MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Eighty-third Session
February 10, 2025

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Angela D. Taylor at 1:06 p.m. on Monday, February 10, 2025, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Angela D. Taylor, Chair
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chair
Senator Fabian Doñate
Senator Michelee Cruz-Crawford
Senator Carrie Ann Buck
Senator Robin L. Titus
Senator Lori Rogich

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jen Sturm-Gahner, Committee Policy Analyst
Cameron Newton, Committee Counsel
Virginia Weitzel, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gabriela Rodriguez, State Relations Strategist, Education Commission of the States
Tom Keily, Policy Director, Education Commission of the States
Zhan Okuda-Lim, Nevada Youth Legislature Board of Directors; Assistant Policy Researcher, RAND Corporation
Christine Mulhern, Economist, RAND Corporation
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Nevada Department of Education
Anna Reynolds, Education Program Director, Nevada Department of Education
Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber

Susan Keema, Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Craig Statucki
John Eppolito, Protect Nevada Children
Nichole Beer, Read Freely Nevada
Robin Carpenter, Read Freely Nevada
Glenda Alberti, Read Freely Nevada
Dora Martinez, Nevada Peer Action Coalition

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I want to address an idea that Senator Doñate brought up yesterday during the presentation regarding the chronic absenteeism dashboard. I want to note that this is an item that the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education considered. The Committee has proposed that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) to create and house a real-time attendance data dashboard and require school districts to report the attendance information to that dashboard daily. This proposed legislation can be found in Bill Draft Request (BDR) 34-525 if you would like to track it before it gets a bill number.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 34-525: Revises provisions relating to education. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 531.)

I would also like to welcome the Deltas. It is Delta Day at the Nevada State Legislature. You can tell by all the red. If you happen to be wearing red and you aren't a Delta, just fake it.

GABRIELA RODRIGUEZ (State Relations Strategist, Education Commission of the States):
Thank you for the invitation to provide some perspective on the trending education policies we are seeing across the country.

My role is to ensure that you all remain connected to our resources and our supports throughout the year. Before I turn it over to Tom Keily to provide his overview of trending education policies, I am going to share a little bit more about the Education Commission of the States (ECS) for those in the room who might not be familiar with our work.

We are a national nonpartisan education policy research organization, established in 1965 through the Compact for Education (CFE), which was a

piece of legislation that was introduced and enacted in all 50 states, Washington D.C. and the U.S. territories. The CFE declared states' commitment to working, collaborating and sharing ideas with each other as they navigated policy challenges related to education, highlighted the need for an organization that connects state policy makers to supports education policymaking.

Our team provides personalized services to help education leaders create effective education policies. We provide factual nonpartisan information and our expertise spans from early care and education all the way to postsecondary and the workforce. We are unique in that we serve all education leaders including governors, chief state school officers, state higher education executive officers, state board members and legislators, such as yourselves.

There are four pillars to our work. We have an amazing policy team that is reviewing every piece of introduced education-related legislation around the country; they maintain a database with summaries of them all. They're also looking at things like state department initiatives, governor’s initiatives and works of state boards of education and higher education. They're using all that information to inform policy reports and 50-state comparisons.

If there's ever a question that you all have that we do not have an immediate policy resource for, one of our unique services is our information request process. You can email me with a policy question and our team can respond with a written memo, usually within 72 hours. Beyond our research and reports, our team is readily available to discuss policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings and interim committees.

Finally, we convene policymakers across the nation to learn from each other. I want to thank Senator Dondero Loop because she always attends, representing Nevada. Our largest event is the ECS National Forum on Education Policy, which brings together over 600 state education policy members for policy sessions and networking opportunities. This meeting provides attendees firsthand perspectives about how states are addressing important education policy issues and is a great way to learn from different role groups. The 2025 forum on education policy will be held July 9th through the 11th in Salt Lake City, Utah. I hope many of you can consider joining us. Ultimately, we know that you are busy. I just wanted to share that ECS is here to be a support to you all throughout the year

TOM KEILY (Policy Director, Education Commission of the States):
As Gabriela mentioned, we track policy across the country. We read governors' state of the state addresses, and we have conversations with education leaders such as yourselves, which gives us a unique perspective into what is trending across the country. The top six trends that I will cover in our presentation (Exhibit C contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.) are related to teaching: K-12 funding, school choice, postsecondary education, early care and education, as well as career and technical education, and workforce development.

As legislators work to strengthen the teacher pipeline, we have seen policies that address these three components. The first is paid pathways; we have seen growth in grow-your-own programs and teacher residencies, as well as apprenticeship programs. Additionally, we have seen an increase in stipends or other means of compensation for student teachers. States have also addressed three general areas related to holistic staffing. They focused on legislation to address teacher working conditions. They've also sought ways to support teacher preparation, and they've sought to provide teachers with professional development, especially in literacy.

A primary focus has been on removing licensure-related barriers to enter the profession and ensuring that licensure supports a quality teacher. To increase the number of qualified teachers in specific subject areas, states have addressed licensing requirements specific to roles such as career and technical education teachers and special education teachers. Licensure reciprocity was also a primary focus among states. Twelve states in addition to Nevada have enacted legislation to be part of the Interstate Teacher Mobility Compact, which allows teachers to transfer their license across state lines in participating states.

As it relates to K-12 funding, there are a few areas of interest that have popped up among the states. States made changes to base funding formulas. This typically was a minor tweak to increase the base funding amount to keep pace with inflation. States also made changes to supplemental funds allocated to certain student populations. We saw a fair amount of activity related to special education students and English language learners. Finally, states increased teacher compensation. For example, South Dakota enacted a minimum teacher salary of $45,000 last year.

State efforts around school choice typically fall into three primary policy areas: student and family eligibility, funding, and accountability and oversight of the program. Since 2021, more than 1,000 bills in school choice have been introduced, and nearly 120 were enacted. In the past, eligibility programs have often targeted specific student groups or prohibited students already in private schools from participating. However, states are now aiming to expand existing programs to universal or near universal eligibility. Some states are creating new programs that phase in universal eligibility. For example, Iowa and Arkansas progressively expand student eligibility based on income level and previous public-school attendance, eventually resulting in 100 percent of students being eligible. In other cases, states have lifted income eligibility thresholds to the point where nearly every student and family in the state is eligible. Universal programs are typically education savings accounts (ESA), which are publicly funded and usually pay for expenses like school tuition, tutoring or instructional materials. We've also seen states create universal vouchers or tax credit programs. There are currently 12 states with universal programs and another two that are near universal.

Regarding funding, we have seen demand exceed estimated levels in multiple states. Universal programs can sometimes strain funding limits. Arizona's program, which is considered one of the most expansive in the country, resulted in a budget commitment of nearly $700 million in fiscal year (FY) 2023-2024 with roughly $300 million in new funding for the program. To contain the scale of the program, some state leaders have capped program participation by appropriation or by setting limits in statute. Oklahoma’s program caps its tax credit at $250 million, and Utah just increased their cap to around $80 million. Another approach that states are taking is creating tiers based on income that provide a diminishing amount of funding the higher the family income. Some limited program budgets have also moved to prioritize specific student groups as well.

Regarding accountability and oversight, states have approached those topics in a variety of ways. For ESA laws, they prevent administrators or agencies to audit individual accounts, ensuring the proper use of funds. In some states, parents must report academic progress to the state. For example, in Utah, students must submit a portfolio documenting academic progress annually. In Florida, students need to reach a certain attendance threshold to keep participating in their program. School level accountability provisions address

school eligibility to accept voucher students on the front end. They also provide for oversight of schools with voucher students on the back end.

Turning our attention to postsecondary trends, in the 2024 Session, we saw the most bills in postsecondary affordability and finance. States continues to address high-demand workforce fields by offering financial aid and support for specific groups to pathways in high-demand fields, such as teaching and health care.

Several states considered bills around various admissions policies. States examined the use of legacy admissions based on family relationships and proposed changes to the direct or automatic admissions policies that may exist or be proposed. We saw several states looking to create funding systems that incentivize certain success. There was a mix of bills that addressed altering current policies and some that created new processes for distributing funds to postsecondary institutions.

We've seen three trends and emerging themes nationwide in early care and education (ECE). The ECE infrastructure is still rebounding from the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, and states are stepping up to help sustain both the ECE workforce and providers who employ them. States have incentivized workforce entry by improving compensation and creating better career pathways for current and potential ECE workers. They have also removed barriers for providers, provided grants and subsidies, and supported quality improvements.

Several states have been working to increase access to ECE programs and services. States have done this by resetting subsidies and reimbursement rates, reforming zoning regulations that can increase the cost of childcare and studying their state’s unique context to make improvements and efficiencies for their programs.

There's also momentum to change how early reading is taught, with many states enacting legislation that requires early reading instruction to focus on evidence-based practices. Strategies include requiring school districts to adopt curriculum aligned with the science of reading and requiring departments to develop guidelines to integrate those principles into teacher preparation programs. We've also tracked nine states that have enacted comprehensive

legislation aimed to support early numeracy development. This includes training and professional development, coaching, curricular materials and interventions.

We have seen three trends related to career and technical education (CTE) and workforce development. As part of an ongoing trend, states enacted legislation that alleviates student debt for those entering specific fields and occupations. The focus is often on high-demand fields within the workforce at the state or regional level. Many states considered and passed legislation focused on supporting pathways that incorporate work-based learning with CTE and classroom learning in both the secondary and postsecondary setting. It also supported the implementation of policies related to work-based learning that require partnerships across agencies and industry partners to support access to work-based learning and pathways to future education and careers.

States have provided funds to support new and existing programs aimed to increase CTE and career connected pathways. Often there is an emphasis on increasing participation and prioritizing funds for education and training in a state's specific industries identified as being in high demand.

We've also seen activity related to the emergence of AI in schools, postsecondary affordability and student health and wellness. Technology and how it affects students' ability to learn in schools has been a common trend for years. With technology developing more and the emergence of AI in school settings, states have begun to monitor the emergence closely and continue to discuss the possible health implications and learning implications for students. We've also seen a recent uptick in states banning cell phones in schools.

States have continued to invest in grant initiatives and programs that can make postsecondary options more affordable and accessible for all students in the state. Lastly, student health and wellness is a consistent trend in education spaces, especially as schools continue to face issues with chronic absenteeism.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I tried to find it online and in your report. Who funds this work? Where does your funding come from?

MS. RODRIGUEZ:
We are funded by state membership fees and grants as well. I handle the state membership fees. I can answer questions about that, but Tom works on grants too.

MR. KEILY:
We receive grant funding from a range of foundations across the country, usually national foundations to support our policy research. We do keep a nonpartisan approach to that research as well.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
Chair, would it be okay to request what those funding sources are?

CHAIR TAYLOR:
Sure. Absolutely.

If you would not mind just getting that to the committee secretary and she can share that information with the committee.

MR. KEILY:
Happy to provide that information.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I believe you mentioned that one of the things you have been working on is removing barriers to teacher certification. What kind of barriers have you seen that other states have been able to remove?

MR. KEILY:
We have seen a range of barriers that states have addressed. The CTE teachers, for example, and special education teachers have unique requirements for those specific fields and the shortages that are associated with that. States have tried to think about prior experience and different educational pathways to get to those licensing requirements within states. So they've thought about those, but we'd be happy to follow up with additional information on that topic to provide a little more detail for you.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
Certainly, I would appreciate that. If there are things that we can do to help with the teacher shortage, I would like to be able to consider that.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
I would just like to thank Education Commission of the States because you are a great resource. Many times, when I am researching a bill or even when a bill is passed, I will get on and type in a few key words to get information about other states that are doing the same ideas. It is very helpful to find out what Washington, Utah or Connecticut is doing. It helps with all the research to know what to do and what not to do with the bill.

SENATOR BUCK:
I was wondering if you have any direct correlative data about states that have implemented Opportunity Scholarships in the last ten years. Are there specific states that have implemented this well? How did they do it? What did their data inevitably show?

MR. KEILY:
I do not have the data on hand, but I would be happy to look into it after the presentation and follow up with you with more information.

SENATOR BUCK:
We are seeing trends in our inner-city schools in Clark County with high rates of substitute teachers, staff that is not necessarily able to teach higher level math. Right there, we see gaps growing between suburban schools and those children. They are the ones who need the best and the brightest teachers in their classrooms. What are some ways in which states have tackled that issue to ensure that we have quality teachers in those schools in every single classroom?

MR. KEILY:
I think states are taking a range of actions to recruit and retain high-quality teachers; a part of it is compensation. A lot of states have thought about working conditions, leave and other aspects for teachers. We can follow up with some more comprehensive state examples and provide that to the secretary for the committee and you as well.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I really applaud your efforts to do this in a way that is nonpartisan, which gets more and more difficult it seems. Really, just giving us the information—what the trends are, what things are working—is help that we really need.

Our next presentation, please come on up. This is a presentation about the RAND study, opportunity and achievement gaps in college and career readiness and gaps that English language learners and Hispanic students specifically face becoming college and career ready.

ZHAN OKUDA-LIM (Nevada Youth Legislature Board of Directors; Assistant Policy Researcher, RAND Corporation):
I am a Ph.D. candidate in policy analysis focusing on K-12 education policy at RAND, which is a nonprofit and nonpartisan policy research organization. To give you a quick overview of our presentation, (Exhibit D contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.) we'll begin with a little background information on our study then proceed to some of our early findings. This is part of a study being conducted through a grant from the Institute for Education Sciences. It is also personal to me as someone who is a product of our public school system. I was born and raised here, a graduate of Valley High School in Las Vegas.

When I started my Ph.D. program at RAND, I was looking for ways to support research that can improve education and support educators and students here at home in Nevada. Through that, I learned about this grant opportunity and shared it with Jhone Ebert, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. She encouraged me to connect with colleagues at RAND, including Dr. Christine Mulhern. We formed our collaboration partnership to apply for and receive this grant so we can conduct work to support education decision-making and support policies here in our State. I am grateful for the opportunity to have worked with my colleagues at RAND and with our colleagues and counterparts at NDE on this work.

CHRISTINE MULHERN (Economist, RAND Corporation):
We have funding from the U.S. Department of Education. A key focus of this grant is using the State's longitudinal educational data system, which has been developed over the past decade or so. We are excited to showcase this data to you, not only some specific numbers, but also the potential for this type of system to be useful in guiding education decisions going forward.

Another key piece of this grant is to enable researchers to help support local education policy decisions, so we are particularly excited to be in front of all of you today. We wanted to give a shoutout to State Superintendent Jhone Ebert

and Peter Zutz, who have both been helpful in getting this off the ground and helping us move forward.

This is a three-year project. We are halfway through the project. As you all have questions, we are happy to incorporate that feedback as we continue with the next year-and-a-half of the project.

The work we are presenting today is using data from Nevada's P-20 to Workforce Research Data System. This is a data system that links information on students who are in the NDE, the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) and the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation.

Today, we are focused on students who have been in high school between 2016 and 2023. We are following them from K-12 into higher education. In the next few weeks, we are going to set up the analysis to follow them into the workforce as well. With this data, we are going to focus on how they are doing in high school, the courses they are taking, including advanced placement (AP), CTE and dual-enrollment courses. In addition to this data, we have conducted interviews with educators in two high schools and have a couple of takeaways on their perspectives on CTE.

We are focused on students who entered ninth grade in Nevada between the 2015-2016 and 2019-2020 school years, as they move through high school. These students are projected to graduate high school between 2019 and 2023. This means that we are focused on information from both before, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. I am sure you have all thought about how that is influencing some of these patterns we will talk through.

It is also important to note that the information we present on course taking and CTE concentrations is only based on students who have graduated from high school. Some of the patterns we show probably look a little bit different for students who have not graduated from high school.

The numbers we present are based on roughly 200,000 high school students, about 150,000 of whom have graduated and 120,000 of whom have enrolled in college in Nevada.

On College and Career Readiness (CCR), the average ACT score for high school students across the State was 17.8 points in 2019. This has declined slightly to

17.1 points on average as of 2023. Things look a little bit better in terms of advanced course taking. About 40 percent of students are taking at least one AP course and 87 percent of students who graduated from high school took at least one CTE course in 2023, which is very high. It has gone up since 2019; and the number of students taking dual-enrollment courses has doubled between 2019 and 2023, which was exciting to see. It is possible that some of this increase in CTE course taking may be related to the new CCR Flex requirement that was in effect for the 2022 class.

We also look at high school completion and the types of diplomas that are earned. In 2023, about 73 percent of students who started ninth grade in a Nevada public high school went on to graduate from a Nevada public high school in four years. This is going to be a little bit lower than the adjusted cohort graduation rates you are used to seeing, because of some of those adjustments. Because these cohort adjustments account for students emigrating from the system, moving to private schools or leaving the State, we are unable to make those adjustments in our data. That is the primary reason these numbers look a little bit different, but they are helpful for seeing the types of diplomas that are being earned. In the past few years, we have seen an increase in students earning a CCR diploma. Some of this has come from a reduction in those earning advanced diplomas. But overall, the share of students who are earning standard diplomas has gone down as more of these students shift to the advanced and CCR diplomas.

Next, we looked into the advanced courses that students are taking. We focused on the share of students who were taking at least one of these courses. Of the 40 percent of students who are taking an AP course, we determined how many of those courses they are taking. Most students are taking just one of each of these types of these courses. There are a fair number of students taking many of these courses. On average, students take about three to four AP, CTE or dual-enrollment courses. Once they've invested in a course, a good number continue on that pathway.

We see students take more dual enrollment courses than AP or CTE courses. This may just be an artifact of the length of the courses. The AP and CTE courses are a year long and the dual-enrollment courses are typically only a semester long. They can fit more of these dual-enrollment courses in their schedule than the other two types.

Next, we dove into the kinds of CTE courses that students are taking. For this, we use information on the pathways in which students are concentrating. Students are defined to be a CTE concentrator if they take at least two CTE classes in that pathway. The most popular pathways are culinary arts, photography, video production, graphic design, sports medicine and automotive technology. Approximately two-thirds of students who concentrate in a pathway go on to complete that pathway. They take all the courses in that pathway, which had been a three-year requirement, but is now moving down to two years. About a third to half of students who complete all the courses in these pathways go on to earn a certificate. To earn the certificate, they need to earn a B average in all the courses they've taken as well as complete and pass an assessment.

The share of students completing or earning the certificates varies a good bit across the pathways. About 30 percent receive their certificate for culinary arts, but up to 52 percent for sports medicine.

There have been some changes over time in the pathways in which students are concentrating. Sports medicine and emergency medical technician concentrations have gone up a fair amount in the past five years. Despite high concentration rates in photography, culinary arts and graphic design, those pathways seem to be shrinking. There are also some newer programs that had almost no students enrolled in them in 2019 that have recently taken off, including military science, teaching and training, cybersecurity and community health science. All these have several hundred students enrolled in them now.

Next, we shift to looking at college enrollment rates and how those have changed over time. Across the State, 37 percent of high school graduates in 2022 enrolled in a public Nevada college within one year of high school graduation. This is a slight reduction from the 2019 enrollment rate of 42 percent for high school graduates. This reduction is largely driven by a decline in enrollment in two-year colleges in Nevada. About half the students who are enrolling in a Nevada college are enrolling in a two-year college and the other half in a four-year college. Around 11 percent of graduates are enrolling in out-of-state or private institutions that would not be captured by NSHE data.

How do these numbers compare to other states? In terms of CCR indicators from high school, Nevada looks pretty good. Nevada is above the national average in terms of AP course availability. The State is roughly on par with the

share of high school graduates nationally who are taking at least one CTE course. The growth in dual-enrollment mirrors what we are seeing nationally in other states.

Nevada also has one of the highest ACT completion rates because all graduates are required to take it. However, the State's average ACT scores are lower than other states that require all of their graduates to take the ACT.

Nevada's college enrollment rates are lower than what we see nationally. The national average of students enrolling in college within one year of completing high school was 62 percent for the class of 2022. In Nevada, about 50 percent of high school graduates attend college within one year of completing high school. In addition, the decline we observe in two-year college enrollment rates does mirror national trends, where there's been a broader decline in two-year college enrollment rates. This may reflect some broader economic forces or education changes that are not unique to the State.

Finally, we wanted to highlight a few key takeaways from this work. The first set of takeaways are around these popular CTE pathways. It is encouraging to see that the emerging CTE pathways are in high-wage, high-demand fields such as cybersecurity and health sciences. This enrollment is growing; however, some of the other popular CTE pathways are not necessarily those most aligned with high-wage, high-demand fields. We see a lot of enrollment in arts-oriented pathways such as video production, photography and graphic design. These pathways may not have as strong a labor market outcome as some of the other CTE fields. While culinary arts is a popular pathway, we recognize that in Nevada, it may be aligned with more high-demand jobs than in some other states. It is also possible that this enrollment in arts-oriented pathways could be driven by instructor availability or student interest. One of the next steps in our research is to dive into the reasons for specific enrollment. Are they what schools can offer because they have the instructors to staff these courses? Are they the ones that students are most interested in taking? What are some of the driving forces behind enrollment in different types of pathways?

It is also encouraging that some of the other popular pathways, such as automotive technologies and computer science, are likely to lead to high-wage jobs. We are looking forward to linking up this information with employment and wage data to see how students are really doing in the labor market when they complete these pathways.

We also wanted to highlight the discrepancy between CTE completions and certifications. The State has a very high share of students taking at least one CTE course. While there are many students who are taking one or two CTE courses who do not complete the pathway, this may be related to getting more students into the CTE pathway and the broad requirement to take some of these courses. What we really wanted to focus on was this discrepancy between completing the pathway and earning a certificate. Fewer than half of the students who complete all this coursework are not earning that certificate. As I mentioned, this might be related to the grades they are earning, but it can also be related to the certification test that's required at the end to earn their certificate.

In the interviews we conducted with educators in two high schools, two things emerged. For one, educators noted that some of these assessments are aligned with outdated technologies and that they are facing a tradeoff between teaching students the technologies they need to pass the certification versus the technologies they need to get a job in the particular field. They were kind of struggling with those tensions. A few other educators noted that some of the tests are still aligned with the three-year pathway standards, despite all the pathways now being shifted to two-year programs. There's some content that is no longer covered in the two-year versions of these pathways that's still appearing on the certification tests.

As I mentioned, we are still continuing this work. We plan to examine the employment and wage outcomes particularly for the CTE pathways. We are going to look at how shortening the CTE programs from three years to two years is influencing the types of pathways that students are enrolling in, trying to understand some of the reasons why some of these pathways are more popular than others and whether that is driven by student interest or instructor availability. We have a little bit more work to do summarizing our interviews with the high school CTE educators.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
Zhan and I have worked together through the Executive Leadership Academy. This is the pathway to upward mobility for every single one of our students. You hit the nail on the head. I have been going into the CTE coursework and figuring out why we provide certain programs at certain schools. A lot of it is —when I talked to principals—due to their staffing, and what they have available. We still have those classes for students we feel do not have a

pathway to a college and career. I think focusing our time and efforts on that issue will help our students. One of the questions that I get a lot from the community is, what is the difference between an AP class and a dual-enrollment class when it comes to going to a college? What are the limitations between AP and dual enrollment? If you have that answer I would like you to share it.

MS. MULHERN:
Advanced Placement courses are courses that are typically taught at a high school. The AP program is designed by The College Board. The College Board sets the standard for what these courses are. In these courses, students must pass an exam at the end of the course in order to earn college credit for that course. It is then up to the discretion of individual colleges to decide whether or not to accept that credit based on the exam scores. Different colleges typically have different cutoffs; some schools will accept a score of three to give a student credit. Others require a score of four or five and some will not accept the credit at all.

Dual-enrollment credits are typically offered by a state public higher education institution, one of the NSHE schools. In most states, those credits are guaranteed to transfer within the state. So, if a student takes a course through University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) or University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), that course is guaranteed to transfer and count towards a college degree. However, if that student were to attend an institution out of state, say Arizona State University, they may not be able to transfer that dual-enrollment credit to another state or a private institution.

Which one is better really depends on what the student wants to do. The other thing I should say about dual-enrollment courses is, whether you earn credit typically depends on the grade that you receive, there is not a test at the end. For AP courses, whether you receive credit entirely depends on the test and not the grade in the course.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I wanted you to share because it is very important that we understand that. Like I said, with the CTE courses, we are putting students on a pathway of you're an in-state kid versus you're an out of state kid. Do you know if anything is being done at the state or national level to allow dual-enrollment and AP classes to be accepted at all colleges?

MS. MULHERN:
I am not aware of a broad agreement for dual-enrollment courses to transfer across states. I work in several other states on dual enrollment and there's a lot of push within states for those transfers. I can definitely look into it more, but I am not aware at the moment of a movement to make those more accessible.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
This really comes down to working with our high school counselors to make sure that they are trained appropriately on our students' pathways, making sure that our students are informed and that we invest in our principals to select programming that benefits their futures.

SENATOR TITUS:
I am very interested in the statements about the folks that are taking the CTE pathway and either not taking or not passing the certification.

Do you have a breakdown on how many students took it and did not pass versus how many choose not to take the test? There could be all kinds of reasons for that. I think it is really important. They should not necessarily be lumped together. There could be a capacity issue where they do not have the money, time or resources to take the test or it is not offered on a day that would work for them versus they all took it, but they didn't pass it. If you could get that to the committee, I believe that is an important distinction to have.

MS. MULHERN:
We personally at RAND do not currently have that information. We were just speaking with NDE about that data this morning. We will follow up with NDE and see, if between the two of us, we can look at or provide that information.

SENATOR TITUS:
I think it is super important. I love the dual-enrollment programs, and I know kids who graduate from high school with their associate's degree, which helps them kind of catapult into the system. The program saves money and time for families in the long run. Certainly, kids can recognize that is not where they want to go as a career after they've taken a few classes with much less cost to their themselves or their families, whoever happens to be paying for their education.

When these kids enroll in these programs, do they recognize that the credits may not be transferable? If they take English 101 at that level, do those credits transfer? Are we doing a good job making sure they are not just transferable within the University of Nevada or NSHE, but across other state colleges?

MS. MULHERN:
Our study does not exactly speak to this question. We have not spoken with individual students or gone that far into the higher education system to see what this looks like. I am working in another state that is more focused on the transfers and that is more geared around interviewing folks there to try and understand what the landscape looks like.

I think we do not really have a good answer to these questions yet. I think there are a lot of reasons they may or may not know what is going on, but the dual-enrollment credits are supposed to be guaranteed transfer to the NSHE system.

SENATOR TITUS:
Certainly. We brought that up in many sessions, making sure that they are transferable to all our schools under the NSHE system. So that—it's apples to apples—if they take English 101, it goes to UNLV and to UNR. Making sure that these students that think they have this certification, it must be transferable.

MS. MULHERN:
Right. We do not unfortunately know what students are thinking. I think so far we have not engaged directly with students. We have student level data, but we can't see.

SENATOR TITUS:
I understand. I am sure I understand that you do not know necessarily what students are thinking. I know they are obviously still young folks; I think the emphasis should be, are they informed? They may not even recognize that it's important to make sure that the credits they take may or may not be transferable. Is there a disclosure when the kids sign up for these programs? That's what I am asking. Is there any kind of disclosure that this may or may not be transferable?

MR. OKUDA-LIM:
What I can share at this time—with the caveat that we are beginning to analyze our preliminary interview data—is that a potential theme has emerged in some of our interviews with school-level staff. I am speaking about school counselors who work with students to assign them to different courses, also some teachers of CTE classes and dual-enrollment classes. There are educators who make this clear in speaking with their students, what the different pathways might entail if a student were to take a dual-enrollment pathway. There might be an understanding, or there is an understanding that could lead to credit that is transferable within NSHE but perhaps not outside of Nevada. Whereas if a student pursues an AP pathway and gets a certain score on the AP exam, they might be able to get advanced credit once they get to the institution, whether in Nevada or out-of-state.

Another theme in our interviews was around students who know that they want to stay in state purposely pursuing a dual-enrollment pathway, so they can earn their credits—perhaps receive their Associates of Arts (AA)—before they graduate from high school or have enough credits to be at that point. They know that they are on a pathway to have that advanced standing once they go to a two-year or four-year institution in our State.

SENATOR TITUS:
I just want to make sure students are informed at the time because if you do not know the subject matter, it is hard to ask the question. These students may not even consider that. I want to make sure on the front end they are being informed.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
In reference to several of the comments today, I think the important piece here is that because they have that two-year AA degree, it does not mean when they go to college, it is only going to take them two years. That's one of the very biggest pieces of misinformation that I think kids receive. They go, oh, this is great, and the parents go, this is great. I am going to go to college now and I only have two years left.

The other issue is that let's just say you have this AA degree; you get to college. Now you are in a third-year biology class that you are not prepared for on any level. Now you have to back up. Getting an AA degree or getting advanced pieces are very different than, for example, a CTE credit.

As my colleague here was suggesting—which is a great piece—we have a lot of culinary needs in Nevada. When these students take their culinary credits, those are very different than if I want to be an orthodontist, for example.

I think that the counselors are really important here, but I think the information to the parents and the students is very important. Like I said, the biggest misinformation piece is thinking, oh yeah, I have got this now, it's only going to take me two years. That is not what happens. I am a CTE person, I think it is a fabulous thing for kids to do. If nothing else, it gives them the ability to practice their work ethic and in a very different way than just studying.

I have done lots of meetings at schools where students have come in and prepared food for us or done other things, for example, given nursing presentations. They are really great. Southeast Career and Tech in Las Vegas has a great carpentry piece. I could go on and on about CTE. I think that for fairness to the students and the parents, we need to have some accurate information on the front side of that.

SENATOR ROGICH:
Regarding the dual-enrollment program, what is the cost per credit for a student's family? For instance, in Utah, they charge $5 per credit for a dual-enrollment class.

MS. MULHERN:
We do not have that exact information.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
For a high school class with a high school teacher teaching, the cost of a college credit, dual enrollment [and/or] concurrent enrollment, was $100; now it is going to be $125 this next year. Assemblymember Selena Torres is carrying a bill to fund that in the Assembly, Assembly Bill 139.

ASSEMBLY BILL 139: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for programs of dual credit. (BDR S-178)

SENATOR BUCK:
I have seen myself that not all AP programs are created equally and not all dual-enrollment programs are created equally.

In some dual-enrollment programs, students are in a high school classroom with a teacher that has a master's degree. Some are actually sitting in a college classroom taking those courses and earning the AA degree. My question is about the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB). Do we give the ASVAB so that students are kind of enlightened as to where their strengths may be?

As far as any exposure to the different fields that are out there, do we have a top ten careers that are hiring? That way we could make sure that students are more exposed to various careers they could potentially go into, opposed to getting a degree that would place them in a position or a job where they could further themselves and their families.

MS. MULHERN:
I am not aware of whether students take the ASVAB. I believe the Office of Workforce Innovation does publish lists of high-wage, high-demand careers in the State. There might be some variation over time across regions of the State. That information exists. I am not sure that information is in the hands of students or even counselors. There is data out there showing what those careers are if we want to direct students to them.

SENATOR BUCK:
One of my biggest frustrations with many of the school systems is that magnet schools take great students because they have to apply to a magnet school. Then the comprehensive schools are often left with students that may need more career attention, more ASVAB or remedial attention. So, maybe we should look more at that.

Also, what are the remedial rates for going to college or higher education levels? Do you have that by district, or do you look at the remedial rates for math and English language arts?

MS. MULHERN:
We have not looked at that yet. Are you referring to the share of students taking remedial courses in higher education? We should have the data on that so we can add that to the list of things we can look at and how that varies by what students have done in high school. Yes.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
On the slide that deals with common CTE pathways and breaks it down to different programs by certificates Exhibit D. I am assuming you are referencing … say I was in enrolled in a CTE program, for example certified nursing assistant, and I have a licensure exam, you are also capturing that as part of that column, correct?

It is not a certificate; it is an actual state licensure for example. I am assuming you are you are keeping track of them the same way?

MS. MULHERN:
So, these are the certificates specifically aligned with that CTE pathway. There is a state-specific CTE assessment aligned with each CTE pathway that students have to pass in order to earn that certificate that is potentially different from the state license for a nursing assistant, for instance.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
Just to clarify, you are not tracking in terms of students enrolled in a CTE program that has an industry-recognized credential. You are not tracking, for example, a state license. You are only tracking that they are completing the program at the end?

MS. MULHERN:
Yes, that they are earning the certificate. The certificate is often not the same as the license.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
Just to be clear from the line of questions today, you do not have any data points as to why the students are putting themselves in that situation? So far, you are only collecting the information on how many of them do or do not.

MS. MULHERN:
Yes. Right now, we do not have all of these details on the reasons they are not earning that, but we are hoping to look into that.

SENATOR DOÑATE:
I have a bill for you that's coming up. So maybe we can connect afterwards.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
You talked a little bit about the number of students taking dual enrollment. We know it is on the rise and I think it is a wonderful thing. Do we know of those students who take dual-enrollment courses, how many actually enroll in college?

MS. MULHERN:
We do not know that right at this moment. That is in the data, and we can look at that, we will add that to our list of things.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I am wondering if that has any impact, right? If there's a higher going-to-college rate?

On slide 13, Exhibit D, it talked about our trends and enrollment in Nevada's public colleges and how many from year to year. Then you said additionally, about 11 percent of students go to out-of-state colleges. Do you have trends on that?

MS. MULHERN:
Not at the moment. We are working with the team at NDE to get some information on that.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I did want to share that those capture and readiness rates that we have asked for are on the NSHE data dashboard. The students that we capture throughout those programs in the State are available there. We might want to have them present in the future regarding the ASVAB. It is presented to high school students and then they can opt-in once it is presented.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We are now going to have our first bill hearing of the 83rd session of the Nevada State Legislature. We're going to hear Senate Bill (S.B.) 45.

SENATE BILL 45: Revises provisions relating to educational programs. (BDR 34-275)

CHRISTY MCGILL (Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement Nevada Department of Education):
This bill is really short and to the point; it has two main sections. The first section looks at how we fund CTE. As you heard today, there are a few issues to tighten up around that. We are hoping that this bill will help as it also looks at reporting in the second section.

Starting with the first one. The current status of Nevada law calculates funding allocations for career and technical education based on the number of students enrolled in programs of CTE. This method includes all students taking CTE courses within a program of study based on October 1 enrollment from the previous year.

The problem is, with the current formula for awarding grants under *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 388.395, it relies on the proportion of students enrolled in CTE programs. This method does not fully reflect the value or the cost of offering advanced CTE courses, which are critical for preparing students for high-demand careers. Specifically advanced CTE courses, such as those offering industry-recognized credentials, dual-credit courses and work-based learning, requires significant resources to administer and are more expensive to offer. However, the current funding model does not adequately address those increased costs and therefore does not promote in depth, a course of study.

What we are proposing—which I will talk about next—is moving from an inch-deep and a mile-wide to a more in-depth funding proposal. Senate Bill 45 revises this calculation for funding allocation by basing the allocation on the number of students enrolled in advanced courses.

Enrollment counts for allocation are based on the prior school year. This calculation would begin with the enrollment counts from the 2025-2026 school year resulting in funding changes for fiscal year (FY) 2026-2027. Again, I just want to make really clear that these changes would not occur until that funding year. We want to make sure that districts understand and can prepare for these changes.

This means that students in level one courses would no longer be included in the enrollment count for funding. Given that the number of students currently participating in advanced coursework is significantly lower than the number of students participating in level one, less students will result in a higher per-pupil

allocation. Students should encourage students to move to level two. The goal of CTE funding is to provide that to CTE students as opposed to funding electives. Students may take a level one course for an elective credit or other needed credit and the student may not be taking a CTE program of study.

This really allows districts to go deeper and to fund some of the costs that they are incurring around dual-credit exams, so that students get the full experience and can graduate with something that can be improved.

Section 2 of S.B. 45 deals with work-based learning reporting. Currently, Nevada law requires that the report be provided on or before January 15th of each numbered year to the State Board and Legislature regarding work-based learning. What's changed is that the federal government has now required the work-based report be included in the report that we give the federal government.

What we are suggesting in this change is to merge the two reports into one report. It will be not only on the federal websites but also on U.S. Department of Education (DOE) websites so that the information is readily available to our participants. Again, that solution eliminates this reporting requirement as it becomes duplicative reporting beginning with the 2024-2025 program year.

SENATOR TITUS:
I am hearing you say that essentially not all CTE programs are created equal, that some are more costly, some require more technical assistance, some require more in-depth learning so there's different costs to that. Did I hear that correctly? I am trying to understand and wrap my head around why it would cost, just based on the number of kids enrolled versus the type of program that is enrolled? Is a solution to that using a Level 1, a Level 2? Does that separate the cost of those? I mean, does that identify if you are talking about a Level 1 program that it's more technical? Is there more equipment needed? Is it going to cost more to put on that CTE program? Could you give me a little bit more explanation on that please?

MS. MCGILL:
Yes, you are correct. Level 2 is a more in depth CTE where the Level 1 is more introductory, exploratory, those arts that we heard about today in the study. I am going to allow our director to go ahead and give the details.

ANNA REYNOLDS (Education Program Director, Nevada Department of Education):
As the courses become more in depth moving from Level 2 and beyond, which is our advanced coursework as defined by this bill, they do become more expensive for the students. For example, there might be fees associated with dual-credit or with industry-recognized credentials that would make the coursework more expensive moving beyond Level 1.

SENATOR TITUS:
The reporting requirements ... if you already have to report it, why are you— since you are doing the work anyway— why are you eliminating, why does it even need to be addressed? Since the information is already accumulated, you already say that you are reporting it. I am worried that if you say, we are reporting it to the federal government, we are just merging that. How do we find that? How do we know about that?

MS. REYNOLDS:
These will be reported on the federal government's website, the Perkins website <https://perkins.ed.gov>. In terms of where we can find that information, we can provide links to it. Currently, we are creating a separate report based on the same information that is being presented from the information that we are collecting from districts. This separate report is formatted slightly differently. However, our Consolidated Annual Report already provides this information, and it will be posted to the website.

SENATOR TITUS:
I am hesitant on saying we are already doing this. If we can't find it, we do not know that it is on a government website. If you are already doing it, why can't you just cut and paste it so that we can all see it?

MS. MCGILL:
We can cut and paste it so that we can see it. This is again an effort for us to be efficient amongst our districts by taking two reports and putting them into one. We can definitely cut and paste. We can definitely share.

SENATOR TITUS:
Just to confirm, the federal requirements for reporting are exactly what you have listed here. There's nothing additional that Nevada asks from you?

MS. MCGILL:
Correct. The additional is on the federal and not on the State end.

SENATOR TITUS:
So the federal government requires more on top of everything you are providing here? There's more that they are requiring?

MS. MCGILL:
That is correct.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
The report that you have to do is the number of students who participate in the learning program and so on is reported to the federal government. You got to one question before I did, asking how we will get that and if you do not have to do a whole new report. If you can still give it to us, that would be great.

I want to express specific concern about S.B. 45, section 2, subsection 6, paragraph (a) because that requires that information to be disaggregated. They're based upon a whole bunch of characteristics, as you know. Is that included in the federal report as well?

MS. REYNOLDS:
Yes, the data is disaggregated at the federal level. There are special populations identified for Perkins reporting and while the data may be collected at the secondary level, it can be displayed in the Perkins portal.

Our special populations refer to individuals with disabilities, individuals from economically disadvantaged families, including low-income youth and adults, individuals preparing for nontraditional fields, single parents including single pregnant women, out-of-workforce individuals, English learners, homeless individuals, youth who are in and aged out of the foster care system and youth with a parent who is a member of the armed forces and is on active duty.

These are already reported to the Perkins portal even though we may not collect certain information in Nevada. So, it does provide additional information. Additionally, there is information regarding the career clusters that the students have participated in.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
That is really comprehensive. That is really good to hear. I just want to make sure that everything listed in S.B. 45 section 2, subsection 7, paragraphs (a) through (d) is included because those are really specific to Nevada in some cases.

MS. REYNOLDS:
Yes, the information required by the Nevada report is collected in the Perkins report going forward.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I just want to be sure that when we make the requested change to the report—I mean in the funding—I want to make sure, are any students therefore excluded that are included now?

MS. REYNOLDS:
The students that would not be included are the students that are taking the Level 1 courses which are included now. However, with the removal of that, it will change the per-pupil allocation based on the number of students that are taking the advanced coursework. Districts are encouraged to make sure that beginning with next year, their students continue within the pathway and move on to Level 2 courses to ensure that their funding remains the same.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
So how will that impact the students who are taking Level 1? I assume, maybe incorrectly, that is the vast majority of the program. My concern is, will they lose opportunities? Will they no longer be able to, or will they not have the support to take full advantage of even Level 1 so that they are prepared to go on to Level 2?

MS. MCGILL:
Yes. The funding is going to move toward that deeper portion of CTE. Now, I am not saying that the schools can no longer fund those electives and the arts and those kinds of things. They could fund that, but they'll have to fund that utilizing a different funding pot.

What we are trying to do is to shift CTE into more depth. So that when these costs come up in these programs for an industry-recognized credential or an exam that we have the funds that can actually pay for that. So that student is

ready to graduate with a differentiated, you know, not only with their diploma but with that industry-recognized credential. It is a change moving that inch-deep-mile-wide, to a more focused, more in-depth CTE program, with the Perkins money and what we believe is the focus of what CTE should be. Moving away from the electives to a more in depth.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I am concerned about the students who will not have the support. What students are they? Who will not have that support? Just want to make sure that we are not leaving students behind.

MS. MCGILL:
Agreed. Director Reynolds, is there anything that you wanted to add that I left out?

MS. REYNOLDS:
Nothing to add that you left out. We can provide any data requested.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I did see the reported demographics shared from our person in Southern Nevada. I did not hear gender, is that included in the report?

MS. REYNOLDS:
The information provided was regarding our special populations. Yes, we can disaggregate that by gender.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
Okay. I would like that included. It is tracking for me as an educator … what I am hearing is that those basic Level 1 classes that you might take in their freshman year … we have a teaching and learning program that everybody goes in that is paid for with our general pot money. As we go higher in those technical fields, they are more expensive. I host 25 student teachers from Rancho High School in their senior year. They come to my school and student teach and there's a cost associated with transportation and additional time. So, what we are doing is leveling out those cheaper classes, paid with the general pot of money and then putting specialized Perkins loans in those more technical ones. Usually, you do an introductory class, then they go in, right? That is tracking for me. I appreciate this; it's simplified. I spoke to a few trusted friends, and it is tracking.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
Now we will hear testimony in support of S.B. 45.

TREVOR PARRISH (Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber):
The chamber is in support of S.B. 45 because of the importance that CTE and dual enrollment has in a student's academic achievement. Education quality has a direct correlation to the strength of Nevada's workforce. There are few better ways to prepare our students than to allow them to participate in work-based learning programs, giving them the opportunity to learn applicable skills and direct knowledge of various industries.

Senate Bill 45 helps to streamline the process for schools and school districts to implement these learning programs and further help achieve our education system's goal of adequately educating our students.

SUSAN KEEMA (Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Superintendents):
On behalf of the superintendents, we support S.B. 45.

CRAIG STATUCKI:
I submitted my public comment in support of this bill previously (Exhibit E). Based on the questions that were being raised, I just want to provide some general technical assistance. As many of you know, I served as the previous director of the Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options at the NDE.

I believe the intent of this bill is not to exclude students from funding. However, it is to recalculate the funding based on the number of students who are taking advanced coursework. Students who are in the Level 1 or entry-level classes would still have access to the equipment, the staff, the instructional materials that come with those Level 2 funds. The allocation, the way that the formula is calculated, would be based on advanced course work and beyond. So that is just my general technical assistance on that.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
That concludes the hearing on S.B. 45. Now we will move onto public comment.

JOHN EPPOLITO (Protect Nevada Children):
You can find 1,500 of us on Facebook at Protect Nevada Children. Some of you may remember when the Nevada DOE wanted to charge a father $10,000 to view the NDE System of Accountability Information for Nevada (SAIN), formerly SMART, data that will be stored forever on his kids. That was me. Today, many people are concerned about Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency having access to personal data. The amount of data the federal government has on us adults pales in comparison to what they have on our children and grandchildren.

It is illegal for the federal government to create a national student database. The federal government spent almost $1 billion to ensure that states, including Nevada, have databases that are compatible. Nevada took $17.5 million of these federal dollars. In our State, the K-12 data is collected via a third-party EdTech vendor, Infinite Campus (IC). There's way more to IC than checking your kids missing assignments. We asked Washoe County School District (WCSD) for a copy of the IC data fields. They told us "that record is confidential and proprietary to Infinite Campus Inc." So, a copy of the data field stored forever on our kids and grandkids is not available for us to view. I have seen the actual IC data stored for my kids and was very surprised by what I found. The school district promised to transfer some of that data out of major discipline. You can go to <protectnevadachildren.org> to learn more. The problematic data that lives forever is discipline, minor discipline, counseling, multi-tiered systems of support and psychiatric. Much of that data is stored forever about our children, and much of it is subjective. I had the spouse of a WCSD psychologist let me know the psychologist was upset that she had to enter sensitive psychiatric data on students in IC because they know it is not protected by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996. You are the only one in Nevada who can help protect the future of Nevada students.

NICHOLE BEER (Read Freely Nevada):
I started the organization Read Freely with other Clark County School District teacher librarians. I come before you today to express concerns regarding S.B. 59.

SENATE BILL 59: Revises provisions governing the licensing of educational personnel. (BDR 34-274)

This BDR was introduced from the Nevada Department of Education. The problematic language is buried in section 2, subsection 4, paragraph (b), subparagraph (10). This language seeks to hold educators criminally accountable for materials that are provided to them by their school districts in the State. We have no control over curriculum adoption, this is done at the State and district level. However, rank and file teachers will be the ones to bear the cost of materials provided to them by their employer, if deemed pornographic.

We have a Nevada teacher shortage. We fear that threats such as these will increase that shortage. I have devoted 25 years to being a public-school librarian. I value all of my children, their students and their families. Please do not attempt to criminalize age-appropriate diversity inclusion in our public schools.

ROBIN CARPENTER (Read Freely Nevada):
I am a certified teacher librarian here to speak about S.B. 59. On its face, S.B. 59 addresses licensed teachers and other educational professionals engaging in sexual impropriety with students. It is a matter of concern for all of us, but there is language in this bill—specifically in section 2, subsection 4, paragraph (b), subparagraph (10)—that could criminalize teachers and teacher librarians for simply meeting their professional responsibility of curating and providing diverse books, which represent all of our students, their families and all of our history.

The bill as currently written criminalizes "displaying, sharing or transmitting materials which are pornographic or sexually explicit and which lack serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value." However, not only is the term materials incredibly vague, the bill does not address who decides what is pornographic or explicit and what is just distasteful, perhaps for a certain group of people. Is it a professionally trained teacher or teacher librarian licensed by the State and working within district policies? Or is it just a community member who deems some material not in alignment with their own personal ideology?

This language is problematic; it is unnecessary. If and when you consider further action on this bill, please remove this section and treat teachers and teacher librarians as the professionals the State has licensed us as.

GLENDA ALBERTI (Read Freely Nevada):
I am an educator in Las Vegas, and we stand together in this. My version is just reiterating that our organization is committed to supporting school libraries and school curriculum that reflect all of our students and families in Nevada. The language in S.B. 59 is very ambiguous. There are no definitions for what materials means. There are no definitions for the terms. The bill says, "pornographic or sexually explicit materials." Also not defined is the phrase "lacks in serious literary, artistic, political or scientific values." What does that mean? The ambiguity lies in how these judgments are to be determined and by whom; it is just opening up the floodgates to those who would ban books that simply do not conform to their beliefs. We ask you to just consider the ramifications of accepting this language into law and to protect the educators providing these so-called materials.

MR. STATUCKI:
I really appreciate the work the RAND group is doing, and I look forward to seeing the final future report. I had the opportunity to work with them when I worked with NDE on really looking at the State and how we can improve our CTE programs. I do appreciate the work done on the presentation today. I just hope that as they present going forward, that the RAND group really focuses in on the core typical education programs that are still currently offered within Nevada and have the emphasis on those high-skill, high-wage and high-demand occupations and career pathways the department has been emphasizing with its community partners and its postsecondary institutions.

DORA MARTINEZ (Nevada Peer Action Coalition):
My concern with the bill that's been talked about is what if there's a student who is visually impaired or low vision who would need an adaptive graphic? We know you can't see so it has to be tactile. I hope when this bill comes before you all that you will keep that in mind for teaching the students who are visually impaired or low vision. One more thing regarding the dual credit, my daughter is taking one or two and did not know it is not transferable outside of Nevada. Now she is going to go to UNR, so I appreciate this question. I want to thank Senator Fabian Doñate for passing on the information regarding the American Sign Language that is provided at the Legislative Counsel Bureau for my peers who are going to be using that assistive device.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We are adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Virginia Weitzel,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Angela D. Taylor, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
	C	4	Tom Keily, Education Commission of the States	Presentation: Trending Topics in Education Policy
	D	10	Christine Mulhern, RAND Corporation Zhan Okuda-Lim, RAND Corporation	Presentation: College and Career Readiness Among Nevada Pupils
S.B. 45	E	30	Craig Statucki	Letter of Support