous question. How would communities of interest be reflected in the division of the new seats? How would they be carved out?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

The way I understand this, NSHE would use the same process they have used over the last two redistricting cycles to redraw seats. They have undergone their own process to engage community members to figure out the communities of interest and how those can be preserved, not divided. They bring forward proposals which, ultimately, come to the Legislature. As a Body, we have authority to make the final determination. We could adjust any boundaries that come from the proposal from NSHE. It would follow our existing rules,

procedures and laws in adopting the maps. By doing so, it would ensure communities of interest are protected and other requirements for redistricting are carried out.

SENATOR NEAL:

Theoretically, will we be updating the census numbers, or will we use the numbers as they exist in 2027?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

Obviously, we cannot conduct a full census in between census counts. We get updated population estimates from the American Community Survey which is done by the U.S. Census Bureau. However, those numbers do not reflect a full census. I am not sure if, and to what extent, we can use those population estimates since they are not an official census. To the extent it would be viable to do so, we could pursue using updated population counts.

SENATOR NEAL:

I have a third question not related to census or communities of interest. You talked about efficiencies, but in order for regents to have effective policymaking, they have to be able to communicate with each other. The Open Meeting Law violation is not being addressed at all. Regardless of changing the number of regents, being able to talk to each other about policy and discuss and make deliberative decisions is a problem. How are we going to deal with that? Get your magic wand.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

That is a bigger conversation we need to have. Open Meeting law and trying to figure out the balance between transparency and deliberation—allowing for a thoughtful exchange of ideas—is an issue across many different elected bodies. That is a worthwhile conversation. I support transparency, but I also recognize when members cannot have discussions prior to the meeting, it can pose challenges for productive conversations.

That is a good point but for a different bill. I do not want to discount that it is another important consideration. This bill is something that the Vegas Chamber, others who were involved and I felt could make a positive difference. A tighter group, similar to the size of other decision-making bodies such as the Clark County Commission, which has seven, and the State Board of Education, could lead to easier deliberations and consensus.

SENATOR BUCK:

You mentioned the term of a regent is 12 years, is that correct?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

The term limit is 12 years, similar to our positions. They have a six-year term. Under the current model, regents run for a six-year term, then a second reelection for another six-year term. That is the term limit. Under this proposal, regents would have four-year terms. They could have three four-year terms. That would be the term limit for the Board.

SENATOR BUCK:

Being in a four-year term myself, I typically spend about a year and a half of that term campaigning. Do you see this as being more productive because campaigning ends up taking time away from serving?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

As I am currently serving in a two-year term, I believe they can make it work.

SENATOR TITUS:

Although I appreciate the presumed basis for this bill, it was created by the Southern Nevada Forum. My biggest concern is the Southern Nevada Forum got together and thought about what is best for southern Nevada, not necessarily the whole State.

Assuming there are 3.2 million people in the State, each of the 13 current representatives serve an average of 246,000 people. By narrowing the Board down to 9 members, each member will represent 355,000 people. Would you look at dividing the map by latitude or longitude? Where were you looking at dividing this map? Is it the demographic location or the number of people being represented?

In other words, my concern is northern Nevada may only have one person on the Board. We know students in our State go throughout the entire State for education. Some students may come from the north and go south or go to rural colleges or vice versa. My concern is about representation for all Nevadans, not just what the Southern Nevada Forum felt was best for southern Nevada.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

I appreciate that. I would like to point out a couple of things. In determining rural representation, part of it depends on how the maps are cut. When drawing maps, they look at how many people represent rural populations or how many people represent some portion of Washoe County or the Truckee Meadows metropolitan area. Depending on how the maps are drawn, there might be one to three people representing those areas.

Some communities might be split up, meaning, someone across the street from you might have a different representative. Whether that necessarily equates to greater representation for an area is debatable. At the end of the day, everybody only has representation by one member of the Board of Regents. That gives us all a level of equality, no matter the overall size of the Board.

Additionally, depending on how the map is divided, some areas could be described as punching above their weight in terms of proportion of the population to proportion of representation they have.

It is a judgement call whether it is better to have all of a rural area represented by one person, who has a base of knowledge for the entire community, or split it into multiple pieces where the rural representative might also represent urban communities. Those types of issues are wrestled with regardless of the size of the Board.

At the end of the day, maps are going to be drawn based on the one-person one-vote principle; everyone is only going to have one regent; and every area is going to be drawn based on population to ensure the number of people a regent represents is essentially equal.

SENATOR TITUS:

I do not necessarily agree with your conclusion. I certainly agree with one-person, one-vote. With more regents, there is a higher likelihood that they will represent more areas of the State. Again, I am concerned about the representation of everybody.

I represent six very diverse counties, which include South Lake Tahoe, Fernley, Yerington, among other small urban cities. Each place has dramatically different needs—especially considering the different needs of rural agriculture communities.

I get what you are saying, one-person one-vote. Reducing the Board members would increase the representation by over 100,000 people. I worry about the distribution.

MR. MORADKHAN:

Obviously, the name is Southern Nevada Forum, but we have members from northern Nevada and rural communities come to meetings. Their voices have been part of the process. It may be called the Southern Nevada Forum, but many of the ideas that are brought forward are from a Statewide perspective. The Vegas Chamber has members throughout the State. Reforming accountability, being student-focused and doing the best for our students is a Statewide goal, not just a goal from southern Nevada.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Mr. Moradkhan made the statement I was going to make. It is called the Southern Nevada Forum, but many times we think about what would be good for northern Nevada. The issues that emerge are Statewide issues. We bring these issues up in the Southern Nevada Forum. Some of the issues are not regional, but we still try to figure out the best approach. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of this bill and look forward to figuring it out.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

To the broader point, while there are some regional-specific issues, the approach the Forum and I take is: a policy that benefits southern Nevada, benefits the State, and a policy that benefits the State benefits southern Nevada.

CHAIR LANGE:

Is there anyone wishing to speak in support of A.B. 118?

MAUREEN SCHAFER (Council for a Better Nevada):

I am here in support of A.B. 118. This bill seeks to increase accountability over the NSHE Board of Regents. We support this bill because governance matters in all aspects of operations and success of public, private and nonprofit organizations. We know and understand that fact.

When it comes to the business of higher education, the professionals in the sector have been watching the trends and understand major shifts are beginning to occur in this space. Birth rates in the U.S. are beginning to decline for the

first time in decades. College and graduate applications are beginning to decline for the first time. That means the fight for students will increase among institutions of higher education.

In addition, for the first time, the top 20 universities worldwide, which have always been U.S. institutions, have 2 international universities in the rankings. The world is catching up to the U.S. in competitive higher education offerings.

Here in Nevada, the Board of Regents is a system that has failed to police itself and has been the subject of repeated ethical complaints. It has largely become a system of people we have let control us. It has made us ask ourselves if they should be in control.

To clarify, there are very good and qualified people who have been and currently are regents. However, when there is a struggling and ethically-challenged system repeatedly causing good and qualified people to perform poorly, it is incumbent on all of us to think about changing the system. If we do not, the outcomes will rarely provide the return on investment we expect for the vast financial investment in pupil time that you, as elected officials, and we, as taxpayers, have made in our students, families and economy. That statement is true, regardless of who we ask to serve within this archaic governance model.

Assembly Bill 118 begins to modernize the governance model. The world is changing around us and will continue to do so. Most states have already put a different higher education governance model into place and are ahead of us in taking advantage of the changing demographics happening in higher education nationally and internationally. Please support A.B. 118 to enable Nevada, the limited dollars you invest in it, our students and the economy to benefit and keep up.

FRANCESCA PETRUCCI (Clark County Education Association):

The Clark County Education Association is in strong support of A.B. 118. This Session, a theme of accountability has emerged, which is something that my organization is proud to help promote. Assembly Bill 118 provides accountability. Governance is the hub of accountability. It is the check on an institution, in this case NSHE. It is also a check on the budget, vision, mission, and, ultimately, the outcomes. This bill moves us toward a more effective model of governance. We look forward to the forthcoming discussion around Clark County School Board reforms.

CHAIR LANGE:

Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition?

DALE ERQUIAGA (Acting Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education):

As the primary appointed employee of the Board, I am here on behalf of the Board. In the other house, the chair and vice chair of the Board of Regents were available to testify in opposition to this bill. They apologize for being unable to come today.

The Board has not voted on this bill, but in a meeting in early February, the chair polled the Board in a consensus format to give me direction on our positions during the Session on this and other issues. The sponsor had kindly chatted with me about what the components of this bill might be. The Board expressed, through direction to me, its opposition to changing the terms or size of the Board.

The testimony from my bosses in the other house centered on what Senator Titus brought up, which is the size of a district represented by an individual on a nine-member board. There would be winners and losers because we apportion seats based on population. Therefore, northern Nevada would lose representation on almost any map drawing.

CHAIR LANGE:

Seeing no one wishing to speak in neutral, I will now close the hearing on A.B. 118 and open the hearing on A.B. 164.

ASSEMBLY BILL 164 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to outdoor recreation. (BDR S-487)

ASSEMBLYMAN STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

It is my honor to present A.B. 164. With me at the table is our new administrator of the Nevada Division of Outdoor Recreation, Ms. Denise Beronio, to help answer any questions and make comments, when it is appropriate. This is a first reprint of the bill and an amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) that I will cover briefly at the end.

Those who know me know that getting outdoors is a passion of mine, especially because we spend so much time inside this building. It can be hard to sit here and process. Getting outdoors has been important to me and my mental health.

Throughout my time here, I have made it a priority to make sure I do what I can to get our kids outdoors.

This bill is the continuation of an effort that started in 2017. Back in 2017, my first session, I had a chance to create A.B. No. 385 of the 79th Session, which was the "Kids in Parks" bill. It gave all of the fifth graders in the State a free parks pass to get into our State parks. Governor Brian Sandoval signed that bill at the Mormon Station State Historic Park, which was a pretty cool bill signing for my first one. I do not know if I will ever top that. It was a special day and that prompted me to visit all of our State parks over the next few years. I am proud to say I have been to every one of our State parks. I would like to spend more time at the State parks. Hopefully, after Session, I can do that.

In the 2019 Session, we passed A.B. No. 331 of the 80th Session, called the "No Child Left Inside" Act, which created the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program. That was a program set up to help get kids outside, particularly to fund busses, transportation and similar things. We set up the program, but we did not fund it. We did not have any money in it. Then, in 2020, the coronavirus pandemic hit. There is no money in that account right now, but there is a recommendation in the Governor's Executive Budget, I think for \$250,000, to go into that account. I am hopeful we will be able to do that.

What you have in front of you, A.B. 164, is an effort to study in the Interim how we might be able to integrate outdoor learning into our education system. It is a one-time study group, not one that will remain forever in statute. We are not the only state that has taken on this issue; Washington and Georgia have as well. Georgia recently came out with a report.

This bill sets up a working group to meet in the Interim. There are many members in this bill. At last count, I have 15 members in the group. When I first started this process, I had a list of about 35 people. If you have created similar bills that incorporate members, you know you have to try to find a manageable amount. Thirty members is too many. In working with my colleagues in the Assembly, we made some amendments. This bill now has 15 participating members. Included in that number are legislators, people in the outdoor recreation space, teachers and parents.

The idea is they would meet in the Interim and discuss how other states have integrated outdoor learning with education. Some parameters are set forth in

this bill including: the participant can get a day off work without taking leave; the Division of Outdoor Recreation can accept gifts and grants to run the Program; and, at the suggestion of the Assembly, the group has one bill draft request (BDR). Of course, they do not have to use the BDR, but if they get to the end of the study and they decide they want to use it, they can. That is the bill in front of you.

I have been in discussion with other groups that want to be a part of the working group, if it passes. I am talking to the Nevada Department of Wildlife to have one member as part of the group, which makes sense. I am also thinking of an odd-numbered membership versus an even-numbered membership. I do not have that amendment for this Committee today.

The conceptual amendment is dated April 19, 2023, because that is when this bill was originally scheduled to be heard. This relates to A.B. No. 331 of the 80th Session, which was the Outdoor Education and Grant Recreation Program I talked about earlier. When that Program was set up, there was going to be a technical advisory committee that would administer the program through the *Nevada Administrative Code*. It has not been set up because there is no money in the Program and, as you know, we have had a lot of turnover in State agencies.

The amendment gets rid of another technical advisory committee. Instead, this would allow the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation, which already exists and meets, to be the Advisory Board that would administer the grants. That means when schools apply for grants, the Advisory Board would be able to take that information and decide how to grant the money. This amendment is an attempt to streamline the Program because, if funding comes in, I do not want to delay it by setting up another committee for the money when the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation already exists. I have been working with former Senator James Settelmeyer, who is now in leadership at the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. We collaborated on this bill.

DENISE BERONIO (Administrator, Division of Outdoor Recreation, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

The Division of Outdoor Recreation is testifying in support of A.B. 164 and the proposed amendment. The Division's mission is to advance and promote sustainable, world-class outdoor recreation opportunities throughout Nevada.

Our primary focus is to improve public health and wellness and to increase community capacity for outdoor recreation and stewardship. To accomplish this, it is important to pursue programs and partnerships that support diverse opportunities to incorporate outdoor education into prekindergarten through Grade 12 educational programs.

The Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program created by the Legislature, which has proposed funding through the Governor's recommended budget, has the potential to serve as a supportive, adjoining State effort to create opportunities for youth engagement with local outdoor spaces in schools and in extracurricular activities.

Additionally, recommendations of the working group proposed in A.B. 164 may elicit projects that are eligible for grant funding under this Program. The working group could serve as a catalyst for partnerships and future opportunities to increase outdoor recreation and education in Nevada. Outdoor recreation and education brings a plethora of known academic, health and behavioral benefits to students and schools. Nevada public schools have the potential to be an exemplary setting for implementing outdoor education into the lives of Nevada youth.

Access to outdoor spaces is the hallmark of many Nevada communities, though often without programmed connections to our educational system. Expert recommendations, paired with grant dollars, can start to change that dynamic and afford our communities, especially in under-resourced areas, greater access to the local outdoor spaces to promote regular outdoor activity.

The Division of Outdoor Recreation supports the amendment proposed by Speaker Yeager to allow the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation to serve as the technical advisory committee for this Grant Program. This modification will help streamline dispersing grants as the Advisory Board is already established and has been meeting over the past year.

SENATOR NEAL:

I appreciate this bill. Our generation grew up outside, whether it was playing freeze tag in the front yard or "Mother May I." Parents did not want us in the house. How will we do outreach to the minority communities? I saw in the bill there is a representative from the Office of Minority Health and Equity. I know Roz Brooks from Vegas Roots has a group that is currently engaging with and

trying to bring more minority communities outdoors. Would you consider including that group as a member?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

In the initial iteration, there were many different members. Tom Clark testified on this bill in the Assembly. He said something that made sense, which was "you cannot have everybody be a member because then there is nobody to present to the group." The working group would have certain membership but, much like we do in the Legislature, they will have people and groups come in to present. The group will make connections and hear from those types of organizations about what they do. I am still thinking about the membership. I want to be very deliberate about not making the group too big, so they still have groups that can provide some testimony.

Your point is well taken. There are a lot of groups sort of involved in this space in their own little areas including some in southern Nevada and other parts of the State. I am hoping that this can be a way to pull all these groups together to focus on whatever comes out of this bill, including the companion part of the Grant Program to fund some of these things.

SENATOR NEAL:

I was thinking it would be better to have Vegas Roots instead of the Office of Minority Health, since they are focused on many other things. The Office of Minority Health has limited staff, mostly contract staff who may or may not be there in 2024 or 2025.

Vegas Roots is specifically focused on the outdoors. I think they started working with the Nevada Department of Wildlife recently to increase cohesion throughout the State for hiking, camping as well as other outdoor activities. They started an adult swim team for minorities to help people learn how to swim. I think Vegas Roots would be a better fit than the Office of Minority Health.

SENATOR TITUS:

It is hard for me to fathom that we need to have legislation to get people to go outside. As someone who grew up in rural Nevada and still spend as much time as I can outside, I did not realize we would need to have legislation to do that.

I need some clarification. Under the existing Division of Outdoor Recreation, you have an advisory committee that handles grants, but that is not currently operating because you do not have any grants. Does that already exist?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

The Division of Outdoor Recreation already has the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation, which is chaired by the Lieutenant Governor. The membership is set up in statute. I think we created that office in the 2017 Session. Alongside that Advisory Board, a Grant Program was created through A.B. No. 331 of the 80th Session. It was envisioned that it would operate with a different technical advisory group set up under regulations to work on just the Grant Program. There is no funding in the Grant Program. The technical advisory group has never been appointed.

The thought behind the bill is to take an existing committee that oversees outdoor education and let them administer the Grant Program, instead of having a duplicative membership with two groups doing similar things. I do not know if the Advisory Board already does grant work.

MS. BERONIO:

Being brand new to the position—it is my tenth day—I hope I can give some insight. The current Board is set up to take on the tasks of what the advisory committee would do. To have both would be duplicative. The Advisory Board would cover most of what the other group would do. The Advisory Board has met once this year. They changed their meeting schedule to four times a year for the Lieutenant Governor. We feel as though the existing Advisory Board would be adequate.

SENATOR TITUS:

Are we looking at having a third board?

MS. BERONIO:

Only one.

SENATOR TITUS:

Assemblyman Yeager said there was the initial board of outdoor recreation and there was another board for grants within that, correct? Now we are looking at a third advisory board to get people to go outside. There are three boards just to get people outside?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

There is one board that exists and has always existed. The technical advisory committee never got appointed. It is a group that does not exist. In this bill, there is a one-time study group that will meet during the Interim to think about matching outdoor education with the educational curriculum. This study group would go away after this current Interim.

SENATOR TITUS:

You are looking at potentially setting up a third group. Yes, one group does not exist but one does exist and this study group would make the third group. This study group would self-end at the end of July? When does it officially end? It says it starts on July 1, 2023. I see the date December 31, 2024. Is that when it will end?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I will defer to Mr. Killian. The way I read it is the study group would submit the report on December 31, 2024. That would be the end of the working group unless we authorize them to continue to meet in the next Interim.

SENATOR TITUS:

At that time, they will potentially present a BDR. They get one of those. I have a difficult time comprehending the need for legislation to get people to go outside. I do like the part of the bill that is encouraging schools to look at how they can help get people outside.

I am not totally against this, but it is foreign to me that we have to do this at all. I support the concept and like that the group disappears after December 2024. They will come up with some ideas and potentially submit a BDR. This group could be a phoenix and reemerge. Conceptually, I like the idea of working with school groups in urban settings to understand why people are not getting outside. I am supportive of that, but it is not something I am used to doing.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I certainly understand that sentiment. I was pretty surprised to learn, maybe it does not surprise everyone in here, that there are many students who have never been to Red Rock Canyon or Valley of Fire, which are practically in their backyard. These are big outdoor attractions in Las Vegas. That could be, in part, because of transportation issues. Busses are needed to visit these places.

Some studies I have seen, which might not be true in rural communities, show children spend as little as ten minutes outside these days. To Senator Neal's point, my mom used to lock me out of the house and say do not come back until dinner. I am amazed I did not get into more trouble than I did.

The intent of this bill is to understand why kids are not getting outside and how to incorporate that more. I appreciate the comments. Hopefully, we will get some good work done if this outdoor recreation study group is approved and becomes law.

CHAIR LANGE:

I am confused. Could you clarify this study group? The way I interpret your amendment is it is taking a current study group and does not create a new one. Is that correct?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

The study group in the bill still exists even with the amendment. It is a brand-new, stand-alone, one-time study group. The amendment looks at two other groups that already exist and consolidates them. The group that administers the grant is different from the other one. In my ideal world, they would be combined as a funding mechanism. That is why I do not have an appropriation on this bill. It is my hope that the \$250,000 going into the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program will be used in conjunction with this so the programming and recommendations by the study group would have a natural funding mechanism. The Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation would administer the funds.

CHAIR LANGE:

Is there anyone wishing to speak in favor of A.B. 164?

TOM CLARK (Nevada Outdoor Business Coalition):

Assemblyman Yeager has provided clarity in other committees, which I would like to pass along to this Committee. The Advisory Board was created in 2019 when the Division of Outdoor Recreation was created. The intent of the Advisory Board was to look at the outdoor recreation industry, including ways the State could market the industry, do economic development for the industry and bring people in to testify and to talk about the industry as a whole.

That Board was not given any granting power because there is not grant funding available. The amendment, as I understand it, uses an Advisory Board that is already populated to oversee grant resources instead of having the technical advisory committee that was created by statute. This legislation creates a new commission. It brings the education element into the classroom.

As a native Nevadan, born in Elko and having lived in Tonopah for a while, I am surprised by how little kids go outside. I am even more surprised at how little they take care of what is outside when they go out. Part of the education process could be teaching "Leave No Trace" how to take care of State parks and how to preserve resources for future generations.

We also need to get kids to understand there are really fun places to play in Nevada, whether it be Red Rock, the desert, Ely, Tahoe or wherever else. When kids are exposed to the outdoors, it will hopefully spark more curiosity about what is out there. During the pandemic, many people discovered urban trail systems. The trails got a lot of use because people went outside and discovered trailheads in their own neighborhoods.

I hope I clarified some of the questions. On behalf of the Nevada Outdoor Business Coalition, we support this bill.

SHEILA BRAY (University of Nevada, Reno):

We would like to express our support of A.B. 164 and thank Speaker Yeager for bringing forth this bill. The University of Nevada, Reno, is proud to be the home of the Cooperative Extension and our Nevada 4-H youth development program that spans the entire State. For more than 90 years, the Cooperative Extension has administered 4-H in Nevada, which is part of one of the largest youth organizations in the U.S. The 4-H organization is a learn by doing and life skills program that teaches youth communication, team building, problem solving, self responsibility, community leadership and much more.

For nearly 79 years, 4-H camping has been a proven and effective method of reaching, teaching and involving youth in leadership skills development. We are now home to two youth camps, our Nevada State 4-H Camp at Lake Tahoe and our newest camp in Alamo, located in Lincoln County. These camps provide both day trips and overnight recreation options for our youth in southern, northern and rural Nevada. Whether the outdoor experiences are large or small,

in a park or at a camp, the value that a day in the outdoors can bring to our youth is limitless.

From our many experiences in this space, we know providing both camp and outdoor recreation experiences helps our youth become more aware of the natural world around them and grow as leaders and as members of a team. Again, we thank Speaker Yeager for elevating the need for outdoor recreation for our youth. We urge your support of A.B. 164.

LEA CASE (Nevada Public Health Association):

On behalf of the Nevada Public Health Association, we support A.B. 164. We recognize that access to outdoor activity increases the amount of physical activity kids do. Physical activity leads to decreases in weight, helps with the obesity epidemic and increases positive mental health. For children diagnosed with attention deficit disorders, it can help alleviate some of those symptoms.

I would also like to add that, as a person who sits on the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission, our group would love to participate and provide resources to this working group. We would like to help kids in Carson City and across the State get access to some of the fabulous outdoor recreation activities we have here.

NICK SCHNEIDER (Vegas Chamber):

We are in support of A.B. 164. We believe in finding creative ways to incorporate the resources our beautiful State provides to further engage our students. Doing so will aid in providing a higher-quality education, as well as supporting our outdoor tourism industry.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

We want to thank Speaker Yeager for adding a superintendent to the working group. We asked for that representation at the end of the hearing on the Assembly side. We appreciate getting school administration involved when decisions are being made about what is happening in our schools. This is a good bill. We need to get our kids off devices and outside where the trees and the water are. They should appreciate our beautiful State.

CHRISTI CABRERA-GEORGESON (Nevada Conservation League):

I am the Deputy Director for the Nevada Conservation League. We are here in strong support of A.B. 164 and its amendment. The bill provides funding for the

Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program and is a priority for the Nevada Conservation League this Session. Moving that money quicker is something we support.

We submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit D](#)) that describes the many reasons why we think this is a great bill and outlines some of the benefits of getting kids outside. I will not spend too much time reiterating that.

I grew up in Reno and I went through the public school system. Some of my fondest memories are field trips that included getting outside and learning about nature. To this day, I have vivid memories of experiencing the Oxbow Nature Study Area on the Truckee River and Davis Creek Regional Park for the first time.

Every child should be able to have those types of experiences that they can cherish for the rest of their lives. Those experiences cemented my love of nature and the great outdoors and my appreciation for all the opportunities Nevada has to offer. I ended up in a career advocating for our environment by teaching our kids about nature and the great outdoors. We are building the next generation of stewards of our lands and water. We would like to thank Assemblyman Yeager for being a consistent advocate for getting kids outside. We strongly urge the Committee's support.

CHRIS DALY (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association supports A.B. 164 to better incorporate outdoor recreation into the curriculum of public schools. We were proud to support A.B. No. 385 of the 79th Session and A.B. No. 331 of the 80th Session to extend outdoor opportunities to Nevada students. Many educators and schools already incorporate outdoor education into the curriculum to improve academics, personal health and appreciation of nature. We believe this working group will be a good opportunity to discuss best practices and to make recommendations to ensure outdoor education is available to every Nevada student.

SHELBI SWARTZ (Battle Born Progress):

We are in strong support of A.B. 164. Nevada is lucky to have an incredible number of outdoor treasures all across the State; however, a lack of financial and economic resources often excludes underserved youth and their families from fully experiencing the array of land, water and wildlife activities. Creating

this working group to find ways to increase access and include exploration of these treasures and the education of our kids will not only help with mental and physical health, but overall school performance. The outdoors can heal and renew our kids to be the best that they can be. Please support A.B. 164.

HANK BROWN (Carson City Montessori School):

I am a student member of the Carson Montessori School Student Legislative Team. Before we begin, I would like to say to Senator Titus, you want to know how to get us out of the classroom and outside? My opinion would be to get rid of some of these standardized tests. In fact, that is why I am not there in person today.

Our team is speaking in favor of A.B. 164. Thank you for streamlining the grants especially, but can we go a little bit further? First, we feel that to wait until December of 2024 to release the findings and suggestions is way too long. If the suggestions and ideas are doable, workable ideas for the curriculum, they should be available to educators to implement, to explore, to try out and for students to experience as soon as they are discovered. Trust us, teachers are spending so much time collecting data that they miss out on teachable curriculum opportunities.

Second, as you read through the list of appointees, we noticed the voice of the student is missing. Take advantage of programs already in place. While the list of appointees does have experts, we think there should be more educators and experts like river anglers, Great Basin Outdoor School and the water conservancy for this northern Nevada area.

Nevada has some of the greatest outdoor opportunities in the U.S. Currently, Carson Montessori has curriculum and outside opportunities including studies on water clarity at Lake Tahoe—which has the clearest water in 50 years—water conservation, and restoration of the land to its natural state. We also explore issues such as balancing animal preservation with the mustangs and native heritage explorations. All of these lessons are out the front door of this Legislative Building. Please consider these additions and let us experience the outdoors in Nevada in our classrooms immediately. Please support A.B. 164. I have also submitted written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR LANGE:

Assemblyman Yeager, we have one more question from the Committee.

SENATOR BUCK:

I really like the bill. Get Outdoors Nevada has been providing field trips through donor dollars for years. I like the makeup of this working group. I think the key is to make sure there are lots of educators included in the group because they know how to connect the outdoors to the curriculum. Four to six of the most at-risk schools in Henderson and Las Vegas, on the Boulder Highway Corridor, go on a field trip. The day field trip is for fourth graders and has been happening since I was working. They go to Valley of Fire, Callville Bay Marina, Lake Mead and Hoover Dam. It is a wonderful day for the students, so I really like what the bill is doing. I want to ensure there are many educators in the study group.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I appreciate the comments and we will certainly look into that. You make a good point; some outdoor education is happening in schools, and some schools do not have that.

In closing, thank you for a great hearing. We are very busy in this building, but I will be truthful, when I get a moment to daydream, I daydream about Lake Tahoe, Spooner Lake and getting outside. We do not get a chance to do that a lot in this building, but I would love to create a culture where our students obviously have to do well in the classroom, but they also need to have an appreciation for the great State of Nevada. Hopefully, this bill moves us in that direction.

CHAIR LANGE:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 164 and open the hearing on A.B. 212.

ASSEMBLY BILL 212: Establishes provisions governing student transcripts.
(BDR 34-523)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ERICA MOSCA (Assembly District No. 14):

I am here to present A.B. 212. I will share a summary of the why behind this bill then pass it over to my colleague, Renee Davis, to share local context. I will also review specific language in the bill.

The problem we are trying to solve is that within NSHE, if you are a student and you owe over \$100 to the institution, you cannot access your transcripts. Right now, this impacts over 26,000 students. Getting a transcript allows them to transfer schools or get a job. We are trying to solve a practical problem.

We want to ensure that young people still have responsibility and are paying their debt. We know that is important to all the NSHE institutions. We also want to make sure they can still access their transcript, either by setting up a payment plan or by not having to pay for their first transcript request.

Truckee Meadows Community College already does this. They are an example. Again, we want young people to pay their debt; it is important that they are responsible, but we also want to remove systemic barriers that prevent them from accessing the transcript. The solution is to give the student their transcript, put them on a payment plan, but do not make them pay for the first one.

Nationally, this is not a new issue as shown in the presentation ([Exhibit F](#)). The U.S. Secretary of Education called this his priority a year and a half ago. There are eight states that have adopted similar legislation. If you include states that allow access to a diploma—for which a similar issue exists, where young people are not allowed to access their diploma if they have not paid their fees—there are 13 states that have similar legislation.

This bill is only talking about transcripts. It is not a new policy. My colleague will share the State context.

RENEE DAVIS (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education):

I began my career in the financial aid office at Truckee Meadows Community College and, I have to say, this is a topic I am really passionate about. As the Assemblywoman mentioned in her introductions, the topic of transcript access has been receiving attention at the national level over the past year or more.

The timing of discussions across the entire NSHE system was influenced by this national conversation, particularly by the release of a joint statement from the National Association of College and University Business Officers and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. By fall of 2022, NSHE had undertaken this conversation in earnest; we began planning for a joint meeting between our campus student affairs officers and business officers. Ultimately, the joint meeting occurred on February 23, 2023.

Before that meeting, we learned about Assemblywoman Mosca's BDR. During that period, not only did the Assemblywoman reach out to my office, but she

also had conversations with campus leaders across the entire system. The work on her part helped us advance our internal conversations on the transcript access issue.

That is not to say the conversations were easy; they were not. We have to balance the needs of students accessing their transcripts with the needs of institutions to collect fees that are owed to them, so that costs are not passed on to other students. During February's meeting, a compromise was reached, described by the Assemblywoman, in which we will give students access to transcripts after they sign up for a payment plan. This would allow students to move forward with their desired educational and employment goals, while giving institutions the opportunity to counsel students on their payment obligations and the consequences of not paying them.

I am happy to report that in early March, prior to the introduction of [A.B. 212](#) in the Assembly Committee on Education, this policy revision was approved by the Board of Regents.

I am sure you all are wondering how many students are impacted. The Assemblywoman shared there are 26,000 students affected when we collected that data at the beginning of the school year. As of that data collection, the median debt owed by students with the transcript hold, ranged from \$426 at Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) to \$1,152 at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV).

It is also important to note that students from historically minority backgrounds made up the majority of the students in this population when we pulled that data. These and other data points are in the letter of support from Dale Erquiaga ([Exhibit G](#)). Thanks again to the Assemblywoman for her collaborative approach. I have also submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

We knew it was better to make a policy that NSHE Regents would adopt because they have to execute it. In this bill, we wanted to ensure current and former students can access their transcripts, both unofficial and official, and they cannot be charged a higher fee for the transcript. Section 2 contains all the definitions.

I am a proud first-generation college graduate. I have worked with youth for the past 15 years as a founder and executive director of a college access nonprofit. We spend most of our postsecondary budget each year on this issue to ensure young people can continue and persist in their higher education.

I want to acknowledge and thank the many stakeholder engagements from our presidents, vice presidents, student affairs representatives, college students, high school students, parents, teachers, professors, chancellor, vice chancellor and the regents who passed this policy last month.

We are continuing with this bill to codify it into law. Even if the NSHE Regents changed their minds, they could not change this because it is codified into State law. We are really excited to hopefully remove another institutional barrier for our young people.

SENATOR NEAL:

I appreciate the policy. In terms of the policy's effect, what is the loss of revenue from the transcript fees that would not be collected according to this bill.

Ms. DAVIS:

That is a difficult question to answer. According to prior policy, institutions would require debt to be paid before receiving a transcript. In an ideal world, there will not be a financial impact. Hopefully, this bill will have a positive effect. We do not know if students who wanted their transcript did not get their transcript because they were unable to pay. If that were the case, the cost would be neutral. Students might take advantage of the payment plan and not pay.

SENATOR NEAL:

Is the policy going to be retroactive to allow students who may have previously been affected by the policy to get their transcripts?

Ms. DAVIS:

Essentially, yes. Anyone who currently has a balance due with one of our institutions, including current and former students, can request a transcript. Anyone who has a balance due and needs their transcript would need to contact the institution and set up a payment plan to receive access.

SENATOR NEAL:

Is there going to be a new way in which the institution makes sure students pay their debt?

Ms. DAVIS:

There is not a new way other than setting up that payment plan. We are hoping that is going to have a positive effect and facilitate a conversation with the student to explain what they owe and the consequences of not paying. Students should understand there are consequences for not paying.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

From my practical experience, we see students who maybe started school in northern Nevada, but now live in southern Nevada, a parent lost their job or the student needs to go home. If the student leaves mid-semester, they still owe money because they are withdrawing. A young person, if they move, and want to go to the College of Southern Nevada next semester, might still owe money and cannot access their transcript to transfer. We are hoping that by allowing students access to transcripts, it gives them a reason to go back into that door, have counseling or work with the institution to get back onto their educational track.

SENATOR NEAL:

Do these debts go to collection or onto a credit report?

Ms. DAVIS:

It is a mix. Many of these debts would not have gone to collections yet, which is why having a conversation with the student is so valuable. It gives the student one more chance to not go into collections. If the debts are old, they will have already gone into collections.

SENATOR TITUS:

I like the concept of the bill. You cannot pay your debt if you cannot get a job. I understand that is what you are looking at. Can you repeat the numbers about the average debt of a student?

Ms. DAVIS:

[Exhibit F](#) has that information by institution. The two examples I gave were on the low range. I am talking about medians. The average debt from TMCC was \$426 and, at UNLV, it was \$1,152. Those numbers are in the exhibit.

CHAIR LANGE:

If someone has something on their credit report, will you be issuing a letter so they can get that off their credit report moving forward?

MS. DAVIS:

That is not really part of the policy. I could get an answer and report back.

CHAIR LANGE:

If you are looking at how you can help people get jobs to pay their debt, getting something off your credit report is helpful. Many jobs look at credit reports and it might be something you want to look at. Seeing no more questions, is there anyone wishing to speak in support of A.B. 212?

ANTHONY RUIZ (Nevada State College):

We are in full support of this bill.

AMANDA VASKOV (Associated Students of the University of Nevada):

We represent over 14,000 undergraduates at the University of Nevada, Reno. We support this bill and its efforts to dismantle barriers to employment post-graduation. I have also submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit I](#)).

MR. SCHNEIDER:

The Vegas Chamber is in support of A.B. 212. We believe removing this barrier of not being able to access transcripts will provide a more level playing field and provide opportunities for the more economically disadvantaged students to better compete in the job market for positions with higher wages. We thank you for your consideration.

KANANI ESPINOZA (University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

We would like to thank the sponsor of the bill for working with us during the Interim and meeting with President Whitfield. We support the bill.

LAWRENCE WEEKLY (College of Southern Nevada):

On behalf of the College of Southern Nevada, we support A.B. 212. We have a similar example to the one the sponsor gave. A student was accepted to the University of Nevada, Reno. His mother passed away two weeks before he was scheduled to go to school. He went to school, but he was so grief-stricken, he could not finish. He sat out a number of years and decided to go back to school. He decided to take a couple of classes at the College of Southern Nevada but,

because of the existing debt, he could not get access to his transcript. It caused a hardship.

To your point Chair Lange, that is a part of his credit report today. His father is trying to help him work through that because it has become a huge barrier. We are so very grateful to Assemblywoman Mosca and to Ms. Davis for providing information. This will be a huge blessing for so many students looking to further their education.

MICHAEL FLORES (University of Nevada, Reno):

I want to thank the bill sponsor. We met with her last summer when she was still executive director of Leaders in Training. We had a roundtable last week on campus; for a number of first-generation college students, this came up as an issue. We are thrilled to support this legislation.

I did not know about the situation that Mr. Weekly mentioned, so we will work with him to reach those students.

DOUG UNGER (Nevada Faculty Alliance):

We are in support of A.B. 212. I served for years on the Academic Standards Committee at UNLV. This was a consistent issue with students wishing to reinstate and get back on track to get their degrees. Because they owed money, they could not get transcripts released.

Personally, 50 years ago in June, I had a diploma withheld because I owed a \$2 library fine that I did not know about. I had to walk across the campus to pay it before I could get my diploma.

MS. SWARTZ:

We fully support A.B. 212 and thank the sponsors for bringing it forward. No financial hardship for low-level fines should prohibit any student from pursuing an education or having access to their educational records. We have seen these fines and fees prohibit many of our students across Nevada. As someone who works for someone who went to UNLV, we have seen this firsthand. This will remove a barrier to access in our higher education system. We urge the Committee to support this critical legislation. Our access to higher education is the Nevada way. Please support A.B. 212.

KEVIN OSORIO HERNANDEZ:

I major in history at Nevada State College. I am in full support of this bill. I also want to thank Assemblywoman Mosca for always advocating on behalf of the students here at Nevada State College and all over Nevada. I am a first-generation college student. This particular issue affects many students here and throughout the U.S. We have a large majority of first-generation students. Please support A.B. 212.

AMY KOO (One APIA Nevada):

We are a nonprofit that advocates for the growing Asian-American community in Nevada. Asian-American students have the highest unmet financial need. Assembly Bill 212 is a simple way to make sure our students are not prohibited from their educational records because of financial reasons. We urge everyone to support this bill.

CHAIR LANGE:

I have received four letters of support ([Exhibit J](#)) and a flyer from Teach Plus Nevada ([Exhibit K](#)). Seeing no one wishing to speak in opposition or neutral, I will close the hearing on A.B. 212. Is there anyone wishing to speak in public comment?

MR. DALY:

This week the National Education Association (NEA) released their annual Rankings of the States for 2022. Sadly, Nevada still struggles. At \$11,280 per student expenditure last year, Nevada once again ranks forty-eighth in the Country. We are more than \$5,000 behind the national average and about \$1,000 behind both Alabama and Mississippi.

The crisis of educator vacancies in Nevada schools is often discussed. From fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 2022, the total number of teachers in Nevada declined by nearly 1,200—that is a net reduction—or, in other terms, 5 percent of the teaching workforce in the State. The National Education Association projects Nevada will lose another 2,000 more teachers this year, which reflects another net reduction of 10 percent and is, by far, the largest of any state in the Nation.

That is why Nevada State Education Association has been saying it is Time for 20. We advocate for a 20 percent raise for every Nevada educator so we can stop the bleeding of our workforce. We know Nevada has a serious vacancy

problem, which includes education support professionals, paraprofessionals, who are integral to student learning, and bus drivers, who are responsible for getting students to and from school.

The NEA reported this week that the average Nevada education support professional earns about \$37,000 a year, which is nearly \$20,000 less than what is needed for a family of two to have a modest standard of living here in Nevada. That is why we say it is Time for 20 with a starting pay of \$20 an hour for the workers who make our schools run.

Meanwhile, Nevada has once again retaken first in the Nation for class size. Nevada has the largest class sizes in the Country, with about 22 students in average daily attendance per teacher in the system. Our large class sizes do not just impact student learning, it is a serious working condition issue for classroom educators. Large class sizes also contribute to issues of student behavior and school safety. During the discussions of restorative justice, we know that if you have 40 or more kids in a classroom, it is impossible to do it right. That is why we say it is Time for 20 with class sizes of 20 students.

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

Senate Committee on Education
April 26, 2023
Page 32

CHAIR LANGE:
The meeting is adjourned at 3:39 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kirsten Oleson,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Roberta Lange, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 164	C	11	Assemblyman Steve Yeager	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 164	D	21	Christi Cabrera-Georgeson / Nevada Conservation League	Letter of Support
A.B. 164	E	22	Hank Brown / Carson Montessori School	Letter of Support
A.B. 212	F	24	Assemblywoman Erica Mosca	Presentation
A.B. 212	G	25	Renee Davis / NSHE	Letter of Support
A.B. 212	H	25	Renée Davis / NSHE	Written Testimony
A.B. 212	I	28	Amanda Vaskov / Associated Students of the University of Nevada	Letter of Support
A.B. 212	J	30	Senator Roberta Lange	Four Letters of Support
A.B. 212	K	30	Senator Roberta Lange	Flyer Teach Plus Nevada