MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Eighty-third Session
April 28, 2025

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Angela D. Taylor at 1:51 p.m. on Monday, April 28, 2025, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, 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

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Assembly District No. 5
Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Robert Munson, Nevada State Education Association
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Nathaniel Waugh, Clark County School District
Steven Cohen
Brianna Lee, Black Student Union Network

Sriya Wint, Black Student Union Network
Lena Lemma, Black Student Union Network
Madalyn Larson
Alejandro Rodriguez, Nevada System of Higher Education
Sheila Bray, University of Nevada, Reno
Sabrina Schnur, Nevada Public Health Association; Nevada Psychiatric Association
Ryan McInerney, Nevada State University
Kanani Espinoza, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Madison Fowler, Black Student Union Network
Yvette Williams, Chair, Clark County Black Caucus; Executive Director, Black Student Union Network
Kent M. Ervin, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Sarah Adler, Nevada Opioid Treatment Association
Joe Arrascada
Kennedy Pryor, Black Student Union Network
Kelechi Odunze

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We have two bills that we are going to hear. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 391.

ASSEMBLY BILL 391 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing annual reports of accountability of public schools. (BDR 34-1074)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BRITTNEY M. MILLER (Assembly District No. 5):
I am here presenting A.B. 391, which revises provisions governing annual reports of accountability of public schools. For some background information, Nevada's education system faces significant challenges that undermine student success and teacher retention. This increases pressure on 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, K-12 schools experienced a 25.9 percent rate of chronic absenteeism in the last 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 those absences are excused or unexcused. Research shows that missing 10 days of school in math alone is [equivalent to] missing the entire school year. Chronic absenteeism is not merely

a statistic, it is a critical warning sign that can dramatically shape a student's academic trajectory.

Consistent attendance is essential for building a solid foundation in core subjects. These alarming rates of absenteeism signal a pressing need for targeted interventions. A Brookings publication—just one of continual research on the matter—established links between absenteeism and student achievement referencing absenteeism as a predictor for course failure and citing its association with lower achievement in math and reading. According to the U.S. Department of Education, students who are chronically absent between preschool and second grade are much less likely to be able to read on grade level by third grade and four times more likely not to graduate from high school.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, Nevada is only behind Oregon, Alaska, New Mexico and Arizona when it comes to the number of students who are chronically absent. That means we are fifth in the country for chronic absenteeism. For the 2022-2023 school year, 39 percent of Nevada students were deemed chronically absent. Assembly Bill 391 seeks to enhance the accountability and transparency of our education system by refining 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 allocating resources effectively and implementing targeted interventions that will help reduce absenteeism and alleviate teacher shortages. Informed decisions are not based on a narrative and not based on the mantra that we have the worst schools in the country. I promise you, most of the staff and students in our Nevada schools are working way too hard for these demoralizing comments and stigmas.

Ultimately, A.B. 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 diverse 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 10 absences that school year.

We know that measuring student achievement should not be one-dimensional because there are many more factors that go into student achievement, such as: effort, desire, focus, interest, aptitude, emotional or social maturity, trauma, a good night's sleep, a good breakfast, family upbringing, parental expectation, et cetera. All of these things impact learning; however, not all of those are quantifiable like attendance.

What the bill says is that every student who has more than 10 absences prior to the administration of the exam that school year will be reported separately from those who have less than 10 absences. In this case, the scores of those with 10 or more will be compared in our larger school districts. We have a window of about two months to administer the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium or a college readiness test, usually beginning in March. So essentially the bill says the tracking begins from the very first day of school until the first day of the testing window.

Now, the 1st reprint of the bill says by the State Board's window, but I am going to make a minor amendment because every district is different. The State Board gives a window of when testing has to occur. Each district then provides their individual testing window. For instance, Douglas [County] may be able to accomplish all of their tests within two weeks. For Clark County, it is usually six or seven weeks. You have schools that will operate within that window, but they also get to choose. Some schools want to do it before spring break, some want to do it after spring break. We also have principals that make different decisions, like testing fourth graders first and sixth graders last or testing math first or science last. There are so many variables within that testing window. We're just going to measure absences until the district begins their testing.

Because I know someone will ask, this is not about if the absences are excused or unexcused. Whether your absence is excused or unexcused, it impacts your ability to obtain instruction and practice. It is based on whatever is a scheduled school day and if it is a half-day or a full day. We are going by full days because

of the challenge of someone coming to school an hour late because they were at the dentist or leaving early [deciding] which subjects were impacted. A school day is a school day.

By refining these provisions, A.B. 391 aligns with our educational accountability measures for best practices ensuring that we continue to hold high standards in our public education system. This bill represents a proactive step forward, nurturing an environment where every student has the opportunity to exceed, ultimately contributing to our State's broader educational excellence and future workforce readiness. We will be able to see the difference between the scores that we have for students who are in school compared to the scores of students who are not in school. I urge your support on this bill.

SENATOR TITUS:
I appreciate your passion for education. So we are going to collect this data set of two separate … one of the scores for kids who did not miss any school or not more than 10 days, and another list of kids who did. And you are going to compare the outcome data. How long are you going to continue to do this? One time or two times or would it go on indefinitely?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
That's one of the major problems we have in education. When it comes to human and behavioral science, one shot does not really measure what we are looking at. I am not looking at this like we are going to do it once or twice. I believe this should be how we represent our test scores so that everyone—parents, educators, business owners and the Legislature—can see there is an impact. Those students who are in school are performing better than those who are not.

SENATOR TITUS:
You are assuming that is going to be the outcome, but we do not know that yet, right? So that's why you are doing this to give us some true data points over a period of unknown time? Then at some point, say after 5 years, 10 years, 20 years … I am just wondering where the outcome is here? Who's going to review this? What are we going to use it for? Can we actually get something out of this? Instead of in 10 years we are sitting here, and somebody says, "Why are we still doing this? It did not show anything, or it did show something." Is there any demand that we act on that?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
This bill does not require a demand. That is essentially what I would hope would happen. I would suggest to please keep things in place for three to five years so we can actually see a trend. That is what we hope happens so that policymakers, educators and the Legislature—if the data shows what I anticipate—encourages us to come up with some real effective policies, expectations, standards or laws to ensure that our students are in school.

SENATOR TITUS:
Have other states already done this? Is this something that we are just going to repeat in Nevada or, no other state has done this, and this is brand-new stuff? Is it a thought you had, or do we already know the outcome?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
I feel there's a couple different questions in there. The first one is, do we already know the answers? Yes, you can ask most teachers, they can go right through their grade book and tell you the impact of attendance on scores. Attendance is not about intellectual ability; it is not about effort. There are a lot of different factors, but generally when we look at our grade book, those students with multiple absences—sometimes 40, 50, or 60 in a school year—that makes a big difference.

For other states, I went to the U.S. Department of Education website yesterday. Sadly, you can go to the front [page] but all the links and connecting things are gone. What I was able to pull up is that states are doing a variety of things. This is a chronic issue nationally. Like many chronic issues in education, Nevada is still feeling it much harder than other states are. We are fifth from the top when it comes to chronic absenteeism.

One state is going to encourage an ice cream policy where kids get ice cream cones if they come to school. Another state is instituting arrest and incarceration for parents whose students are not in school. Everything from ice cream cones to jail are the different ideas that states are doing. Specifically, I do not know of any other state attempting this. I feel before we actually start making policies and decisions … a lot of it, especially [for] younger students, is parental. High school kids can skip; that is different. As someone who's taught in elementary and junior high, if a kid gets dropped off late every single day at the same time, that is parental. If a kid is out two to three days a week, that is parental.

How do we encourage parents so they can see how important school is—that it does make a significant difference in their child's learning and potential—if we do not have the data? This bill is just letting us look at the numbers. Then we have that information available to us all.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I see this all the time, working at a Title I school. We lose so many points twice, because we go down in our academic achievement when our attendance is down. Just like any type of training, if we miss a third of it or 10 percent of it, we lose that training. You do not have the opportunity to submit assignments or get back that content. On top of that, when a student is out and they come back, teachers have to pull that student and give them some one-on-one or small group [practice] and then the whole class is affected. I appreciate the intent of this bill. I like the amendment. I like where you are going with this. I think it is great.

We disaggregated our Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data at our school, and we did see [the data for] students that were there every day. Guess what? Their math and reading scores are higher than students that are not there. We are able to take that data door-to-door with parents [whose kids] were chronically absent. Every morning, we pick the top ten students. We go to their house with their MAP data to show them how they are performing against their peers with their chronic absenteeism. I think it is a tool to bring the community in and let the community know that teachers are not failing their kids. It is a community [effort]. It is a family effort. Have you talked about or thought about tying this to the Nevada School Performance Framework scores?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
Absolutely not. [This] should [not] be tied to any teacher, administrator evaluation or school scores.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
Not the Nevada Educator Performance Framework of the school?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
No.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
Great. As we collect this data I think that is something we can start having conversations about. I do feel like most schools that are Title I or are low-income, lose points both in the attendance rating and in the academic achievement rating. I think we will uncover a lot more things that we have to deal with.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
One thing I do want to clarify is we all know that Title I schools have certain challenges when it comes to attendance. What people forget or neglect is that so do non-Title I schools. This is not something that is just in certain communities or certain income levels. I have worked at both 5- and 1-star schools and the absentee levels at those 5-star, blue ribbon, high-performing schools are just as high. It may be for different reasons. It may be because of that three-day Disney Park Hopper Pass every weekend or the cruise or the trip to Paris or the trip overseas. I told someone lobbying me on Sony yesterday, there's still absenteeism. and I never want people to think that absenteeism is just happening in certain schools. It is a thing of priority.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
No, I agree there's issues across the board, but we do have State data that shows Title I [schools] have significantly more absences across the State due to different challenges. We try to address those and meet students and families where they are. I did see that one of the concerns over schools [is] that [they] might want to lessen their attendance efforts maybe because their students are … if they make it to that 10-day mark and they want them not to be there because they want to be in the data. Do you have any ways to combat that? Do you know what I am saying?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
I do. I know that there are times that schools will try to manipulate certain things to get certain resources. [That is] the structural situation that some people feel they are working with. I honestly do not anticipate this because we are looking at an entire school. It is just going to be reported by [the] school. That would take a lot of effort on staff or administration to try to lessen this, so they get certain results. I really do not anticipate or hope that no one would want to do that. We are doing this schoolwide; students will not be identified in any way. It would just be this school building; this is how many students missed more than 10 days and [this is how many] missed less than 10 days.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I agree, I was just putting that out there because that is what some people might anticipate. With the transiency of students that come from outside the State, is this … and I am sorry if it was addressed in the bill. Is this continuous enrollment from the day they start or do those 10 days start … have you thought of that piece or is that something to work out at the State Board of Education level?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
We are going by the most obvious, cleanest states we can look at. I know that in certain districts, if you are absent more than 15 days or not enrolled, there's already policies around that. If they are within the same school district, they should be counted because it would be from the very first day until … essentially what is going to happen is each district is reporting to the State. I know there are times when families are moving, and students are attending multiple schools within one school year. But if they've been in that same district, they would still be counted.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
I think it is really important to share with the community the great work that schools are doing, and the importance of businesses and families being brought into this chronic absenteeism conversation. I think this bill addresses that.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I just want to make sure I am clear, and I read the part of it in the bill, but I want to make sure I get it. On the partial day, does that still count as an absent day or does that count as a day that that child was in school? If the kid has a doctor's appointment in the morning, they get there at 11:00 a.m.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
That would still be an absence. A partial day or a full day, it is any regularly scheduled day. I know that in the district that I work in there is a policy about how many minutes. If a student misses 20 minutes of a period, they are absent. If they showed up for a half day at 11:00, that is absent. Whatever the district policy is about when it becomes an absence, that is an absence.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We will open up the hearing for anyone who would like to testify in support.

ROBERT MUNSON (Nevada State Education Association):
As the voice of Nevada educators for more than 125 years, Nevada State Education Association supports A.B. 391 to require school districts to report on achievement data for students who are chronically absent. As Nevada pushes forward with increasing demands on accountability in our education system, it is increasingly important to dig deeper into the factors that impact student achievement. Student absenteeism is one of these issues. With over one-quarter of Nevada students being chronically absent last school year, it is a problem. Chronic absenteeism lowers academic performance as students struggle to keep up. Frequent absences create gaps in knowledge, making it harder for students to grasp new material. Students who are chronically absent are more likely to fall behind, become disengaged and eventually drop out of school. Research shows that chronic absenteeism is linked to lower test scores and grades, especially in reading and math.

Nevada has put much of the responsibility for student achievement on classroom teachers, including tying a teacher's evaluation to student growth. The reality is always more complicated. Over the past couple of years, I have witnessed more absenteeism in my classroom and a lack of effort on the part of students to make up work and activities they've missed, especially those activities that are building skills and therefore not graded. Since credit is no longer tied to absences, many see attendance as optional. Students miss critical instruction discussions and the collaborative work, missing out on learning from their peers as well as the direct instruction that I may provide. This is foundational work, and it is critical for student growth. Disaggregating student achievement by attendance will provide better insight into the effectiveness of classroom instruction to those who are attending. This data also gives the State and school leaders … please support A.B. 391.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):
We want to thank the Assemblywoman for working with us on this bill and helping us with the amendments. Attendance is obviously important, and this bill will give additional data to parents and to everyone about the importance of showing up for school and the impact it has on test scores. It is important to show up for school because, if you show up for school, you'll probably show up for work when you grow up. If you turn in your homework on time, you'll probably show up for work on time. It is beyond testing and beyond attendance at school. It is a lifetime commitment to live up to your responsibilities and it starts in school. Attendance is really important. We support A.B. 391.

NATHANIEL WAUGH (Clark County School District):
It was important for Ms. Pierzynski to go first because we echo her comments. We thank the Assemblymember for her work on the bill.

STEVEN COHEN:
I wanted to echo the previous comments, for the most part, and also want to draw the committee's attention to an amendment I wrote last Session. [It was] enrollment-related [for] partial-day absences for medically necessary disability therapies. I appreciate your consideration.

BRIANNA LEE (Black Student Union Network):
I am a student at Faith Lutheran. I am not in support of A.B. 391 because of the unaccounted-for differences between excused and unexcused absences. Though I do agree that missing any portion of school sets you behind, many students today are planning to be impactful and influence activities outside of school. I could not stand before you today without having an excused absence to be here. This year, I have a collected 35 absences, both excused and unexcused absences. Though this may seem like a substantial number of absences, it has allowed me the time for proper treatment of my ACL, MCL and LCL tears. What if I am unable to attend the proper recovery treatments for an injury because I am not allowed enough excused absences? My other absences were directed towards my future career goals in becoming a professional soccer player and to attend events in the community where I can give back. If the data from A.B. 391 is being used to argue for more limitations on excused absences, it is arguing for more limitations on student growth beyond school.

SRIYA WINT (Black Student Union Network):
I am a student from Las Vegas. I attend Faith Lutheran Academy. I am neutral on A.B. 391. I agree that it is important to report student achievement and what level they're at. I also recognize that tests and exams do not give a holistic view of any student, whether it is of their intelligence or even just of how hard they work in school.

It was mentioned that there are a lot of reasons for chronic absenteeism. I think it is really important that's mentioned, especially with the difference between excused and unexcused absences. Even with unexcused absences, there are a lot of people who simply do not have a choice about coming to school. A lot of people have chronic illnesses that make it so they simply cannot come to school. A lot of times, these are the people who work the hardest to catch up

with their work versus people who just do not come to school because they do not want to or for some other reason. A lot of times, their attendance has nothing to do with the effort they put in or the effort their parents put in. This data can even skew the data of people who I think we're trying to measure; those who just don't make the effort to go to school. Because of these people who try really hard to come to school and do well on the tests—they do well and then it skews the data of people who do not because they don't come to school.

LENA LEMMA (Black Student Union Network):
I am also a high school student from Faith Lutheran. I agree with the segment of the bill of trying to test the difference between absent students and students who are present. Especially after COVID-19, I believe that students and others within my cohort had a significant decrease in motivation within school and that has impacted how well we are able to do in school. I think separating the students and being able to actively go and help the students who are maybe suffering within school is a great idea. However, I do question how well using a standardized examination would be at achieving this.

I think my big concern is with reading. I did not learn how to speak English until I was four or five years old. I massively improved my English skills because I went to an American school in Japan, and I did not do any standardized testing. I just read and wrote and that is what improved it. However, when I went into the Nevada school system and there was standardized testing, my reading skills—even though my scores were improving—were mostly stagnant. I did not think that my reading ability or my ability to connect with the reading itself and being able to fully understand it improved until I entered tenth grade. I was able to go to a teacher that did not force me to do standardized testing, and I was able to connect stories, and dive deeper into larger stories. Therefore I am neutral about this bill, and I think it could be a great bill if the standardized testing was questioned a little bit more.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
Thank you to the students who came and testified. We know how important public speaking, advocating and articulating your position is. I just want to clarify a few things. Again, this would not pertain to private schools. It would pertain to our public schools, districts and any charter school that receives public funds. That will be another small amendment to clean up the language because it says chartered through district, but it is one that receives public

funds. Of course, just adding a few words to make sure that it's not just the date that the State Board says, but what each individual school districts testing window is. This bill is not to place judgment; it is not to penalize; it is to give us some data to work with and support all the hard work that our staff and our students do and the successes that we have.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
I am listening to some concerns … as you collect the data and as it is reported … is it individualized, or you are taking an average per school and per district?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:
It would not be individualized. There would be no way to identify students or who it is, it's just numbers. It would just be numbers reported from the schools and through the State. What we would see from the State, as they disseminate the numbers, would be for this school district. This is the percent of students who had more than 10 absences and this is the percent who did not.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 391 and open the hearing on A.B. 394.

ASSEMBLY BILL 394 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada to require certain institutions to adopt emergency response plans related to opioid overdoses. (BDR 34-95)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER TRACY BROWN-MAY (Assembly District No. 42):
I am joined today by my co-presenter Madalyn Larson. If you served on the Interim Committee on Health and Human Services, then you know Ms. Larson and this issue is familiar to you.

You should each have at your desks your own emergency overdose response kit and that is what we are here to talk about today. Ms. Larson presented her idea to start the good work being done to decrease overdoses in our community, while providing a framework for emergency preparedness. She accomplished much over the interim. I am pleased to introduce her today before we summarize the bill.

MADALYN LARSON:
This issue originated within my seven consecutive years as a University of Nevada, Reno student from 2017-2024. During those years as a student, I

noticed a lot of drug use. Really, this is not unusual because college and the young adult years are a time for experimentation. What was unusual to me was the inability to find harm-reduction tools across the university's campus to empower students to use drugs safely.

Over the past several years, overdose deaths have skyrocketed due to fentanyl being in just about any and all illicit substances you can find. With that, harm-reduction tools, such as naloxone, also known as Narcan and other opioid overdose reversal medications, have become widely accepted and available for the layperson's use. With the widespread availability and acceptability of naloxone, I thought it was truly a no brainer for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) institutions to supply it to their students. At the crux of this issue, I do not want one of my fellow college students, colleagues, faculty staff or their loved ones to die because their friends did not know where to get naloxone or how to use it. This type of scenario is simply unacceptable with the tools we have access to now prevent death from adulterated substances.

Section 1, subsection 1 states that the Board of Regents may require each institution within the system to, in consultation with the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services, adopt an emergency response plan to address opioid-related drug overdoses. The response plan must include plans for providing education on opioid-related overdoses; measures to respond compassionately to opioid-related drug overdoses, including emphasizing rescue breathing techniques and utilizing naloxone [hydrochloride] in the lowest effective dose [to restore breathing]. In addition, this bill includes student protections against university disciplinary actions for students obtaining an opioid antagonist. This plan also includes procedures for the distribution and administration of opioid antagonists and ensuring ease of access to opioid antagonists.

[Section 1], subsection 2 says that each institution within the system may tailor their emergency response plan to meet the needs and capacity of the institution implementing the plan. Subsection 3 identifies that an emergency response plan described in subsection 1 may not require a person to complete any training in order to obtain or administer an opioid antagonist. Subsection 4 notes the Board of Regents may adopt a model emergency response plan to assist institutions in developing their individual emergency response plans. That is the entirety of this bill.

SENATOR ROGICH:
This is so very important, and I just wanted to know if you foresee it being similar to what we have with defibrillators in public places on campuses? Is that what the intent is?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
Eventually we would love to get there. We were not able to do that through this measure. But yes, that would be the ideal and what we would hope to [get to]. With all of the work that was done with NSHE and all of their individual institutions, each one of those institutions currently has an emergency response plan relative to overdose and how they respond. We want to be able to give NSHE the opportunity to collaboratively work with each of those institutions to tailor what their outcomes would be. We did have conversations about how you fulfill a first-aid kit that is available in every commercial business. If you have a [certain] number of employees, every business has a first-aid kit. How do we now get that, [same] awareness to [an opioid] overdose? I would look forward to continuing this conversation. Although that is not what this measure does.

SENATOR ROGICH:
In getting familiar with how this works, what is the response in the event of an emergency? You have an individual that you suspect has overdosed; when using this product, is it a quick response? Is there something that has to occur in addition to administering this product?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
I am not a medical doctor. I would defer to Senator Titus, as she probably has more information relative to an emergency response. It is my understanding that when you administer this, it reverses the overdose immediately.

SENATOR TITUS:
I would say that the response is pretty amazing. I have used it multiple times [in the] emergency room.

This is enabling language. Is there anything that prevents the Board of Regents from asking their schools to do this now?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
There is not and they have done some really good work on that. When you get into support testimony, you will hear—NSHE is here, the Board of Regents is

here. Every one of our institutions has come in support of this measure. I think collaboratively, there's been a lot of really good work done in the interim to help them create a more coalesced emergency response plan.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
Can you describe to us how students currently find help on a campus?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
Every single campus is different. For example, at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) you have access to naloxone out of the pharmacy or another location. That is different for the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and their deployment. Every institution has it is own emergency response plan. Through this measure, we're hoping to be more coordinated and systematic in that effort.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
I thought maybe you were going to say that because I think that is part of the problem. There's no consistency. If you go from UNR down to UNLV or you are at College of Southern Nevada (CSN) and you go over to UNLV. No matter where you go, there's no consistency so you would not know how to get help.

SENATOR CRUZ-CRAWFORD:
It freaked me out. My daughter is a student at UNR, so I texted her, "Do not take any drugs; there's fentanyl." Every time I have this conversation—it scares you as a parent because our kids are so vulnerable. I do want to let you know as a principal in Clark County School District (CCSD), we do have a protocol. We have the emergency response buttons, and if we push them a number of times, a team runs to that location with Narcan and an automated external defibrillator. It is nice that any school that you go to within CCSD has the same policy and it makes us safe. I am just saying if we do this at the elementary school level, we should definitely have something at the college level. I think this is a great piece of legislation.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
Currently the system and the institutions have emergency response plans, but it just does not include opioid overdose. Do I understand that correctly or did I miss that somewhere?

MS. LARSON:
Yes, that is correct. There are *Nevada Revised Statutes* with emergency response plans for a variety of different things. I do not know all the different subsections of it. Opioid overdoses would now be included in that within this legislation.

ALEJANDRO RODRIGUEZ (Nevada System of Higher Education):
We're pleased to support this bill; NSHE is very much in support. We appreciate Assemblymember Brown-May and Ms. Larson working with us throughout the interim. They gathered a group of institutions—all the institutions have representatives—from university police services both in the North and the South trying to address this very important issue. We look forward to continuing to work with her on this. We are proud to support and urge your support.

SHEILA BRAY (University of Nevada, Reno):
I echo a lot of what Mr. Rodriguez said. Ms. Larson and Assemblymember Brown-May pulled this all together during the interim to really work on this issue and develop something that we think is in a really good place and something we can help streamline across campuses. We are in full support.

SABRINA SCHNUR (Nevada Public Health Association; Nevada Psychiatric Association):
We are in full support. Great job to Ms. Larson on that one.

RYAN MCINERNEY (Nevada State University):
We are in full support of this bill.

KANANI ESPINOZA (University of Nevada, Las Vegas):
I echo the sentiments of my colleagues; UNLV is in full support.

MADISON FOWLER (Black Student Union Network):
I agree with this as a high school student. Students also want to experience things. I think that this is important because overdoses can happen throughout all ages at schools. You just do not know where you get it from.

YVETTE WILLIAMS (Chair, Clark County Black Caucus; Executive Director, Black Student Union Network):
[I am] speaking today in support. At Clark County Black Caucus, we do a tremendous amount of work in the area of mental health, including our peer

ambassador program with our BSU [Black Student Union] students. Mental health is a big issue, and we know that drug use is related to mental health issues. We are in support of this bill and happy to see it. We would love to see more of this type of legislation. I would like to just give a shout-out to Assemblywoman Brown-May. She does incredible work, and we appreciate her bringing this forward.

KENT M. ERVIN (Nevada Faculty Alliance):
We support the bill. We see this measure, along with the mental health of our students that was just mentioned and the safety issues after the December 6th [2023] tragedy at UNLV, as all part of what we need to do for our students to keep them healthy and safe.

SARAH ADLER (Nevada Opioid Treatment Association):
Nevada Opioid Treatment Association is a group of opioid treatment providers here in the State and they welcome this policy. Emergency response will be followed by awareness and that can be followed by treatment. When our NSHE institutions have a consistent policy in place, it will be easier for treatment providers to reach into those systems and make their services known and available to students. We urge your support.

JOE ARRASCADA:
Ms. Larson and the Assemblywoman did a remarkable job presenting the facts. The potential damage that can be done on the campuses of NSHE is not just through students, faculty and staff, but for everybody who is on our campus. We already use preventative measures, predominantly when we have athletic events. There's always an ambulance. Throughout our campuses, we have epinephrine pens for peanut allergies. This is another option available to assist with a secure location for our faculty and staff, but most importantly for our students to continue their higher education. I fully support this proposal.

MS. WINT:
I think it is incredibly important to provide drug education, especially to college students and people doing higher learning. At Faith Lutheran, we have a drug education week where we learn about this kind of thing, and we learn how to administer Narcan. When I was taking a college class at CSN, I had to explain to someone else how to use Narcan because they did not know how. I think if our grade is learning about it, then people of that age who use it even more than we

do should definitely have to learn about it and be able to access ways to solve overdoses.

KENNEDY PRYOR (Black Student Union Network):
In our week of drug education, we are learning about opioids or using Narcan. Even learning about that at a high school level not knowing how important that is, I think it is really important that people in college or even outside of that should know how important it is. [They should] have the necessary options to be able to help someone out who is going through something like that. To what Ms. Yvette said about mental health, a lot of times that is a direct [result] when they are not mentally doing well, and I think it is really important to have this bill.

KELECHI ODUNZE:
I am a student at UNLV and the newly elected student body president, but I am not here to speak on behalf of the student government. Assembly Bill 394 is a smart and compassionate move to help save lives on our college campuses. Opioid overdoses are a real and growing problem. Nevada students, faculty and staff deserve to know that if an overdose happens, there is a plan in place and help will be ready when needed. One of the best parts about this bill is that it removes barriers. No one will be forced to jump through heavy training just to carry or use a lifesaving opioid antidote. Students who need help or help administering it will not have to worry about being punished for doing the right thing. The kind of approach in this bill is going to help save many college students' lives. I hope it passes.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
We're really excited to have this opportunity, as you can see. Rarely do we have such wonderful support around a singular issue with no opposition. We'd be happy to entertain an amendment and add anybody on to the bill if you so desire.

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We will go to the last item on our agenda which is public comment.

MS. WILLIAMS:
You never give an activist an opportunity to speak about another issue. You know that we are very much concerned about the mental health of our youth. I am coming before you again to make another plea for the State to fully fund

access to [a] mental health professional through telehealth to every student in Nevada, which is affordable to the State. There are a lot of opportunities out there for this to happen. I still do not understand why we have not done it yet. I am going to plead to the consciences of this committee. Please, these children need it desperately. They're not well; some are, but too many of them are not well. Please, there are things in the works now that we are going to be able to provide some services to our rural [students] with the help of UnitedHealth Plan, but it is not enough. We can do better. Please help our children.

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

CHAIR TAYLOR:
We are adjourned at 2:51 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