

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

**Eighty-Third Session
March 25, 2025**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Selena Torres-Fossett at 12:40 p.m. on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, 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/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett, Chair
Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Joe Dalia
Assemblymember Rich DeLong
Assemblymember Tanya P. Flanagan
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy
Assemblymember Linda F. Hunt
Assemblymember Gregory S. Koenig
Assemblymember Selena La Rue Hatch
Assemblymember Erica Mosca
Assemblymember David Orentlicher

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Assembly District No. 5
Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel
Kathryn Dodge, Committee Manager
BC Lindsley, Committee Secretary
Mary Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Emily Testwuide, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Corrections
Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center
Tom Clark, representing Nevada Association of School Boards; and Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Amanda Brazeau, representing Western Nevada College
Jodi Hocking, Executive Director, Return Strong!
Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Dr. Lawrence Weekly, Executive Director, Government Affairs and Chief Diversity Officer, College of Southern Nevada
Ashley Dodson, representing National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111
Douglas Unger, Chapter President, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Faculty Alliance; and representing Nevada Prison Education Project
Chandler Cooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Penny Brock, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Brian Wallace, Vice President, Nevada State Education Association
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada
Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy Secretary of State, Office of the Secretary of State
Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Flor Diaz, Youth Organizer, Make the Road Nevada
Adrien Hunt, Police Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Joshua Skaggs, Legislative Affairs Director, Nevada Republican Party
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Nancy Roecker, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Geneva "Geny" Evangelista-Del Rosario, President, Lions Club of Nevada, District 46
Ed Uehling, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Janet Campbell, Private Citizen
Ellen Gifford, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada
Lorena Biassotti, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Dane Davis, Private Citizen, Nye County, Nevada
Katrín Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ivon Meneses, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Mary Wagner, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Audrey Peral, Program Director, Chispa Nevada
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Aleah "Sia" Liilii, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Joseph Baptist, Private Citizen, Silver Springs, Nevada
Kendall Lewis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Ava Chavez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Miles Shanor, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Grace Nielsen, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Maddison Hodge, Private Citizen
Aisena Allen, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Mikayla Kelly, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Aymee Lunsford, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Riley Roleson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Taylor Fewins, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Brooke Roleson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Reagan Christinson, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Anyá Lopez, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Jordan Eddington, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Jessica Glover, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Allura Addington, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada

Chair Torres-Fossett:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will start with the work session, and I will pass it over to Ms. Lower.

Assembly Bill 164: Revises provisions relating to the Account for Student Indemnification. (BDR 34-544)

Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst:

As a reminder, as nonpartisan staff I may neither support nor oppose any measure before the Committee. The first item on work session is Assembly Bill 164, which revises provisions relating to the Account for Student Indemnification. This is sponsored by Assemblymember O'Neill, and the Committee heard this bill on March 6, 2025 [[Exhibit C](#)]. Assembly Bill 164 increases the Account for Student Indemnification balance limit from \$250,000 to \$750,000, exempting institutions from paying certain fees above this limit. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Members at this time, I will accept a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 164.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MOSCA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 164.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DALIA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember O'Neill. We will proceed with Assembly Bill 212.

**Assembly Bill 212: Revises provisions relating to early childhood education.
(BDR S-815)**

Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst:

The next item on work session is Assembly Bill 212, which revises provisions relating to early childhood education. This is sponsored by Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno, and the Committee heard this bill on March 13, 2025 [[Exhibit D](#)]. Assembly Bill 212 renames the Virtual Early Childhood Family Engagement Pilot Program by removing pilot from the name and extends the deadlines for submitting required reports to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Joint Interim Standing Committees on Education and Health and Human Services through 2027. The bill removes the requirement that the program administrator limit digital screen time for children who are four years of age as recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics. Lastly, this bill appropriates \$1 million for each year of the 2025 to 2027 biennium to DHHS to implement the program.

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno proposed an amendment retaining the provisions removed by this bill which ensure a child is required by the program not to use a screen longer than the maximum recommended screen time for a four-year-old child.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Members, are there any questions in regard to the amendment at this time? I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 212.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER D'SILVA MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 212.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno, but I am sure it will make its way to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means first.

**Assembly Bill 217: Revises provisions relating to law enforcement on school property.
(BDR 34-201)**

Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst:

The next item on work session is Assembly Bill 217, which revises provisions relating to law enforcement on school property. This is sponsored by Assemblymember González, and the Committee heard this bill on February 25, 2025 [[Exhibit E](#)]. Assembly Bill 217 establishes provisions relating to the presence of certain federal officials and the use of a chemical agent or electronic stun device by certain school police officers against a pupil or minor on school grounds. This bill prohibits a school district, public school, or any employee from granting access to the grounds, facilities, or buildings of a school district or public school to certain federal officials engaging in the investigation or enforcement of immigration laws without a lawfully issued warrant or court order. This bill prohibits a school district, public school, or an employee of such from disclosing, in any manner, information about a pupil or the family of a pupil to certain federal officials. This bill specifies that any person who knowingly and willingly violates these provisions is guilty of a misdemeanor.

There are two amendments proposed for this measure. Assemblymember González proposed an amendment to delete section 2 of the bill, relating to the use of chemical agents and electronic stun devices by school police officers against pupils or minors, and requiring reports and investigations after the use of such chemicals and devices.

The Nevada Association of School Boards proposed an amendment to section 1, subsection 3 of the bill. For the first documented offense, any person who knowingly and willingly violates the provisions of section 1 will be disciplined under the discretion of each school district. For all repeated offenses, a person is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I do not have a question but I want to clarify for the record that all language regarding stun devices has been taken out, and this piece of legislation, at this time, just pertains to the interactions with Immigration and Customs Enforcement on school campuses. Is that correct?

Kelly Lower:

Yes, Chair, that is correct.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

At this time, I will take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 217.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DALIA MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 217.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblymember Hansen:

I am thankful for the amendments deleting section 2, and the one from the Nevada Association of School Boards clarifying some language and giving discretion to the school districts. I do want to say I am going to be a yes in Committee, because at this point in time, it appears the bill is really just reaffirming and codifying what has existed since 1974 during the Ford Administration, the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Just for the record to make sure I am understanding this is what the bill is doing, according to FERPA, as it has existed since 1974, it protects the privacy of student education records and restricts the sharing of personal identifiable information. This includes data that could reveal a student's immigration status. Schools are also not allowed to share student records with immigration or law enforcement agencies without a subpoena, parental consent, or a judicial order. Immigration & Customs Enforcement officials must, and always have needed to, have a judicial warrant to carry out their work, and district policy requires parental consent before law enforcement can interview any student. Since it appears we are just codifying again that protection, I can be a yes in Committee.

Assemblymember DeLong:

My concern with the bill, and I will be a no on this, is because there is a chance federal law could change in the future. Thus, we set up a situation where no matter what a school official does, they are going to be in violation of one law or another. I do not want to put anyone in that position.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Just a reminder to the Committee, federal law can change at any point and our state laws could be a violation of federal law at any point, but we do appreciate that concern. Because we have accepted the motion to amend and do pass at this time, I do not see any further discussion, but we will take a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER DELONG VOTED NO.)

We will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember González. We will proceed with Assembly Bill 286.

Assembly Bill 286: Provides for a pilot program to assess the competency of applicants for a license to teach through alternative assessment methods. (BDR 34-836)

Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst:

The next measure before the Committee on work session is Assembly Bill 286, which provides for a pilot program to assess the competency of applicants for a license to teach through alternative assessment methods. This is sponsored by Assemblymember Torres-Fossett, and the Committee heard this bill on March 13, 2025 [[Exhibit F](#)]. Assembly Bill 286 creates a pilot program for alternative teaching licensure at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). The bill sets forth the program participant composition, curriculum requirements, and participant evaluations. The bill requires reports relating to participant demographics and preliminary findings of the pilot program to be submitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau for distribution to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education by July 1 each year of operation. Additionally, program operators must submit a plan to Nevada's Department of Education six months after ceasing operation concerning the metrics of success for the pilot program and permanent program implementation. Applicants for an initial license to teach are exempted from the requirement to pass a competency-based test in basic reading, writing, and mathematics upon successful completion of the pilot program. Finally, the bill appropriates \$1 million to UNLV to develop and operate the pilot program.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett proposed the following amendments concerning certain provisions of the pilot program. The amendment clarifies that pilot program participants are exempt from the requirement to complete the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching; permits any Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) institution to create a pilot program offering an alternative pathway to teaching licensure; clarifies that the pilot program may have 100 participants per academic year; eliminates participant selection requirements as described in the bill, and specifies that NSHE institutions may not impose residency restrictions on program participants if participants reside and teach in Nevada; provides participants must hold either a provisional or substitute teaching license; directs all participating NSHE institutions to submit the required reports and plans; removes the appropriation to UNLV; and establishes a sunset clause terminating the program on July 1, 2029.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Members, are there any questions in regard to the amendments? At this time, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 286.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MOSCA MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 286.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will proceed with the next item on our agenda as our work session is now closed. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 153. Please begin when you are ready, and welcome to "Assemblymember Miller Day."

**Assembly Bill 153: Revises provisions relating to education of incarcerated persons.
(BDR 34-234)**

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Assembly District No. 5:

Thank you, Chair. It has been a while since I have been here. Today, I am presenting Assembly Bill 153, which revises provisions relating to the education of incarcerated persons. Sustainable, gainful employment plays a crucial role in reducing recidivism and facilitating the successful reintegration of incarcerated individuals into society. So much, in fact, before I moved to Nevada, I had developed and managed a highly successful prisoner reentry program. What folks did not realize is the prisoner reentry program was—about 20 to 25 percent of the funding was from the Michigan Department of Justice—but the majority of funding actually came from the U.S. Department of Labor. Why the U.S. Department of Labor? Because employment is key, and we know there is one major factor that leads to job opportunities, and that is education and training. By equipping these individuals with knowledge and skills, educational programs within correctional facilities significantly improve their prospects upon release. In Nevada, the statewide program of education for incarcerated persons allows school districts, in cooperation with the Department of Corrections, to operate these programs within correctional facilities.

Historically, incarcerated individuals had limited access to federal student aid. However, recent changes at the federal level have opened new doors. As of July 2023, incarcerated students enrolled in improved prison education programs are now, again, for the first time since 1994, eligible to receive Pell Grants, which do not require repayment. Individuals are not eligible, however, for federal student loans. This change implemented through the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), as we refer to the FAFSA Simplification Act of 2020, has the potential to dramatically increase educational opportunities for incarcerated individuals.

One of the keys to the success of the program I directed back in Michigan was we knew the reentry process does not start upon release. It begins while in prison, preparing for release. Among a variety of needs and services, education is one individuals can begin working on while still incarcerated. We do this so they are prepared to obtain certain jobs upon release.

As for the bill summary, before I discuss the components of the bill, I would like to apologize for not meeting deadline. As many of you know, sometimes amendments are still going late into the hours before the hearing. I did directly email members the proposed amendment, as well as having copies over on the table for the public.

With that, I will be working off the conceptual amendment [[Exhibit G](#)]. First, this measure follows my bill from the 2021 Legislative Session, which was Assembly Bill 235 of the 81st Session. Among other things, it required school districts of over 100,000 students to

provide at least two FAFSA nights, and districts, charter schools, and private schools under 100,000 that operate a high school to provide at least one FAFSA night each year. The goal was to provide assistance, in collaboration with colleges, universities, and staff, to families to complete the FAFSA application on-site, when needed. In other words, to open up the schools to enable parents to come in with their paperwork and gain assistance to complete the FAFSA application, which is now pretty complicated. And of course, the added bonus, if parents want to fill out a FAFSA application for themselves, so be it.

However, as stated in the amendments for A.B. 153, I have actually removed the responsibility and the role of the K-12 schools currently written in the bill. I have removed them because what this bill is aiming for can actually be administered within the correctional facilities with their current staff. While the bill does see two FAFSA events each year as well, the bill is permissive in nature in order to allow each facility to plan and administer such events in the manner that is most suitable.

First, each facility, if they are not already doing so, should provide career planning that includes information about financial aid and what it can cover. By that, we mean dissolve the misconception that financial aid is just for college. We know it also includes vocational and training programs as well, which is often a block to some people because they do not believe they can apply for it for other trade and vocational programs. Also, within the facilities, they are provided the information that they will receive services and assistance to actually apply for FAFSA. Individuals should receive this at least in their final year, prior to release or once a parole date has been determined. However, it can be ongoing and there is no restriction to how early or when individuals can be provided such information, or the ability to access the application.

Similar to this, they will need assistance with applying for online schools or training. Facilities should also establish a means for family members who are on approved visitation lists to bring necessary documents that can assist with the application and may attend FAFSA application events. Of course, this measure encourages coordination with our colleges, universities, and/or our library district, to assist with applications, informational meetings, registration pamphlets, and other educational or job training.

The amendment does outline an existing process that is currently being used between the Department of Corrections and Great Basin College (GBC). We are using that as the model for the administration of the financial awards. In other words, once a determination for student eligibility has been made, a financial award—typically for most students, that financial award does consider living expenses, but for incarcerated individuals, it does not. It will just pertain to books and other course expenses. Once that is determined and the student is enrolled in the class, the cost of tuition, fees, books, and any other required materials will be charged to the student account at the college. The financial aid administrator at the college pays the student account balance electronically, and if there is any money left in the student's award, unlike other students who may receive a refund, in this case, the funds are returned to the Department of Education (NDE).

Additionally, the amendment clarifies financial aid cannot be used for noneducational expenses such as restitution, commissary, damages, medical, technology, and so on. Also, for those incarcerated, we do not want applying for or seeking financial aid to be used as any kind of sanction or incentive.

In closing, A.B. 153 represents a significant step toward enhancing educational opportunities for our incarcerated individuals in Nevada. By facilitating access to federal student aid and ensuring compliance with established education standards, this bill aims to empower incarcerated persons to pursue higher education and vocational training. Such initiatives not only benefit the individuals involved, but also contribute to the betterment of society by reducing recidivism and promoting successful integration. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, currently 17 states have no regulatory or statutory ban on people who are incarcerated receiving state aid. In fact, New Jersey also recently expanded their access. The implementation of A.B. 153 underscores Nevada's commitment to, and alignment with, other states doing what is necessary to reduce recidivism by providing equitable education opportunities for all of its residents, including those who are in correctional facilities. Moreover, it is important that while supporting individuals with reentry, it is a public safety matter. It is also a prime opportunity to lessen financial burdens on the State.

Part of the reason I brought that first bill back two sessions ago was because it was to encourage more students and more adults to apply for financial aid in order to lessen our state's financial obligation. Again, workforce development is key for reentry, and this provides a more individualized approach while assessing federal support. With that, Chair and members, I appreciate your consideration of this measure and I am open to questions.

Chair Torres-Fossett:
Members, any questions?

Assemblymember Mosca:

I was really interested, and I am glad you talked about how Great Basin College currently does it. I would love to hear about that and how it is going over there.

Assemblymember Miller:

If the Deputy Director of Corrections is here, I will let her speak on that.

Emily Testwuide, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Corrections:

For your question, or just to clarify your question?

Assemblymember Mosca:

How is the program going? How many people are taking advantage of it?

Emily Testwuide:

Currently, at Lovelock Correctional Center, GBC is operating the only Pell-approved PEP, or Prison Education Program. We currently have 54 students enrolled this semester and 52 are on Pell Grants. There are new student admission workshops currently happening this week. There are 74 individuals from the waitlist completing applications for FAFSA as of now. There are 31 other individuals on the waitlist who do not reside in eligible housing at this time, and we expect 52 of the current students to continue in the program over the next year. I would definitely want to get back to this Committee with other data points, but that is what I have here so far.

Assemblymember Hansen:

If you could just please clarify. You said 52 of the 54 are on Pell Grants at Lovelock, and then you mentioned 74 applicants are on a waiting list. Can you clarify for me with the 74, where are they? Are they on a waiting list?

Emily Testwuide:

Those individuals are currently at Lovelock.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Members, are there any additional questions?

Assemblymember D'Silva:

Thank you, Assemblymember Miller, for bringing this bill. I think it is a great step toward making sure everybody is able to access an education, and that next step in regard to college. My question is, in your vision, how do you see the mechanics playing out in terms of how these programs will be rolled out in all of our institutions throughout the state?

Assemblymember Miller:

This is a main reason why the bill is permissive, because when we are talking about prisons, obviously, first and foremost, is safety—safety for everyone who is incarcerated as well as safety for our staff. Every prison is a different size, has a different staffing model, and has different levels of security for individuals who are there based on their offenses. It is really important to give that flexibility for each facility to tailor the program to what fits them, unlike when the bill for the high schools, which could be more regimented, which was basically, This is what you are going to do. In discussions with Director Dzurenda, it has been, when I say a FAFSA night, maybe in some situations that works—and the reason why it is twice a year is because those are near the two dates where more money is available to get—but maybe in some situations, it works to have an evening or a day program where everyone is pulled in together as a group and the counselors or the educators there are able to assist people. Maybe that does not work. Maybe it works better in some cases that we do it online; maybe university staff are able to come in and physically assist; or maybe they assist online. The goal is to ensure people are getting information and assistance with filling out the applications. How that is done can be tailored to each, as long as, basically, those standards are met. But again, that flexibility is available because it is a different environment.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I am going to ask a question because what I am hearing you say is the intent for this piece of legislation is to be permissive. But the language I am seeing in front of me is not permissive. I see the programming staff with the corrections on the amendment will provide, so that would require them to do it. Then it also says the "FAFSA application assistance can be ongoing but shall"—and so I am just trying to understand what the expectation is of what must happen and what is permissive?

Assemblymember Miller:

Thank you for that question, Chair, and that is a good clarifying question. The requirement will be the information is provided, and assistance is given to those who desire to apply for the application. It is not required that everyone who is incarcerated applies or participates. It is just required that information is provided and this service is available to them.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I think that helps clarify some of what I was reading. My follow-up question is the intent. I am just reading this in conjunction with the other piece of the actual bill I have in front of me with the amendment. Who is the intended audience of this piece of legislation? In the original legislation, it would have been students in a K-12 setting. Is the intent of this only adult inmates, or is it students in juvenile facilities? I had conversations with others who thought the intent was for this to capture juveniles. I am just trying to understand who the audience is.

Assemblymember Miller:

The intent is to capture the adults who are incarcerated, but most certainly can include those in the juvenile facilities as well.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Members, any additional questions? I do not see any other questions. Thank you so much for the presentation.

As we have done with other pieces of legislation, we will hear 20 minutes of support and then we will go to 20 minutes of opposition and 20 minutes neutral, if such a desire of the public exists. Every speaker will be limited to two minutes. I do ask every speaker to please state and spell your name for the record, as well as stating your affiliation. At this time, I invite anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 153. Please begin when you are ready.

Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:

The Nevada Fines and Fees Justice Center is a proud partner with NPEP, the Nevada Prison Education Program, that are doing absolutely amazing things inside our prisons, setting people up for success upon release. The FAFSA is extremely difficult to navigate. As someone who struggled with it for many years myself, I can attest. Having one of these nights or these types of events inside prisons, and that kind of help, will ensure that our incarcerated populations have access to education that not only benefits them, but benefits our communities. We strongly support this legislation.

Tom Clark, representing Nevada Association of School Boards; and Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce:

From the school boards' perspective, we very much appreciate the amendment. From the Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce's perspective, one of our number one priorities this legislative session is workforce development. We do not really care where that workforce development comes from, whether it is an incarcerated person who is looking to do something better with their lives by getting into the trades or getting into their college degree—and to find out while you are incarcerated that there are opportunities through FAFSA and others, to get some funding to do that—we think is fantastic. As a father of a 17-year-old, I am very happy I did not have to fill out the FAFSA form. I got two pages into it and was told I did not have to, and said, Thank goodness, because it is complicated, and some level of direction is needed for anybody who is trying to fill that out.

Amanda Brazeau, representing Western Nevada College:

We want to let you know Western Nevada College has maintained a prison education program here in Carson City for many years. We are supportive of A.B. 153 and want to support increasing access to prison education.

Jodi Hocking, Executive Director, Return Strong!:

We are an organization that represents incarcerated and formerly incarcerated people, and I just want to echo, for a lot of our people—I remember once, stopping and asking somebody, Why did you not fill out a Pardon Board application? They said, There are so many of us who do not have beyond a sixth, seventh, eighth grade education. My husband did not; he dropped out of high school or dropped out of middle school really, in eighth grade. He got his high school GED and his high school diploma while he was in prison. But when you put paperwork like that in front of him, he has never furthered his education—not because he could not do it, but getting through the paperwork without—he has never filed taxes; he does not know what the questions are that they are asking him. We are in support of this bill; just him as one example, but also for the thousands of people we represent inside of Nevada Department of Corrections.

Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

We are in support of A.B. 153. Allowing those who are incarcerated easier access to FAFSA and educational programs is critical for both the individual and the community. Education is one of the most effective ways to reduce recidivism. A study shows inmates who participate in correctional education programs had 43 percent lower odds of recidivism than those who did not. This not only benefits the individual, but it benefits the community at large. If we can stop the recycling of the criminals in our system, everybody wins, and education is one of the best ways to do that. We support A.B. 153.

Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

On behalf of the Clark County Public Defender's Office, strong ditto.

Dr. Lawrence Weekly, Executive Director, Government Affairs and Chief Diversity Officer, College of Southern Nevada:

Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the most studious—am I saying that right—Committee here in the Nevada State Legislature. We are here today to show our support for A.B. 153. We thank you all for your work and we thank you for your representation here on behalf of the citizens of the state of Nevada.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Seeing no one else wishing to testify on A.B. 153 here in Carson City and no one in Las Vegas, is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in support of A.B. 153?

Ashley Dodson, representing National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111:

We are in strong support of A.B. 153. Assembly Bill 153 takes a bold and necessary step toward dismantling systemic barriers by ensuring incarcerated individuals enrolled in educational programs receive assistance with completing the FAFSA. This bill not only promotes access to higher education, but also acknowledges the humanity, potential, and work of those currently navigating our justice system. Too often, incarceration becomes a cycle fueled by poverty, limited opportunity, and lack of access to resources. By requiring school districts to provide faster support and hold annual events focused on educational access with correctional facilities, A.B. 153 offers a bridge to rehabilitation, self-sufficiency, and reintegration. We commend Assemblymember Miller for her leadership and urge the Committee to pass A.B. 153. Let us be a state that leads with empathy and invests in the transformative power of education for every individual, regardless of their circumstance [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit H](#)].

Douglas Unger, Chapter President, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Faculty Alliance; and representing Nevada Prison Education Project:

The Nevada Prison Education Project is an independent organization that includes teachers from colleges and universities in the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), community groups, justice-impacted students, and the Nevada Department of Corrections. We all work together to improve and expand prison education in our state. Our teachers currently work with higher education prison programs through Western Nevada College, the College of Southern Nevada (CSN), GBC, and other NSHE institutions, now also UNLV. Any given semester, we have between 350 and 375 registered students. Western Nevada College and CSN do have outreach professionals to inform about and assist financial aid planning and the FAFSA forms. But this financial aid support, which too often presents obstacles for the justice impacted, needs additional organization and resources. Assembly Bill 153 offers a solution by further systematizing these efforts, all of which can help significantly to grow pathways to earning an education for the incarcerated. The Nevada Prison Education Project and the Nevada Faculty Alliance stand in support.

Chandler Cooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in support of A.B. 153. According to the RAND Corporation, incarcerated individuals who participate in educational programs are 43 percent less likely to return to prison. That is not speculation, that is hard evidence. And yet, too many of these individuals never even get the chance to pursue higher education, simply because they cannot access financial tools like FAFSA.

Assembly Bill 153 changes that. It ensures every incarcerated student enrolled in a high school level course gets the same access to FAFSA support as their peers in traditional schools. More importantly, it mandates the tracking of this outreach, creating transparency and accountability that can drive real progress. For many without FAFSA assistance, higher education and vocational opportunities become a closed door. We know every dollar invested in prison education saves \$4 to \$5 in reincarceration costs. The FAFSA is more than a form for some, it is a lifeline, and A.B. 153 ensures that lifeline reaches those who need it most.

This bill is not just a moral one. It is a fiscal one too. If we are serious about breaking cycles of incarceration, we have to be just as serious about opening up cycles of opportunity. That begins with access to financial aid. When we give someone a chance to fill out a FAFSA, we give them the chance to fulfill a new future. I urge you to support A.B. 153.

[[Exhibit I](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Torres-Fossett:

At this time, I invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 153. I do not see anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 153? [There was no one.]

[[Exhibit J](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

I will invite anyone wishing to testify in neutral. Please, when you are ready, and if there is anyone in Las Vegas, please approach now.

Penny Brock, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am from Washoe County. In the nineties, I was the state director for the National Right to Read Foundation. What we found, based on a lot of research, was a lot of people go to prison or juvenile, Juvie Hall, because they cannot read. They found if that population learned to read by intensive systematic phonics, very few returned to the prisoner juvie population. I would hope this Pell Grant—whatever they want to do—will have a strong emphasis on teaching reading by intensive systematic phonics.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I do not see anyone in neutral in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 153? [There was no one.] Would the bill sponsor like to make any closing remarks? [Closing remarks were waived.]

We will close the hearing on A.B. 153 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 391, which provides provisions governing annual reports of accountability for public schools. Please begin when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 391: Revises provisions governing annual reports of accountability of public schools. (BDR 34-1074)

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Assembly District No. 5:

Thank you, Chair Torres-Fossett, for again indulging me and allowing me to present two bills today, and thank you members of the Committee for your consideration as well. I am presenting Assembly Bill 391. Assembly Bill 391 revises provisions governing annual reports of accountability of public schools. As you know, Nevada's education system faces significant challenges that undermine student success and teacher retention, which increases pressure on our schools and, frankly, creates demoralizing narratives that do not acknowledge the hard work of our students and staff.

According to Nevada's Department of Education (NDE), K-12 schools experienced a 25.9 percent rate of chronic absenteeism in the last school year. As you all know, a student is considered chronically absent if they miss 10 percent or more of their enrolled school days, regardless of whether the absences were excused or unexcused. Research shows missing ten school days, in math specifically, is like missing the entire school year. Chronic absenteeism is not merely a statistic. It is a critical warning that can dramatically shape a student's academic trajectory. Consistent attendance is essential for building a solid foundation in core subjects as well as preparing for professional skills. These alarming rates of absenteeism signal a pressing need for targeted interventions.

A Brookings publication, just one of multiple continual research on the matter, established links between absenteeism and student achievement, referencing absenteeism as a predictor of course failure and citing its association with lower achievement in reading and math. Assembly Bill 391 seeks to enhance the accountability and transparency of our educational system by refining annual reporting requirements to include detailed disaggregated data on student performance including chronic absenteeism. This bill aims to provide a clearer picture of where our schools stand and where additional support is needed to show how our students are actually performing under certain circumstances. This robust accountability framework empowers administrators, policymakers, and community stakeholders to make informed decisions, allocate resources effectively, and implement targeted interventions that will help reduce absenteeism and alleviate teacher shortages.

Informed decisions, not based on narrative, but fact, and not based on the mantra we are the worst schools in the country. I promise you, most of our staff and students are working extremely hard, and too hard for these demoralizing comments or stigmas. Ultimately, Assembly Bill 391 reinforces our commitment to ensuring every student receives the quality education they deserve, and that our educators are equipped to meet the challenges of today's learning environments.

Currently, public schools, charter schools, and the State Board of Education create annual accountability reports detailing pupil achievement and school performance based on standardized tests. However, these reports have not consistently provided detailed insights into the progress of all student groups, particularly those facing unique challenges such as excessive absences or receiving instruction from unlicensed personnel. Assembly Bill 391 addresses these gaps by revising the accountability reporting requirements for public schools, charter schools, and the State Board of Education to include disaggregated data on pupil achievement among students who have accrued more than ten absences, and therefore, have been deemed chronically absent.

We know measuring student achievement should not be one-dimensional, meaning it should not be based on one particular test, during one snapshot of one school year, because the factors that go into student achievement are not one-dimensional. Factors such as effort; desire; focus; interest; aptitude; emotional or social maturity; trauma; a good night's sleep; a good breakfast; family upbringing; parental expectation; all of these things—and there are many more—impact student achievement. However, they are not quantifiable, attendance is.

Right now, I will refer to the conceptual amendment [[Exhibit K](#)] and again, apologies because this was occurring late in the evening, last night. What it does, is it states for you the information on the pupil achievement, among pupils, to basically separate out the scores. When the state is producing those scores, student achievement based on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) or any other standardized test, we can see the scores between students who had less than ten absences prior to the administration of that test, and students who had more than ten absences prior to the administration of that test. The reason why I wrote prior to the administration of the test is because absences that occurred after the test only skews the results. Also, there is no one specific day in Nevada when we take the test; there is a window, especially for our larger school districts, especially Clark and Washoe, where you have thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands of students, over 100,000 students trying to take a certain exam. It takes more than one or two days to get all the students in schools through. Typically, in the Clark County School District, the window opens in March, and it is usually about a 6- to 8-week window. Again, we do not want to capture absences. There could be a student who had all ten absences the day after they took the SBAC. Obviously, that is just going to skew what we are looking for. It would be prior to the administration of that test.

The amendment also removes the second part, which was to capture those students who have not had a licensed teacher for four consecutive weeks or more. Again, I brought this bill last session. Those of you who were here remember, you also sitting on Education know the struggle, that there are often students who do not have a licensed teacher, do not have a certified teacher, they only have full-time subs. Full-time subs are not evaluated, so it is hard to really determine how well they are doing. In worst case scenarios—because again, sometimes we have great full-time subs, sometimes we do not—there is no full-time sub, and it is literally teachers having to sell out their preps. Every single day, that class may see a

different teacher in that room. Again, all of that impacts student achievement, but that section was removed, based on discussions with the group of school superintendents and the technical challenges around gathering that information, and the inconsistencies around certain business laws and definitions between schools and districts. We are focused on the amendment and just the absenteeism.

The other thing I want to make sure was covered and removed from the bill, is in the way it was written, it talked about gender and things like that. That is absolutely not the goal. This is not based on gender or any other factors, just whether the students are in school or not. I believe those types of statements are there in case there are not enough students in a certain group to populate certain data but, obviously, we have enough students so gender or any other factor does not need to be identified.

In closing, by refining these reporting provisions, A.B. 391 aligns Nevada's educational accountability measures with best practices ensuring we continue to uphold high standards in our public education system. The bill represents a proactive step toward nurturing an environment where every student has the opportunity to succeed, ultimately contributing to the state's broader educational excellence and future workforce.

It also gives us an idea to see just how important school attendance is and the impact it has on student performance. Of course, we also have students who are doing extremely well, working extremely hard—but because they may be in a certain school in a certain community, how demoralizing is it for these hard-working students, these high-achieving students to also hear their schools are not any good, and their teachers are not any good, and so on. As well as for our staff, who continues to pour so much into their profession to only be berated and blamed for so many things, also to support the idea we need to be in school. That concludes my remarks. I am open for any questions.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I will open it for any questions.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

This disaggregation is something I do in my own grade book, for my own students; and I see huge differences between the students who show up and the students who do not. I think 80 or 90 percent of the students who are failing in my class are those who are chronically absent. I understand the intent here. My question is just on the process. I would imagine this should not be that difficult to pull because we can pull this directly from Infinite Campus. Is that what you are envisioning for the process?

Assemblymember Miller:

Yes. And speaking with others, the rates of chronic absence, this information is already available to NDE unlike the other one, which would have created multiple steps and more technical challenges. But yes, they do have the rates of absenteeism. Of course, it may require some process on the schools because, again, I believe NDE should be told which date your schools are participating in these as well.

Assemblymember Mosca:

It is just a clarifying question. Are the ten absences prior to the administration of the exam because you want to capture who was absent ten days before they took the exam?

Assemblymember Miller:

It is not who was absent ten days before the exam, it is whoever had ten absences throughout that school year before the administration of that exam.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

And along those lines, I do have a couple of quick questions. Is the intent to capture unexcused and excused absences? Does it capture school activities, or is it to capture those unexcused absences?

Assemblymember Miller:

It is to capture either, both, or basically no separation between excused or unexcused—because, again, the bill is not about making judgment calls on the reasons. It is not trying to even solve that problem. It is to provide us with that data. Again, with that 25.9 percent that NDE said, it does not matter, and the impact it has on education, it does not matter if it is excused or unexcused. We know there are a variety of—those of us who work in schools—excusable reasons, and we see a variety of things we would not consider excusable. But at the end of the day, they were either in school or they were not. There will be no separation between those.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I was looking through my notes for this bill. I do know some of the testing, an example would be SBAC testing, is more than three weeks sometimes, especially with testing and makeups, because of absences. I am trying to understand whether or not this would be in place before the initiation of testing, recognizing testing can go on for weeks on end, or is the intention of this piece of legislation ten days at any point during that testing window?

Assemblymember Miller:

I believe it should stop when testing begins in that building because, as you stated, it goes on for weeks and weeks. But again, this is from the first day of school until testing begins at that school. Any students who accumulate more than ten absences, whether they are consecutive or sporadic—but the only clean way to measure it is to just stop it at the first day of administration.

I have one more clarifying question, so I will follow up with you, but I do appreciate the intent of this legislation. Is the intent for this to impact Nevada School Performance Framework at all, for the school performance framework right now? Or is it for us to capture the data right now so we have the data, and then after reviewing this data within the next couple of years, we would then be able to revisit and determine whether or not there would be recommendations for any policy changes?

Assemblymember Miller:

Yes, that is the intention. As you stated, it is not to have any intention on the framework or the scoring of schools. I know attendance is currently a consideration, a benchmark for the stars on our schools, but this is just for us to see the data and move forward with that accuracy.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Thank you, I appreciate it. At this time, I will invite anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 391.

Brian Wallace, Vice President, Nevada State Education Association:

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for 125 years in all 17 counties. We support Assembly Bill 391 to require school districts to report on achievement data for those students who are chronically absent. As Nevada continues pushing forward with increasing demands for accountability in our educational system, it is increasingly important to continue digging deeper into the factors that impact student achievement. Student absenteeism is just one of these factors, with over one quarter of Nevada students being considered chronically absent the previous year. Chronic absenteeism lowers academic performance as students struggle to keep up. Frequent absences create gaps in their education and their knowledge, making it increasingly difficult for students to remain current, and it impacts their ability to access any new material. Students who are chronically absent are more likely to fall behind academically, become disengaged and, unfortunately, eventually drop out of school.

Research continues to show chronic absenteeism is linked to lower test scores and grades, especially, as we have heard, in reading and math. Students who frequently miss school lead to greater demands on educators to provide remediation, while continuing to meet the needs of the rest of our classes. This adds responsibility, increases our workload, contributes to the stress we experience, leads to numerous frustrations and burnout when student progress is hindered by their inconsistent attendance. While Nevada has put much responsibility on classroom teachers when it comes to student achievement, including tying it to our evaluations and student growth, the reality is always more complicated, as we heard. By disaggregating this data by attendance, we will have better insight into the effectiveness of our classroom instruction and our student successes. This data will also give state and school leaders better information so they can adjust their efforts to reduce this chronic absenteeism we are experiencing in the state. We ask for your support.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I do not see anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 391. At this time, I will invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 391. I do not see anyone here in Carson City, nor do I see anyone in Las Vegas. Is anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 391? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral? Please begin when you are ready.

Penny Brock, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I have a background in education. I started two private Christian schools in Reno; we had very little absenteeism. Why? Because the kids loved to come to school. They had an excellent academic education. They learned to read by intensive systematic phonics; they knew their times tables by third grade. We taught history, American history, which they loved, and science. They were tested every year with the College Board Scholastic Assessment Test, which is a very grilling academic achievement test. Most public schools do not give it anymore. But my kids, our students, they excelled. They loved their school; they loved coming to school.

We have a huge problem across our nation. We are failing our children, our students, by not teaching them and equipping them to be part of the workforce when they graduate. It has gotten so bad that Donald Trump issued an Executive Order to abolish the Department of Education. It is coming back to the states. What is Nevada going to do to improve their test scores? We are at the bottom. Absenteeism is a part, but it is not the reason. I know educators are trying to figure out why. Why are our kids not learning? And now they are grappling with absenteeism. That is not the problem. It is lack of true academic education, teaching the reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Because you expressed disapproval of the piece of legislation, we are going to classify that as opposition. I just want to note that for the record. We are on neutral on A.B. 391.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

We are in the neutral position at this point, but we want to thank Assemblymember Miller for the amendment. We spoke with her yesterday and she brought forward the amendment today. We are neutral because we are just in the process of reviewing the amendment with our members. Right now, we are neutral and hope we can get to that positive position.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I will go to Las Vegas where I do not see anyone wishing to testify in neutral. Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 391? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 391. The end of "Assemblymember Miller Day" has occurred, but no worries. She will be back sometime next week or the week after.

We will open the hearing now on Assembly Bill 420. As a reminder to members of the public, at some point, some of us may have to leave for different bill presentations in other committees. Please do not view this as a sign of disrespect. However, it is our responsibility to attend other committees to present this legislation. At that point, I will pass it over to Vice Chair D'Silva, who I know will do a phenomenal job chairing this Committee. Additionally, we are going to take 20 minutes in support, 20 minutes in opposition, and 20 minutes in neutral on this piece of legislation. We will bounce back and forth between Carson City and Las Vegas and take people who are in person to testify before we move to the phone. If 20 minutes of support or opposition has been expended in person, then we will have limited or no time for the phones. Please begin when you are ready.

[Assemblymember D'Silva assumed the Chair.]

**Assembly Bill 420: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration.
(BDR 34-538)**

Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16:

I do want to note I have two presenters with me. Noé Orosco for Make the Road Nevada, and then there should be a representative from the Secretary of State's Office. I am here today to proudly present Assembly Bill 420 for your consideration. The goal of this bill is to increase transparency and accountability in the use of force by police officers and employees within our school districts. Additionally, this bill seeks to enhance civic engagement among students, providing resources to support voter education and participation.

I am sure some of you were reading this bill and probably thought to yourselves, Wow, this is two very different things. Well, we know the legislative process is very short, with very limited resources, and sometimes we have to put bills in places to make it work. That is how we came up with both of these bills. Some of you may have also read the language and know this was taken from Assembly Bill 217 to really address what we are trying to address in this bill. That is also for the purposes of that.

In recent years, concerns have been raised about the use of force by school police officers, including chemical agents; for example, pepper spray and electronic stun devices against students. While police officers and district personnel play an essential role in maintaining order and security, it is also imperative any use of force be documented, reported, and made transparent. That is the intent of this bill. At this time, I am now going to turn it over to my copresenter who will really go through the origins, why it is important, and why we want your support.

Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada:

Briefly, in terms of police in schools, Clark County and Washoe County are the only two school districts that have their own dedicated school police as you all are very well aware. For the other school districts, they rely on local law enforcement agencies. That could include having assigned school resource officers, or SROs. Because we were looking only at Washoe and Clark County, the entities that have the police departments, we were looking through both of those school district's policies, and with the Clark County School District Police Department, we came across GO-650.15. That is the General Order that specifically addresses the use of force. Whenever there is any reportable use of force, there is a committee within that General Order that reviews and evaluates whether the use of force aligns with the department policies, the General Orders, as well as a Supreme Court case that specifically addresses the use of force.

The committee will essentially conduct everything internally; it will evaluate it. From there, there is a system that we saw through the General Order, referred to as Blue Team, and the internal committee reviews it. They upload all the information, all the resources they are able to collect: body-worn cameras, reports, and documentation. They upload all of that into Blue

Team. Then the use of force committee captain uploads that committee report. At the end of it, the final disposition or the resolution is basically made by the original chain of command. That is how Clark County does it.

For Washoe County, we were unable to find any specific equivalent to the Blue Team Clark County uses. However, they do have a procedure. It is 22.07.1, and it is basically very similar to what Clark County does any time there is a use of force incident. It is investigated by a supervisor, regardless of whether there is a complaint filed or made. The supervisor will gather all of the statements, very similar to what Clark County does. From there, they will submit a report to the chief of police, as well as a recommendation as to whether the use of force was appropriate. At the end of everything, the chief of police is the one who makes the final disposition.

In both of those school districts, we did not see where any of the outcomes of the investigations are made public, and that is really what we are trying to get at with Assembly Bill 420, where we recognize some information may not be made available to the public. Just like any business or company that has any disciplinary actions or files, any complaints through their human resources process, there may be some information that is not made public or forward-facing. However, there are some things that can be made available to the public, such as if there were to be the deployment of pepper spray. For example, in the academic year, if it was deployed ten times, of those ten times, did they investigate, were any of those sustained, not sustained, or unfounded? This is more of the information where we are looking to see if we can get any of that because, currently, the only way any of this information is made available to the public is through public records requests.

Last legislative session, the Clark County School District was able to provide a presentation where some of the information was made available. Essentially, between 2019 and 2023—in terms of how they defined the use of force, they were referring to the deployment of oleoresin capsicum (OC), which is essentially pepper spray. They were also referring to the deployment of tasers, the electronic stun phase, and then open hand as it is indicated in their hands, their physical body. Between 2019 and 2023, there were a little bit over 180 use-of-force incidents. Had that presentation not been made to this body, we would not have known that is how many use-of-force incidents there had been between 2019 and 2023.

We currently do have a public records request we submitted to the Clark County School District because, when the presentation was made two years ago, it was during the academic year. It did not capture all of the 2022 to 2023 academic year. The public record request, I believe, was for the end of that year, as well as for the last academic year and for the current academic year, just so we could see how often the police department is using force. Essentially, what A.B. 420 would be doing is requiring the police department, the school district police, to be able to submit a quarterly report to the board of trustees, where they would be outlining the measures that have been taken, the measures that the school police

officers have employed so that they would reduce the incident or even reduce any possibility of a disorder or disruption. And then any actions that may have been taken to either deescalate or stabilize the situation so it would not result in the police officer using force, whether it is their physical force, tasers, or pepper spray.

One thing I want to mention quickly before I turn it back to Assemblymember González, is when we were looking at the reports from the last legislative session, as well as the General Orders and everything, the school district did indicate more officers who are inexperienced tend to use more force. Essentially, officers who have been on the police force between one and five years were the ones who were using force more often. That is part of the reason why we are looking at trying to have something be made public, or made available to the public, so we can see where maybe there are areas for improvement, ways the police department is able to ensure they are not only keeping the students safe, but also the students are able to feel like they are able to learn, since that is the purpose of them being on campus. I will go ahead and turn it back over to Assemblymember González.

Assemblymember González:

Additionally, section 2 of A.B. 420 establishes the Voter Access Grant Program administered by the Office of the Secretary of State to provide grants to counties, cities, and tribal governments. These grants are intended to support election administration and improve voter access throughout the state. The Secretary of State's office must also submit a report to the Legislature on or before January 1 of each odd-numbered year detailing grant applications and recipients, and the amount of grants awarded, as well as the description used for the funds. Mr. Di Chiara from the Secretary of State's Office is in Las Vegas. If he has any additional comments, Chair, if you will allow that, he can go ahead.

Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy Secretary of State, Office of the Secretary of State:

The Secretary of State's Office is grateful to Assemblymember González for including us and this grant fund in the bill. Elections are one of the most important duties government has but are historically underfunded at the federal level. The state of Nevada, in contrast, has invested heavily in elections in the last few years, including with Assembly Bill 422 of the 81st Session. mandating the top-down system, which we implemented this past election cycle. But there have traditionally been, or historically been, additional needs at the local level the Secretary of State's Office has attempted to assist with, either with the limited federal grant funds we have, or via other general fund appropriations or small charitable donations. We have helped counties pay for things like additional ballot drop boxes they have needed due to the increase in mail ballots; ballot sorters, which allow them to process those ballots far more quickly, and other information technology equipment that is necessary for the administration of elections, but the county may not have been able to provide.

There are other costs that have been covered by other means this grant fund would allow us to cover. There has been an incredible expansion of voting rights for Nevada's federally recognized tribes and bands in the last few sessions. One of the large problems we have had is finding poll workers to work at these polling locations. Historically, it is best practice for members of those tribes to be able to work as poll workers, but sometimes, due to other

commitments or due to the level of pay available for election workers from the county, those tribal members are just not able to take on those jobs during those several-week time frames. This grant would allow us to provide grant funds directly to a tribal government so they could supplement the county funds and pay their own tribal members to staff these Election Day and early voting polling locations, which would be great.

This past cycle, the Secretary of State's Office sent our own staff to make sure some of those polling locations were open and could stay open. We think there is a better way to do it, and this grant fund would allow us to do so. Additionally, we received a small charitable donation from a Las Vegas charity allowing us to conduct voter education text messaging. For example, when there was a ballot misprint in Carson City, the Secretary of State's Office was able to send out text messages to all the voters we had phone numbers for, letting them know they would be receiving a second ballot in the mail, and if they had not returned a ballot yet, to please return the second ballot. If they had already returned their first ballot, that is fine, but we would prefer they return their second ballot as well.

That kind of direct communication to voters working with the counties is incredibly important, especially as elections get faster and faster paced. We are very excited for the opportunity to be able to accept funds to sub-grant to counties for these needs—these basic needs that will help counties better administer elections in Nevada. Again, we are very grateful to Assemblymember González for including it in the bill.

Assemblymember González:

We are available for any questions.

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

I want to make sure I understand the amendment [[Exhibit L](#)] correctly. When I look at the original section 11, the data you are looking for applies to Clark County only, and it mentions both the board of trustees and charter schools. In the amendment I do not see the part limiting it to Clark, and I do not see charters mentioned. I wonder if that is a change or if maybe that is a drafting error.

Assemblymember González:

We did remove that part for Clark County because Washoe County, to my understanding, has a police department as well. We want to make sure we are including all police departments throughout the state in terms of this data. And then correct, we were just talking about that in my office. We were trying to figure out—we are still having conversations with charter schools to know what they are doing. I do know this bill definitely needs some more work, and we are working on it. You will hear some opposition today, as well, and so I appreciate the question. It is our intent to include charter schools as well.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

To clarify, it is meant to apply to basically all the public schools in Clark and Washoe Counties and you are just working on getting there?

Assemblymember González:

The intent is to include all school use of force on all campuses in all 17 counties. However, Washoe and Clark Counties are currently, to my understanding, the only school districts that have actual police departments that would be able to provide this data. Like I said, we are still having conversations with charter schools. Every charter school operates differently, private schools, things like that. We are just trying to massage that language to make sure we include them. However, if we do need to just start with Washoe and Clark Counties, I am open to that as well.

Noé Orosco:

That is why, at the very beginning, I did mention that although Clark and Washoe Counties are the only ones that have the school police department, the other school districts, from what we were able to see, if they do have any sort of collaboration and cooperation with local law enforcement, they end up assigning the school resource officers.

We did a little bit of research there, and we were able to find almost every single school district has a school resource officer, but there were a couple of school districts where we could not identify any. If you would like, we could definitely follow up afterwards to let the Committee know which of those school districts we were unable to find the school resource officer.

Assemblymember Hansen:

I just want to clarify; you had mentioned a few stats. In 2019 to 2023, there were about 180 force events, which could be a combination of pepper spray or tasers, that sort of thing. Was that just for Clark County?

Noé Orosco:

Yes, that is correct. That was just for the Clark County School District.

Assemblymember Hansen:

When I did the math, that is maybe around two a month we are looking at. The bill is not doing anything to prohibit the use of these types of force, right?

Assemblymember González:

The bill is not limiting use of force. It is not changing any policies around use of force. It is simply asking for a declassified, disaggregated report in which the public, students, and parents can look at and say, Hey, this school had this many uses of force, or this school had this many uses of force. As of right now, a person would have to submit a public records request. Like we stated at the beginning of our presentation, we have submitted one to the district. We are still waiting to have that information as well.

Assemblymember Hansen:

The information is there, right? We are just trying to make it more publicly available and not have to do these certain requests. We do have that data. I think we are trying to find the sweet spot. We know last session we dealt a lot with juvenile discipline and the climate of the classroom, and that our teachers and our students have felt unsafe, and we need to kind of get a little bit more control of the classroom. I am doing this juggling act because I want to ensure we have safe schools and those who are disrupting—and unfortunately, hoping not to have to use these measures, but obviously we are having to use them—but making it publicly available. If that is the intent, I am getting comfortable with it and I appreciate what you are trying to do.

Assemblymember González:

Yes, that is absolutely the intent. In our conversations, the Clark County School District school police already have these reports. They conduct investigations; it would just be making these reports available. As of right now, to my understanding these reports go directly to the superintendent. We do not know, does that mean the person was fired? Does that mean it was three times that they have used force? We do not know what those qualifications are for that report to get to the superintendent. And then what does the superintendent do with that information? We do not know.

I do agree. I think this is part of the public safety school conversation in which people want to feel safe. Again, if somebody is using use of force repeatedly, whether it is pepper spray or other things, and often on certain demographics of students at certain schools, these are conversations we should be having. What are the resources those schools need to mitigate having those interactions with students?

Noé Orosco:

Just to quickly add to that; in the 2021 to 2022 academic year, there were about 90 total use-of-force incidents. From there, 52 of those were the deployment of OC or pepper spray. This is just from the information provided by the school district in the last legislative session. About 30 of those 52 were in the first two or three months of the academic year. Going to what Assemblymember González is saying, they did not provide any further information as to: Was that in a certain part of the school district? Was it in specific schools? Was it high schools, middle schools, elementaries? That is really what we are trying to find out. If you are saying there were 90 total use-of-force incidents and 52 of those were the deployment of pepper spray, and about 30 of those ended up happening in the first two months of the academic year, we would like to see what is going on there. Provide a little bit more information, more context, so the public is able to get a better grasp as to why the use of the deployment is so high in the first two months of the academic year.

Assemblymember Hansen:

In relationship to these—I was thinking as you were speaking—I have a concern there is going to be sensitive information and that is why you have to do this formal request, so that personal information, whether about the student or about the law enforcement officer, is going to be protected. If we are making things public, is that some of the pushback? Are we going to protect somebody's privacy?

Assemblymember González:

Yes, the amendment [[Exhibit L](#)] does state declassified. It should be declassified data, as well as disaggregated. Something that we experience in the Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islander community a lot, is we classify everything under Asian. But we know that certain subgroups have certain stereotypes, if you will, about them, or they are treated differently. But when we do not disaggregate data, we cannot see what is actually happening. That is why the disaggregated part was there—breaking it down by race. We do not necessarily want to put the school either, but was it a middle school? Was it an elementary school? Was it a high school? We definitely want to protect the students, the families, the school community information, so we just want the declassified information.

Assemblymember Koenig:

I am having a little bit of a hard time finding the correlation between the two parts of this bill. I am under the impression that as long as they are semi-related or in the same section, we can add them together. One of them is minors who have had a use of force against them, and one of them is voters which would be people over 18. I think this question is probably more for Legal, but how are these two related enough to put in the same section? And if not, I think I just found a way to submit 20 bills next session, instead of just 10.

Assemblymember González:

Schools are used as voting sites. That was kind of the connection we had; these officers would be potentially the same officers or security who would be patrolling when we are using them for voting as well. This is an overall conversation of not just our families who go to these schools, but the general public, because we use schools for different things like voting, as well as on the weekends. Things like that. I can definitely pivot to Legal if they would like to answer as well.

Assemblymember Koenig:

This is not going to only be at schools; this is going to be, or could be, throughout the whole community too, right?

Assemblymember González:

What do you mean by this?

Assemblymember Koenig:

You said the correlation there is we will be doing some of these voting places at schools, but this is not limited only to schools. The Voter Access Grant Program can be throughout the community also. Correct?

Assemblymember González:

Correct. I will punt it to Legal now, to give you the legal analysis of your question.

Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:

Generally, under the *Nevada Constitution*, bills are required to embrace only one subject and the matter properly connected thereto. In the case of this bill, the single subject for the bill is governmental administration, and the single topic—and I should take a step back; not all of the material in a bill has to be related to each other, as long as all of the material is related to that one constitutional single subject. In this case, the single subject of this bill is governmental administration, specifically issues relating to elections, and the two different parts of the bill. I think from section 2 onward, all clearly relate to elections. The material in section 1 relates to elections in two different ways. One, the way mentioned by the Assemblymember. The other in section 1, subsection 4, all of this collection of data and then reporting is required to be published by the board of trustees of a school district within 30 days before the date of the next election. All of this reporting requirement is still tied to elections, and all of this material is required to be collected and then published as material available for voters for the next election, for the board of trustees, for the relevant school district. All of the material does relate back to elections. There is just a little bit of a roundabout way of getting there in section 1, because the data has to be collected to then be available to be reported before the election.

Assemblymember Koenig:

Thank you. It might be a little bit of a stretch but congratulations for fitting that in there.

Assemblymember DeLong:

You had mentioned about disaggregating the data on all these reports. Will there be an ability to identify, not necessarily exactly who the individual is that is being disciplined, but knowing each individual person? Are they a repeat offender?

Assemblymember González:

I do not think I quite understand. Are you asking if there will be a way to identify if the student was having multiple uses of force on them?

Assemblymember DeLong:

Yes.

Assemblymember González:

No, this is just in regard to data on uses of force. It is not asking for any student information in terms of what they did. More so, it is asking for the race, the gender, and possibly the age of the students. Again, being able to identify if that is in an elementary school, is that in a middle school, is it a high school? Things like that.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you for that clarification, though I do think if a school is actually dealing with a repeat offender, you are going to get a higher rate of instances than you would otherwise. That might actually be relevant data.

Assemblymember González:

Thank you so much for your commentary. I did not think about that. I appreciate it.

Assemblymember Hardy:

My question is about the Voter Access Grant Program. In section 3, it talks about "the Secretary of State may award a grant to an eligible entity for . . ." and it lists some options. Then section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (d) says, "Any other project, program or expense that the Secretary of State determines to be eligible for the program." I am kind of going through thinking that seems like a lot of discretion for them. Then on the front end is it, say the city, county, et cetera that is applying for a grant, do they have to say what they want it for? Or is it on the back end where they say, Oh, we used it for this. I am just kind of wondering how this all works.

Assemblymember González:

I also have Mark Wlaschin from the Secretary of State's Office, so I will phone-a-friend.

Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:

When it comes to grants, again, not only does the bill suggest regulations to provide clarity—not only for members of the public to understand how the process works, but also for election officials—but the way it works now are election officials will essentially identify a need. Historically, they look internally first, to see if it can be addressed through county funding. If they cannot address it through county funding, they will talk to the State about potential grants such as the Homeland Security Grant Program. Beyond that, there is also the Help America Vote Act grant. It is starting with the requirement first, typically tied to cyber or physical security, or otherwise language access, accessibility, those sorts of things. It does, in fact, start with the requirement first, and then we look for funding sources from there.

Gabriel Di Chiara:

Additionally, the bill calls for a report to be issued by the Secretary of State's Office listing what these purposes were. Understanding that last condition can seem overly broad. What we do not want is for a county to have a need, but that need not being directly addressed currently in legislation. I can assure you, yes, it would be tied to the necessities of election administration. It would not be for office parties for election workers, although maybe next session we will bring that one around. There would be a report released to the Legislature and the public saying this is what the counties applied for, what they were granted, the outcomes of those grants, what they were actually able to fund, et cetera.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

I actually want to ask about the same section, so I appreciate you staying up here. I just want to get some clarity. If the counties reach out and they have an unmet need or the tribal governments reach out and they have an unmet need, you can help them match with federal funds. But otherwise, you are constrained, you are not allowed to share any state funds now without this grant program. Is that correct?

Mark Wlaschin:

Essentially, yes. There are specific things in statute and regulation the state is able to pay for, typically through reimbursements to county and city election officials. But beyond that, there is not a pool of funds. In many cases, there are legitimate needs that are identified across our state relating to the execution and enforcement of *Nevada Revised Statutes* Title 24 that, unfortunately, go unmet simply because of a lack of funding.

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Are there any more questions from the Committee? [There were none.] At this time, we will hear testimony on this bill. We will start in Carson City, followed by Las Vegas, and then the phones. First, we will hear testimony in support of A.B. 420 here in Carson City. Seeing no one, we will go to Las Vegas.

Flor Diaz, Youth Organizer, Make the Road Nevada:

I am here in support of A.B. 420. I am speaking for not only myself, but on behalf of the youth I represent, youth who deserve to feel safer in their schools and communities. Many of the youth, many of the young people I work with, already face systemic challenges, and the use of force, especially without proper oversight, only adds to this. Youth are asking for accountability. They are not saying these tools should never be used, but when they are, there must be a way to track it. Transparency is the bare minimum. No one is prohibiting the use of a taser or pepper spray. This bill simply assures every incident is reported and reviewed. This is a step toward creating safe environments and rebuilding the trust between communities and law enforcement. I urge you to please vote yes on A.B. 420.

[[Exhibit M](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Vice Chair D'Silva:

I believe we have somebody in person here in Carson City, but because they are not here at the moment, we will go to the phone lines first and then come back to Carson City. [There was no one.] Next, we will go to testimony in opposition to A.B. 420. We will start here in Carson City.

Adrien Hunt, Police Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We are in opposition to A.B. 420, particularly in light of the recent conceptual amendment that continues to reference the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. We believe the provisions outlined in this bill overlap with practices our agency is already in full compliance with, and to our knowledge, as a transparent agency, we remain committed to complying

with all applicable laws and fulfilling any legitimate requests for information. However, we find the language in this amendment may unnecessarily duplicate existing protocols and could place undue burden on our operations.

Joshua Skaggs, Legislative Affairs Director, Nevada Republican Party:

I am here today in opposition to A.B. 420. The Nevada Republican Party strongly opposes A.B. 420, which includes provisions regarding school police reporting. However, the most concerning aspect is the creation of the Voter Access Grant Program. This Voter Access Grant Program is vague and lacks transparency, oversight, and the accountability necessary for any program that handles public funds. With the possible enactment of A.B. 420, the Secretary of State would have unlimited discretion to distribute taxpayer money to eligible entities for election related expenses, such as voter outreach and education. The problem lies in the fact these activities are often carried out by left-leaning partisan organizations.

Assembly Bill 420 does not provide clear guidelines to ensure the funds are used appropriately without checks and balances. This opens the door to potential fraud, waste, and abuse; as politically-biased groups could receive taxpayer funding under the guise of promising voter access. Also, the creation of a voter access grant program that lacks transparency and accountability could undermine public confidence in Nevada's election processes. For many Nevadans, the confidence in our elections is low. If taxpayer dollars are funneled to politically-motivated groups without proper checks and balances, it will only generate more distrust and doubt in our elections and further deepen divisions within our state.

We urge the Assembly to reject A.B. 420. Vote no on this bill. Nevadans deserve a fair, transparent, and accountable election system. Assembly Bill 420 could pose a threat to the integrity of our elections, and we must not allow public funds to be used this way.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

We are concerned only with section 2 of the bill, about the way the Secretary of State will have the Voter Access Grant Program. I was happy to see in the bill where it limits that just to counties, cities, and tribal governments, because without that limitation, we would be extremely concerned about how the money could be used. If you look at section 3 under subsection 2, paragraphs (c) and (d), it says, "(c) Programs for voter education and outreach; and (d) Any other project, program or expense that the Secretary of State determines to be eligible for the Program." That is extremely broad, with no limitation. I think it could become a problem when a Secretary of State, who is a partisan officer, who is always a member of a particular political party, may deem how to give those grants out and who would get the money. If he is unhappy with what some conservative, rural county like Elko County might be doing, that could be a problem. We see no oversight provided in the bill for the Secretary of State. We see no check on what he can do with the grants. We would like to see better transparency and also some kind of oversight or input from someone as to how the grants are used. I am happy to see it is limited, because if it were not limited to counties, cities, and tribal governments, I would be even more opposed than I already am.

[[Exhibit N](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Nancy Roecker, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I totally agree with what I just heard from the two prior people who testified. I would also like to add, I have a different concern and here is what it is: The summary for A.B. 420 describes it as "Revises provisions relating to governmental administration." It references the bill draft request (BDR) used by the Legislative Bureau [*sic*] as BDR 34-538. However, in the BDR, listed on the Nevada Legislative website, BDR 34-538 is described as, "Revises provisions relating to elections." Assembly Bill 420 section 1, revises *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 391. This chapter addresses personnel under Title 34, Education. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of Assembly Bill 420 seek to revise NRS Chapter 225. That chapter addresses the Secretary of State under Title 18, the State Executive Department. One bill, addressing two completely different subjects under two completely different NRS categories, to the point Assemblymember Koenig made. Article 4, section 17 of the *Nevada Constitution* mandates, "Each law enacted by the Legislature shall embrace but one subject, and matter, properly connected therewith, which subject shall be briefly expressed in the title . . ." The Legislative Counsel [*sic*] should not honor a request for the drafting of a legislative measure which has been combined in violation of section 17 of Article 4 of the *Nevada Constitution*. So this validates—

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Thank you, ma'am. Your two minutes are up. Would you mind submitting your written remarks to the Committee secretary? I believe our Legal Counsel did address that question or that testimony earlier today.

[Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit O](#).]

Penny Brock, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I agree with the person who just spoke, as well as the previous two speakers. The reason being is I appreciated the legal counsel's opinion, but it was just an opinion. I feel like, in America, some other attorneys may take issue with that opinion. Number two, in the *Nevada News and Views* today, it had this great picture about this very subject [Ms. Brock held up [Exhibit N](#)]. They called it the "Slush Fund Politics: A.B. 420 Gives The Secretary of State A Blank Check." That is very concerning to us as taxpayers. A blank check with no accountability. Who is going to get the money? Will it go to the leftist voting rights groups?

What was interesting today is President Trump is doubling down to secure elections. He had all 50 governors at the White House in February and he told them, We are going to go for proof of citizenship for elections, voter ID, one day voting, and paper ballots. I am expecting, any day, an Executive Order to come out. There is a draft of a bill in Congress to mandate paper ballots, voter ID, and so on. It is coming. What will this mean for Nevada that has universal mail-in ballots, the electronic voting system, et cetera? I would ask that—it is too bad that this was tacked on to this education bill. That was not right. I feel this bill should be voted down because someone I believe is playing games—

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Thank you, ma'am. Your two minutes are up. Please submit any additional comments to the secretary. I will go to Las Vegas for testimony in opposition.

Geneva "Geny" Evangelista-Del Rosario, President, Lions Club of Nevada, District 46:

The way I see this bill is it is a bit unconstitutional, because one bill addresses two completely different subjects and that was already addressed. The Legislative Counsel shall not honor a request for the drafting of this legislative measure which has been combined in violation of section 17 of Article 4, which is already addressed, which is good for validation. The drafting of A.B. 420 violates both the *Nevada Constitution*, the statute just quoted by the previous testifier—this matter must be taken up with the Legislative Counsel and this bill must be withdrawn. I oppose for the moment until it is further revised. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify.

Ed Uehling, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

This is so incredibly wild that this bill deals with problems in the school and then gives a slush fund to a very unreliable public official, the Secretary of State. Just look at what happened in the last election. He took it upon himself to decide we had to limit the number of people on the ballot, and that is why you saw all the nonpartisan people go through hell in order to be able to appear on the ballot. Robert Kennedy had to—well he was not nonpartisan, but he was in opposition to the Secretary of State—he had to file twice, spending millions of dollars to refile on the papers that he was given by the Secretary of State. The same with Jill Stein; millions of dollars having to redo papers that they were given by the Secretary of State. In my case, I paid my \$500 to appear on the ballot. On the day before—we had until Friday to submit signatures; we have to gather signatures since we are nonpartisan—on the day before Friday, they announced that we were going to have to turn in the ballots that very day, Thursday, because the people here in Las Vegas do not work on Friday. So that disturbs the whole collection process. Then, the Secretary of State denied a number of my signatures because the people had moved within the same district. And so—

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Thank you, sir. Please submit the rest of your written comments to the secretary.

Ed Uehling:

Why will you not let people discuss the whole thing?

Vice Chair D'Silva:

We have a two-minute time limit.

Ed Uehling:

You have spent lots of time—

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Sir, we have a two-minute time limit. We have been abiding by that time limit. Please submit your written comments to the secretary.

Ed Uehling:

Well, it is absolutely disgusting what the Secretary of State has done already.

Vice Chair D'Silva:

We have to move to the next testimonial. Thank you. We have had about 15 or 16 minutes of opposition testimony. We will move to the phone lines now.

Janet Campbell, Private Citizen:

I strongly oppose A.B. 420. There are two major issues with this bill. First, this bill covers two completely different subjects. One under the [unintelligible] of governmental administration and one under provisions relating to elections. The *Nevada Constitution* in Article 4, section 17, mandates that "Each law enacted by the Legislature shall embrace but one subject, and matter, properly connected therewith, which subject shall be briefly expressed in the title." In other words, we could only have single-subject bills. For this reason alone, this bill must be withdrawn.

The second major issue is outlined in section 3. It establishes the Voter Access Grant Program for the Secretary of State to hand out money in the form of grants to eligible entities. The purpose of this program would allow the Secretary of State to pay for supplies and equipment, give extra pay to his employees, pay for voter outreach, and other projects the Secretary of State determines to be eligible. Nothing is off limits. In addition, section 4, subsection 2 states, the Secretary of State may apply for and accept any donation, gift, grant request, [sic] or other source of money for deposit to the account. And once the money is deposited it cannot revert to the State General Fund. This borders on the subversive. This is extreme overreach by Assemblymember González.

Vice Chair D'Silva:

Thank you, ma'am, for your testimony. Please submit the rest of your testimony by emailing the secretary.

Ellen Gifford, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:

Article 4, section 17 of the *Nevada Constitution* mandates that each law enacted by the Legislature shall embrace but one subject and matter. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 218D.100 mandates the Legislative Counsel shall not honor a request for the drafting of a legislative measure which has been combined in violation of section 17 of Article 4 of the *Nevada Constitution*. Any bill that combines multiple subjects violates the *Nevada Constitution* and the statute just quoted and must be withdrawn and addressed by the Legislative Counsel.

Vice Chair D'Silva:

As a reminder to callers, we have a two-minute time limit on these testimonies. We want to hear from everybody so please abide by the two-minute time limit.

Lorena Biassotti, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a Clark County School District trustee, speaking for myself today. I have to agree with the previous comment. This bill is wild. I agree with the first section, which addresses investigations into the use of stun guns and chemical agents on students by the police. However, the connection you try to make into our elections makes no sense. The second part of it still opens the door to significant corruption. Why should the Secretary of State, an office so vital to the integrity of our elections, be the one to decide who receives grants and how much they get? I admit when I first read this, the first thing that came to mind was, Huh, a slush fund for nonprofits like Make the Road Nevada—and they are copresenters of this bill. We elect you to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly, not to allow them to be misused by funneling them to the Secretary of State, which can then choose organizations like the one already chosen here today. Allowing the Secretary of State to be responsible for overseeing our sacred elections to distribute funds to organizations that are personally selected using their own criteria undermines the very integrity of the process. This bill is fraught with potential for fraud and appears intentionally misleading. The entire bill seems to be a drafting error. You would have had to do some serious mental gymnastics to tie this into an actual valid concern for our students. Please withdraw this outrageous bill.

Dane Davis, Private Citizen, Nye County, Nevada:

I am a concerned citizen regarding this bill. To spare you repetition of all the reasons to oppose this bill, I ask you to please consider withdrawing this bill. It is very chaotic and it is confusing. It should be divided into two separate bills if this is something that you wish to address. I personally feel strongly about withdrawing this bill.

Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am very strongly opposing this bill. When I was told about this bill, I thought I was going to be listening for election bill. And then, when I was listening to the presentation the whole time, I was thinking, Am I listening to the wrong bill? And why is the election bill in the Education Committee? What does that have to do with education? To me, Education Committee is about education, educating our kids, schools, universities, and things like that. What does the Education Committee have to do with elections? And if it does, they should not be on one bill anyway.

It was so confusing. I was listening to the whole presentation, the whole time thinking, and texting people and asking them, am I in the right place? Because that is supposed to be an election bill that I am going to listen to, and all I am hearing is about pepper spraying the kids at school. So, it was super confusing. Please withdraw that bill. You guys, that is your job; we expect that you take care of that. I am just super confused. Ditto everything everybody said in opposition, and pretty much probably whatever they are going to say after me. Please withdraw this bill. Do not let this bill go further.

[Assemblymember Torres-Fossett reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Torres-Fossett:

At this time, we will close opposition to this piece of legislation and we will move on to support.

[[Exhibit P](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

I understand we did not have time for support earlier. We will go ahead and move to support and we will begin our 20 minutes of support. The time right now is 2:43 p.m. I know we had one in support, and we had a couple of others who had to exit the Committee room for a moment, but I understand you are back. We already had two minutes of support, so we will begin again with the remaining 18 minutes.

Ivon Meneses, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a proud parent of a CCSD student. I am here to show my support for A.B. 420. As a parent, my child's safety is the highest priority. Schools should be places of learning, growth, and opportunity, and something like voter education is important for our youth. I urge the Committee to pass A.B. 420 and send a clear message: in Nevada, we protect our children and believe in an exclusive democracy.

Mary Wagner, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here today in strong support of A.B. 420. I know fraud and abuse have been brought up and I want to remind this Committee these are buzzwords that are recklessly thrown around these days. I also want to remind you A.B. 420 does not prohibit the use of force. It simply requires reporting; promoting transparency, which protects both our children and law enforcement; strengthening our justice system; and reinforcing our shared commitment to fairness and safety for all Nevadans—including the most vulnerable in our communities, our children, who do not have the right to vote yet.

Audrey Peral, Program Director, Chispa Nevada:

I would just like to ditto the last two comments.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

At this time, I will close support because I know we have already gone to Las Vegas, and we have already gone to the phones. We will invite anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 420. I do not see anyone in neutral in Carson City, and I am not seeing anyone in Las Vegas in neutral. Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 420?

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I support the education component but not the election component.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

We will classify that testimony in opposition because they did have an issue with the piece of legislation. Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral? This means you have no stance, no support, no opposition to any parts of the legislation. You just have information you would like to provide to the Committee. [There was no one.] I will invite the bill sponsor for any closing remarks.

Assemblymember González:

I appreciate everyone's thoughtful questions in the Committee. I do know we will be working on an amendment to massage some of the language and some of the concerns in opposition testimony you heard. I look forward to continuing the discussion offline with all of you.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 420. At this time, we will open up the last item on the agenda, which is public comment. Do I have anyone wishing to testify in public comment? Please begin when you are ready.

Aleah "Sia" Liili, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I urge you all to please hear Assembly Bill 240, which will ensure that no female athlete is put in harm's way on the court or field, uncomfortable and vulnerable spaces like our locker rooms, where biological males are currently allowed, lose out on scholarship opportunities, and give us the power to champion our sports again, without having males who have a biological advantage. In the 2024 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division 1 (D1) Mountain West Conference, San Jose State rostered and started a transgender athlete. As the captain of the University of Nevada volleyball team, my teammates and I had the tough decision of taking a stand in the name of women's sports, considering the reasoning of fair competition, biological differences, and ultimately the loss of an opportunity for female athletes.

According to a study performed by the United Nations titled, "Violence against women and girls in sports," as of March 30, 2024, over 600 female athletes in more than 400 different sports competitions have lost more than 890 medals. As a female athlete who has been directly impacted by the participation of transgender athletes in women's sports, I ask you to end this now. Please protect the future generations of female athletes from the mental, emotional, and physical warfare many female athletes have had to go through already.

My question to those who want to diminish the opportunity for this bill to be heard, or even would vote against this bill, is, How many more female athletes are going to have to get hurt, forfeit matches, lose out on scholarships, undress in front of men in their locker rooms, and even see full male genitalia involuntarily, before you do something? How would you feel if it were your daughters, nieces, and even grandchildren being faced with this situation? Please allow for a hearing of A.B. 240.

Joseph Baptist, Private Citizen, Silver Springs, Nevada:

I am a fourth grade teacher at Yerington Elementary, in Lyon County, Nevada. I was brought here today by the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA). I am also a vice president of my local union, the Lyon County Education Association. Any comments that I make today that seem like they might be outlandish, or anything like that, please take them as my personal comments, and not those of any of those organizations.

I have worked in K-12 public education for the past two decades, and I have been teaching here in Nevada since I moved here in 2017. In my first career, prior to becoming a teacher, I served in the U.S. military, where we were always challenged to do more with less, because our mission was critical, and our level of dedication was so high. I have a 40 percent service-connected disability because of my dedication to that critical mission. I have friends and family who asked me why I am proud to be a Nevada educator, and even why I chose to move here, given that Nevada regularly ranks 49th out of 50 states for education spending. My simple answer is, Even though we are that far behind, we still typically rank 43rd, 44th for academic achievement. That tells me that I am working with people who think that our mission is critical, and we do more with less. However, there are costs for that. We see those costs in teacher burnout. We see those costs in people leaving education in Nevada.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Thank you for your testimony. Your time is up. I know you have written remarks too. If you could please make sure my Committee staff gets those, I would appreciate that.

[Written testimony was submitted, [Exhibit Q](#).]

Kendall Lewis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a student athlete attending Galena High School, and I am also a part of the Lieutenant Governor's Task Force to Protect Women's Sports. I worked very hard to put in the effort to get to where I am now in volleyball, a starter on my high school varsity team. When I first started playing volleyball three years ago, I never thought I would have to play against a biological male, considering when I signed up to play girls volleyball, the description seemed pretty clear: 12 girls, playing on a team together, with no male strengths going against them that would add a risk factor beyond the norms.

However, a few weeks later, I found out me and the 11 other girls on my team would be competing against a biological male. Experiencing this firsthand, fear ran through our bodies since we know how it creates an uneven playing field and puts us at danger because of the upper hand males naturally have. It is scientifically proven that males are stronger, their vertical is higher, and their agility is much faster. Some of the balls this male athlete hit were hard to pass due to the power behind the swings.

Confusion was another feeling we all had that day. The question of why the school and school district would allow a biological male to compete against us was a common thought we all shared. As a female playing in a women's sport, I should never have to worry about my safety or the safety of others on my team because a biological male is allowed to play

against us. This is unacceptable for men to be in female athletics and to compete at a woman's level of sports. Athletics already come with a safety concern, and adding in the risk factor of a male competing against women increases the dangers.

It is heartbreaking to see a male take away women's opportunities in sports, whether it be a spot on the team or a scholarship to play at a higher level. Women's sports were created to provide opportunities for fair competition among female athletes in their division.

Although my time playing volleyball is almost at an end, I still have a battle to fight for future generations of young female athletes. I am blessed enough to have the opportunity to stand up here before you, and I will do everything I can to fight for women's sports and making them safe for future generations. It is time we step up and take a step for what we know is right.

Ava Chavez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

Please hear A.B. 240. I am in seventh grade. I go to St. Albert the Great, the great Catholic school. I have been playing volleyball for six years now. Volleyball is my passion and there is nothing else I would want to do besides this sport. Being a volleyball player means that I must always be grateful, even if you are a starter or a benchwarmer. I have a dream to be a D1 volleyball player at the University of Georgia or the University of Hawaii.

Last fall, I had to compete against a boy multiple times. The only thing I could think about was what was their next move going to be, or could I receive what play he was making, or even worse, was I going to get hurt from his hit or his serve? This is very important to me because I play libero, whose job it is to take the most hits. Because I was playing against the boy, he took my mental focus away from the sport I love.

Watching Sia Liilii, senior team captain of Nevada volleyball, having to go through her last season and having to fight for her and her team's rights was sad and inspiring at the same time. Watching Sia gave me the courage to speak here today. I want to help keep my sport that I love fair and safe for me and my teammates. Right now, we are being impacted by adults making the rules. These adults should be protecting girls like me, but they are not. I am calling upon you, as leaders, for me and my teammates and future girl athletes who are also dreaming of becoming D1 volleyball players, please do not let our dreams be given to boys. Change laws and protect our sport.

Miles Shanor, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am an aspiring educator who grew up in Clark County, but I attend the University of Nevada, Reno, to become a public school English teacher. Alongside that, though, I am a para educator in a Title I school in Washoe County, and I speak to you primarily as such. I am calling for the amendment of Assembly Bill 390. To recap, this bill allocates more funding for teachers in high-need areas. As a paraprofessional, I am asking us to extend that funding to those of us who are education support professionals, counselors, one-to-one paraprofessionals, et cetera. I work in a primarily after-school program—

Chair Torres-Fossett:

I really do appreciate your testimony and if you would like to talk about education matters, feel free. However, A.B. 390 is not in our Committee, so it is not within the purview or the scope of this Committee. If you would like to talk about education overall, please feel free to continue. But if it is specific to that bill, it is not within the scope of our Committee.

Grace Nielsen, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a 14-year-old competitive swimmer for Reno Aquatic Club. I am speaking to ask for your support of A.B. 240. In the past years, the topic of trans women competing in women's sports has grown near to my heart. Because of this, I firmly believe that you cannot say you support women and girls, when you value trans athletes' comfort more than our own. By supporting trans athletes, you take away so much from the progression of women's sports in even the past 20 years. Youth sports provide a safe environment for young girls to learn the dedication, resilience, and hard work they have to put in to achieve goals. I know that without my sport, I would lack many of these crucial skills that make me a better athlete, let alone person. This is why I know it is necessary to protect women's sports from men competing or sharing spaces with female athletes.

You might say it is irrelevant given that this is not that common of an issue. The way I view it, it is not that common of an issue yet. When is the line going to be drawn to protect female athletes who have already been robbed of scholarships, been vulnerable in locker rooms, and have had to compete in unfair circumstances against biological men? This is why I am so passionate about this issue. I do not want to have to feel unsafe or threatened in a locker room or shower. I do not want to have to stay silent and compete in unfair circumstances. I do not want to have to be overlooked in my upcoming high school swim seasons, or hopeful collegiate swim seasons, because I lost to a biological male.

This is why this is an immediate issue. I only have four years in high school along with many other girls around my age, who only have one or two left, and we should be respected for the work and dedication we put into our athletics, and our chances of success that stem from that. I ask you to please understand the timing relevance of A.B. 240, and to look at this issue, not under the lens of a political agenda, but through the lens of girls like me who care about our athletics almost more than anything. Please put us first. We are the ones affected by this more than anyone. Support A.B. 240 to provide and ensure the future of women's sports.

Maddison Hodge, Private Citizen:

I am here today to ask for your support on A.B. 240. I currently play volleyball. However, I grew up competing in many different sports, including soccer, swimming, and jiu-jitsu. I am lucky enough to have never been forced to compete against a biological male, but I am here to join the fight for those who have, and for the future of female athletes like myself. Girls should not be competing against biological males. It is unsafe, and it puts girls in a position where they are scared to step on the court and fear they could get severely injured. Males are

biologically stronger and bigger than girls, which is why we have separate sports in the first place. For example, the men's volleyball net is seven inches higher than the women's for a reason. They can jump higher and hit harder and putting them at a women's net gives them great dominance over the women on the court.

Any male who is playing on a woman's team is stealing an opportunity from a woman. It takes a lot of hard work and dedication to play at a high level and it is unfair that women who work hard to get there are getting opportunities stolen by biological males. I understand the need for equality. But what about the equality for women and girls? I ask you to support our right to an equal playing field.

Aisena Allen, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am a 13-year-old competitive gymnast from Sparks, Nevada. I am an eighth-grade student at Sky Ranch Middle School. I am writing to ask for your support on A.B. 240, as fairness in women's sports is so important to me. I have been a gymnast since I was four years old. I love the sport of gymnastics because it challenges me every day to be at my very best. I get to prove to myself that I can do hard things. My goal is to compete at a collegiate level just like my sister. I have had the opportunity to watch her and her team qualify for Nationals [National Collegiate Women's Gymnastics Championships]. How unfortunate would it have been if they did not make it to Nationals because they had to compete against a biological male. Males are born with a higher level of testosterone which makes them stronger and more muscular. Boys do not belong in girls' sports. It is not fair, and allowing males to compete in female sports gives them a major unfair advantage. Please support A.B. 240 to protect girls like me who are working hard to achieve their goals.

Mikayla Kelly, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am a 16-year-old gymnast from Sparks, Nevada. I am currently attending Spanish Springs High School as a sophomore. I have been doing gymnastics since the age of two, and I have been competing competitively since the age of five. I am reaching out to ask for support for A.B. 240 as I strongly believe in equal opportunity for women's sports. Ever since I was a little girl, I have dreamed of becoming an NCAA D1 gymnast. I have dedicated to training since the age of five and as of now, I spend more than 20 hours a week practicing as a young female athlete. I have always aspired to be like role models in my sport like Simone Biles and Jordan Childs. But I could not imagine looking up to a male in women's gymnastics.

In the past few years, we have seen biological males competing in women's sports. You may be thinking that there is no problem with this because it is including everyone. But with that, we can see that it has changed women's sports. As we know, men have a different hormone buildup than females that causes them to generally be stronger and gain muscle faster. Even if a male converts to a female, they still have more strength and muscle causing an unfair lead for them. This also affects females when trying to excel in their sport, by getting beat by a biological male. Another concern is with contact sports. For women to be hitting head on with someone who has the build of a male could be very dangerous. This limits the safety and opportunities presented in sports. For example, in the NCAA for women's gymnastics there is already a limited number of spots available; with the new rule change, there are even

less spots. If a male took my spot that I have been dreaming of my whole life, I would be absolutely devastated. I want to thank you for taking the time to listen to me and I ask for your support of A.B. 240 to help all the young girls who are passionate about the sport like me.

Aymee Lunsford, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

Please hear A.B. 240. I am 12 years old, a student athlete from Reno, Nevada. I believe girls sports should be fair. When I watch men's volleyball, I see when they serve the ball over the net it goes over in a blink of an eye, and it is so fast. When they hit the ball with a lot of force, it goes straight down. They move so fast, and they are very strong. In women's sports, the pace and speed are different. I play volleyball. My dream is to play volleyball in college and at some point, in the Olympics. It would be so unfair if a biological man takes my dream and my spot on a woman's team. Boys and girls are built differently and that is why we have separate teams. If boys are allowed to compete in a girl's sport, it takes away opportunities and it can easily get us hurt. They can easily make teams or earn scholarships that girls work so hard to earn. We can still include everyone in sports while keeping girls' competitions fair, but girls still have their own spaces to compete fair and square. Please support A.B. 240 to protect girls like me who love sports.

Riley Roleson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am 12 years old. I am an athlete at St. Albert the Great, the great Catholic school in Reno, Nevada. I am speaking to ask you to support A.B. 240 because I believe girls sports should be fair. I play volleyball and basketball, and I love it. It is so fun to be around girls and the atmosphere is just so amazing. Sometimes, I think sports can be unfair, but I get through it and then just forget about it. But how would you feel if you were playing volleyball against a male athlete? Could you imagine the fear of getting hit by a powerful ball? Well, you should not have to even think about that, but we have to.

Boys have been playing in girls' sports more recently, which they should not be. Boys and girls are built differently, and that is why we have separate teams. If boys are allowed to compete in girls' sports, it makes it harder for girls to win, make teams, or earn scholarships. We can still include everyone in sports while keeping girls' competitions fair. One idea is to rename boys sports as an open category so everyone can play, but girls still have their own space to compete. Please support A.B. 240 to protect girls like me who love sports.

Taylor Fewins, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am a 17-year-old Level 10 gymnast in Sparks, Nevada. I am currently a senior at Spanish Springs High School, and next year I will be attending Springfield College as part of the gymnastics team. I am writing to you, speaking to you, to ask for your support on A.B. 240, as protecting the integrity and fairness of women's sports is important to me. I have grown up in the sport of gymnastics. I have dedicated 12 years and counting to this amazing and fulfilling sport. I love the daily challenge of the sport and how each day is different. I am extremely proud to be able to do skills only a small percentage of young girls and women can.

I am lucky and proud to be able to say that I have accomplished my goal that I have had ever since I was a little six-year-old girl; being a college gymnast. If my spot had been taken by a male, it would have been extremely unfair and would have crushed me. So far, us female gymnasts have been lucky that no male has tried to compete as a woman. However, if society keeps going down this path, it will not be long until it does. This tragedy has already affected many in swimming, wrestling, volleyball, basketball, and track. Boys do not belong in women's sports because they are biologically different, no matter what they do to change. Their bones and muscles will always be bigger, due to the effects of puberty on their bodies, giving them an extreme advantage over women.

Imagine if your daughter, sister, or teammate got second to that of a man, their incredible record was beaten by miles, their spot on a team was taken, or their career was cut short due to an injury caused by a man. How would it make you feel? This seems unimaginable; however, these events have occurred to many girls around the U.S. So, I ask you to please support A.B. 240 to protect girls like me who are, and have been, working their whole lives to achieve their goals and dreams.

Brooke Roleson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a student athlete from St. Albert the Great Catholic School who lives in Reno, Nevada, and is in the seventh grade. I am speaking to you to ask for support on A.B. 240 because I believe that girls sports should be fair. I play volleyball and basketball and love the sports, whether it is playing or watching them. As someone who has played the sports since fifth grade, I have truly loved the sports, and I hope to continue playing them. I have played two club volleyball seasons at Silver State, now known as Tstreet, and three CYO [Catholic Youth Organization] basketball and volleyball seasons at my school.

I have enjoyed the sport with my friends and hope to continue playing with them. But if my opportunities as a female were taken away from me by a biological male, I would be devastated. This is why girls should have their own league and that we should be able to play sports and not have the fear of being injured by a biological male, which we should not have to worry about in the first place. The reason why girls and boys are separated in sports is because boys are genetically stronger than girls. If boys were allowed to compete and participate in girls' sports, it would become harder for girls to win, make teams, or earn scholarships. This does not mean that boys and girls cannot play together and enjoy a sport with each other, but girls should be able to compete in their own league without having biological males join their league. Boys and girls need to be separated for safety and the protection of girls, being able to have the same opportunity to win, join a team, or earn a scholarship, that is not taken away from them by a biological male. Please support A.B. 240 to protect girls like me who love sports.

Reagan Christinson, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am a 14-year-old competitive gymnast from Sparks, Nevada. I am an eighth grader at Sky Ranch Middle School, and I am writing to ask for your support on A.B. 240 as fairness in women's sports is so important to me. I have been a gymnast since I was four years old. I love the sport of gymnastics because it challenges me every day and it is so fun to do all the

crazy tricks. It is my dream to earn a D1 scholarship and compete at the collegiate level when I graduate high school in 2029. I have been working hard to one day achieve this goal. If a biological male were to take my spot on a roster, it would be extremely unfair. Males are built differently than women, which makes them stronger and faster. Those are biological facts. We are lucky in gymnastics that this issue has not affected us yet. But in sports such as track, swimming, volleyball, basketball, and wrestling, this is an issue now. Boys do not belong in girls' sports. It is just not fair or right. What would you tell your daughter if a biological male took her place on a team? Please support A.B. 240, to protect girls like me who are working so hard to achieve their sports dreams. There is a place for everyone in sports, just not girls' sports.

Anya Lopez, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am a 12-year-old athlete in seventh grade, in Sparks, Nevada. I am reaching out to seek your support for A.B. 240 as I strongly believe in promoting fairness in girls' sports. As a Level 9 gymnast, I have aspirations of becoming a student athlete and competing at the NCAA Division 1 level. I have been dedicated to training since the age of five and have been actively competing for the past six years, alongside my academic responsibilities. I commit 20 hours per week to training. Boys and girls are inherently different, which is why we have separate teams. Allowing boys to compete in girls' sports deprives girls of opportunities to compete and hinders our ability to reach our athletic and academic goals. Being a competitive athlete offers benefits that extend beyond the sport itself. It helps us stay physically fit, disciplined, and focused. Through sports we also have learned valuable skills like time management and emotional regulation which are crucial for success in life.

While I believe that everyone should have the opportunity to develop these skills, fairness is essential, and allowing boys to compete in girls' sports is not fair. Boys' bodies are biologically different than girls. In athletic competitions, boys outperform girls, depending on the requirements of the event. This has become more evident over the past couple of years where biological boys have defeated top-ranked females in swimming, boxing, cycling, tennis, track and field, and various other sports. This should not be allowed to continue as it takes away opportunities from girls. Thank you for taking the time to listen to what I strongly believe, and I ask that you support A.B. 240, to protect girls who love sports like me.

Jordan Eddington, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a senior at the University of Nevada, Reno, and I am currently doing my internship in Washoe County. I am also a member of the Nevada State Education Association, but I am speaking as an individual today. While I have been completing my internship, I have been working more than full-time hours, while being unpaid. I love everything that I do as a student teacher, and I cannot wait to start my profession after graduation.

I believe that passing the plan for optimal public-school funding [Pupil-Centered Funding Plan] will give all students in the state of Nevada a high-quality education. I have lived in Reno, Nevada my entire life. And one of the most distinct things my teachers would always say is that they would have to buy materials with their own money. I have seen that this is still the case with a lot of educators. Our students are our future and should be treated as such.

In my internship, I am fortunate there are only 18 students and because of this smaller classroom size, I am able to have a more one-to-one interaction with these students. Additionally, the students themselves feel more heard and can have a voice in the classroom. However, if this classroom had more than 20 students, it would be harder to make connections with my students. In return, the students would not be learning to their fullest potential. Please help us pass the plan for optimal public school funding.

Jessica Glover, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

My grandmother, my belated grandmother—Mary G. Renick, World War II Air Force veteran—told me to stand for what I believe in, and I am so proud of the young women who came before us today and stood for what they believe in, in their sports, for their biological reasons. Let us support A.B. 240. Twenty hours a week, they are going out of their way, out of their academics, doing something that they love. I support A.B. 240.

Allura Addington, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am here for NSEA and its overall education statement. So, nothing specific but just an overall statement. I am a fourth-grade teacher in Lyon County. I have taught for about ten years in Washoe and Lyon Counties. I have had joys for my job but also felt many frustrations, as I am sure you guys have felt as well. Our kids and our educators deserve better. We need to pass the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (Plan). Passing the Plan would ensure educator retention and reducing class sizes, respecting our educators and our paraprofessionals, shooting for optimal funding for education, and schools over stadiums and studios. More money per pupil means we can reduce class sizes, reduce stress for our educators, and bring performance up by serving our community. Optimal funding would be ideal to keep teachers and allow our students to thrive, not just live in survival mode. We need better class sizes so our students can receive quality education, and our teachers do not feel overwhelmed. We do not want to be last in the country. We want better for our educators, our students, and our families.

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Seeing no additional public comment here in Carson City, it appears that I do have one individual wishing to testify in public comment in Las Vegas.

Ed Uehling, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

What impresses me about this meeting is the degree to which politics makes people hypocrites. You can easily see the difference between Assembly Bill 390 and the—

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Excuse me, sir. We are not talking about how this meeting was run. At this time, public comment is an opportunity for you to talk about issues that pertain to education. If you would like to talk about something that relates to education in the state of Nevada, please feel free. Otherwise, I will have to move on.

Ed Uehling:

Okay. As a member of the LGBTQ+ community, I can see what all these students are talking about. It is so logical that men should not be competing against, allowed to compete against girls. But so many people, the politicians, cannot see that because they are infected by this disease, the politics. And we have seen it in other cases here in this meeting, where you cannot distinguish Assembly Bill 420 that discusses education and the safety of kids—

Chair Torres-Fossett:

At this time, I am going to move on because we are not discussing A.B. 420. You are going back to a bill that has been previously discussed, and per the Committee rules, we cannot continue that conversation because the hearing has been closed. If you would like to send additional remarks to the Committee, please feel free to do so in writing. Do we have—

Ed Uehling:

I cannot comment on education?

Chair Torres-Fossett:

No, sir, because your testimony was going off of that.

Ed Uehling:

—and the horrible things that are going on in Nevada education and that apparently your Committee is supporting. I cannot talk about that?

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Thank you, sir. Your time is up. We will go ahead and cut the mic right now and we will go to the phone lines.

Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I want to say to the young ladies who were speaking, Ladies, I am so proud of you. It is not easy to come up and talk, especially in front of adults, especially people who your future is in their hands. I am going to share advice that I have been given by Riley Gaines. It is not easy—we are following the language they want us to use, and you can take it or leave it. But in the future, if you can try to use only the word "male" or "boy," because they want, on purpose, to use the words "biological male." There are only two genders—thank you, President Trump—there is male and female. The fact that they have to qualify "transgender female" shows that they are not a female. So, if they are not a female, by the process of elimination, they are a male. They use language to—

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Do you have anything to say about education? If you do, please proceed.

Katrin Ivanoff:

Yes, I wanted to say that I am very proud of the ladies who took the time to come to talk in front of you, and I would beg you to please hear A.B. 240. As it stands right now, 84 percent are in support of the bill, and I do not see that bill scheduled for a hearing. I wanted to ask you to do that, and also, please concentrate on bills that will help all Nevadans, and would make sure that we do not lose federal funding. A bunch of the bills you are trying to push right now are going to make us lose federal funding. I understand that most bills are written prior to President Trump winning—thank you, Jesus—however, the Nevada legislators should [unintelligible] bills to protect Nevadans and make sure that we do not find ourselves losing federal funds—

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Thank you. Your time is up. Next caller, please.

Lorena Biassotti, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a CCSD trustee, speaking for myself. I want to commend the beautiful young ladies who came up to courageously speak on A.B. 240. You are all absolutely right. It is our job as adults to make sure you are safe and protected. And I am so sorry that our legislators have failed you, but we are still working and trying hard to correct these mistakes of allowing boys to unfairly compete with you in your sports. Please do not give up. President Trump is working hard to correct these wrongs and I, too, am doing my part.

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

Chair Torres-Fossett:

Seeing no additional public comment at this time, I will move to Committee members and remind them we do not have a meeting scheduled this upcoming Thursday. I hope you enjoy the time off, because the rest of the meetings will be very packed. With that, this meeting is adjourned [at 3:13 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

BC Lindsley
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 164	C	Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 212	D	Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 217	E	Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 286	F	Kelly Lower, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 153	G	Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Assembly District No. 5	Conceptual amendment
A.B. 153	H	Ashley Dodson, representing National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111	Letter in support
A.B. 153	I	Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director; Tia Smith, Policy Counsel; and Kaylah Maese, Civil Rights Analyst, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada	Letter in support
A.B. 153	J	Tanya Attebery, Private Citizen	Letter in opposition
A.B. 391	K	Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Assembly District No. 5	Conceptual amendment
A.B. 420	L	Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16	Conceptual amendment
A.B. 420	M	Various individuals	Letters in support
A.B. 420	N	Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom	Document titled, "Slush Fund Politics: AB420 Gives The Secretary Of State A Blank Check"
A.B. 420	O	Nancy Roecker, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada	Letter in opposition
A.B. 420	P	Various individuals	Letters in opposition
	Q	Joseph Baptist, Private Citizen, Silver Springs, Nevada	Public comment

