



NEVADA LEGISLATURE JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 218E.320)

MINUTES

June 20, 2024

The fifth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Thursday, June 20, 2024, at 9 a.m. in Room 4401, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3138, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's [meeting page](#). The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Chair
Senator Roberta Lange, Vice Chair
Senator Carrie A. Buck
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Jennifer A. Sturm-Gahner, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Alex Drozdoff, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Crystal Rowe, Senior Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Melissa Jimenez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Good morning and welcome to the fifth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education. I want to remind listeners the Solicitation of Recommendation is available on the Committee's overview page on the Legislature's website. If you are interested, please submit any recommendations no later than Friday, June 28, 2024, and contact Committee staff with questions.

Also, we plan to take Agenda Item VII slightly out of order. We are moving this item later in the meeting due to scheduling conflicts.

[Chair Bilbray-Axelrod reviewed meeting protocol and information related to providing public comment.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

With that, let us get started with our first agenda item, which is public comment. I will begin in Las Vegas. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Bill Hanlon, Las Vegas Resident:

I have brought this information to you before ([Agenda Item II](#)). I am tired of students in Southern Nevada being screwed at the State level because of politics, party loyalty, and cronyism. Our State proficiency rates are dismal, teetering in the twenties.

Having said that, I can understand the frustration many of you have in Clark County. The last three superintendents seem more concerned with trying to make a name for themselves by forcing teachers to implement bandwagon research.

Being clear, outside of the parents, classroom teachers are the most important factor in students' education. Knowing that, the State of Nevada has experienced a documented math teacher shortage since 1985—that is almost 40 years. You would think there might be an investment in professional development that focuses on what teachers teach, how they teach it, resources that support it, and assessments.

Since before the pandemic, warm bodies were being thrown in the classroom to cover these vacancies. Since the pandemic, more and more students are being taught by underqualified personnel. While they are mostly hardworking and dedicated people, one fact remains true—teachers cannot teach for understanding what they do not know. Our student proficiency rates are a testament to that.

With the recession, the State's professional development programs were cut in half and have not been restored since. Over the last 14 years, those programs to help teachers help students learn has eroded and been reduced dramatically. For instance, as the first Director of the Regional Professional Development Program (RPDP), we were able to provide three trainers in Nye County—two for the south, one for the north; two trainers in Lincoln County; and trainers in Clark who were specialized in calculus, physics, chemistry, and biology. With the reductions and not having that restored, all that has disappeared.

As the years drag on, salary increases for teachers further eroded, which means the \$2 billion that was invested in education raised teacher salaries—which is a great idea—but results in less staff at the RPDPs.

What I am asking you to do simply is two things. Talk to your Interim Finance Committee and tell them they have to insert money by next month so there are not further reductions in August. Then, during the regular sessions, triple the RPDP's budget so teachers can get the training they need to help students learn. These proficiency rates are a direct result of a lack of State funding.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for your comments. Is there anyone else in Las Vegas? [There were none.]

Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to make public comment? It does not look like there is anyone there making public comment.

Broadcast and Production Services (BPS), do we have anyone on the phone lines?

BPS:

Chair, the public line is open and working, but there are no callers at this time.

AGENDA ITEM III—UPDATES ON THE WORK AND UPCOMING GOALS OF THE COMMISSION ON INNOVATION AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 425 (2023)

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

With that, we will move on to our next agenda item. Agenda Item III is an update on legislation passed last session. Senate Bill 425 established the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education (CIEE) and is tasked with studying education policies, systems, and others. We are excited to hear about their work and findings. Senator Dondero Loop, one of the bill sponsors, will introduce this presentation. Then, we will hear from Nathan Driskell. Go ahead when you are ready.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I had the distinct pleasure to serve as a member on the 2021 International Education Study Group with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), which is a national organization of legislators. It is a bipartisan group, and there were 20 legislators and legislative staff in this group. The group studied the highest performing education systems in an effort to take lessons from these education systems and apply what we have learned to build our own State education system. Michelle Exstrom, Director, Education Program, NCSL, and Nathan Driskell, with National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE), have assisted with these studies. In this group, we had a diverse group of people. We had Republican and Democratic legislators, educators, and community leaders. In fact, our Chair was Tina Quigley, who is the Chief Executive Officer of the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, and former Senator Joyce Woodhouse was our Vice Chair.

Mr. Driskell is going to give us the specifics on the CIEE, more on how we are doing this study, and the findings we have detailed. With that, I would like to turn it over to him. I think it would be best to have the presentation, and then if you have questions, we will go forward.

Nathan Driskell, Chief Policy Officer, NCEE:

We are the global organization that serves as staff to the CIEE, which was established during the last legislative session to develop a statewide vision and implementation plan to improve public education in Nevada, and to build that plan based on comparisons with high performing education systems, both globally and domestically. Over the course of my time with you today, I want to dig deeper into a few interrelated questions ([Agenda Item III](#)). First, what was this Commission designed to do? Why? What will come of the work, and when should you expect to see those deliverables? Then, an overview of what has been done to date.

First, this Commission built on about ten years of work in partnership with NCEE, NCSL, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), and bipartisan legislators all over the country to study changes in the global economy, society, and how education systems all over the world—and in our backyards—were responding. Those studies resulted in policy changes in over a dozen states, including six states that have stood up commissions similar to the CIEE in Nevada. These states include Maryland, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Montana, and Mississippi. They represent many regions of our country and are geographically, socioeconomically, and politically diverse.

I will not bore you with information about NCEE, you have background slides in front of you and can follow up with me if you have any questions about who we are and what we do. We see our role as bringing global future-facing research to policymakers and practitioners across states and districts to help them design education systems that will be more future ready and deliver those systems for their learners. What we mean by future ready is helping educators, learners, and communities to build the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to pivot and adapt to a changing world.

The reason we feel this is necessary—and were gratified to see Senator Dondero Loop and you take up this bill and Commission—is simply the world has fundamentally changed for our students. I do not have time today, and I am sure it would not be appreciated, if I droned on about the voluminous research the Commission has studied documenting global changes in technology, societies, labor markets, and the skills required to thrive in the workforce, and how the role of schools is rapidly changing to adapt to those technological and labor market shifts. Needless to say, the evidence is quite striking that what is required today and will be required tomorrow to thrive—not only in work but also in communities and as high functioning members of society—is different. It will require new technological literacy, new skills, new ways of working and collaborating, and thinking critically to adapt. Schools are going to have to adapt to those realities as well and already are. As policy makers and policy advisors, we encourage folks to do everything they can to help schools make those adaptations.

In thinking through new policy designs, the Commission was asked to look globally, not just domestically and not just in Nevada. In part, because as the world globalizes, we compete with folks all over the world economically, not just our neighbors. Also, because we feel it is important to learn from anywhere and everywhere as we face the monumental task of adapting to a changing future. Then, to crucially translate those insights from the global leaders to make them your own. It is not possible to copy a system like Canada or Finland—as much as we might wish it were possible—but we can take nuggets of good practice from those systems and give them a Nevada flavor to make it your own.

I do not want to belabor the points on performance, but the Commission has studied a number of data points showing that while there are bright spots in the State, there is

a great deal of room for improvement relative to the United States average and your own proficiency rates. As Nevada falls slightly below the United States average, a global data set showing the United States is lagging behind the global average as well—to speak to that point about global competitiveness.

It is incumbent on policymakers and practitioners to come together to try and improve. To face the changing future. To not only perform well, according to the metrics of today, but to enable all learners to perform well and meet the skill needs of the future. It is the CIEE's goal to deliver on this bold promise of creating future ready education for every learner.

It is an ambitious goal and not one the Commissioners, NCEE, or the many members of Nevada's education community and public take lightly. We are taking it in steps. I want to give you a sense of how we are operating and the goals we are planning for. We see 2030 as an end goal for a world class education system that is future ready for all learners. We recognize getting there will require a number of interim goals and action steps with progress monitoring and a lot of opportunity to course correct along the way by 2028. The Commission has an 18-month charge, and we see its goal as building the policy infrastructure needed to launch by 2026.

Based on that, by the time the Commission is done with its work, you should expect to see a number of deliverables. The Commission has a guiding vision and has affirmed that. It is the Portrait of a Nevada Learner that comes out of the work of the Blue Ribbon Commission. Its goal is to position Nevada as a world leader in innovative education that can enable every student in the State to fulfill the competencies, skills, and attributes needed for the future readiness articulated in the Portrait. It is going to require a robust and detailed road map with implementation plans, timelines, and policy recommendations. It is going to require: (1) specificity about how we know we are successful in an effort this bold; (2) planning around how we engage the public in terms of messaging the intent of these changes and why they are necessary; and (3) getting public input on what matters most for kids in the communities throughout the State.

I want to acknowledge this Commission is not the only commission in the State. It is not operating in isolation. This has required collaboration and navigation of roles. The way the Commission sees it is, it is this Commission's charge to establish the future-facing policy framework to ensure a world class, globally competitive education system by 2030. This means close collaboration with the Commission on School Funding, which is getting the current system fully funded now and in coming years. This Commission's framework will ensure those dollars are well spent and spent in ways that are going to set up all learners for success now and in the future and build the road map and plan for 2030 and beyond. It also builds on prior work from the Blue Ribbon Commission that established the Future of Learning Network in order to ensure there is supportive policy framework in place to realize the Portrait.

To recap, we are currently in Phase 2 of a three-phase process. We have studied the research about how the world is changing, and will continue to change, and ways the education system can adapt. We have also looked at the existing bright spots and strong work throughout your State that can be built up, supported, and sustained through commissioners bringing that work to the table, public comment, and partners. We are now looking to surface policy considerations, begin to draft recommendations, and refine them in the full commission so we can begin to build the long-term implementation plan. I am not in a position today, 5 months into the work of an 18-month commission, to share firm recommendations with you. It would be premature and irresponsible of me. What I can do is

give you a sense of what has been discussed and what commissioners are considering as they dig into specific policy areas to hopefully make this more concrete.

We have a subcommittee focused on world class teaching, focused on addressing the policy area referenced earlier during public comment, thinking through how to make teaching a more attractive profession. Then, ensuring consistent opportunities for professional learning enables all teachers to thrive, meet students where they are, and enable them to be future ready. This is going to mean thinking through what professional learning looks like, how it is incentivized, teacher preparation and licensure renewal requirements, and additional supports for teachers around technology and their career progressions. We are also looking closely at the career and technical education (CTE) system in Nevada with an aim of ensuring that every learner has opportunities to explore careers, participate in career pathways and authentic learning environment—if that is of interest to them. Also emphasizing how students can build those skills necessary to be entrepreneurial and learn for life. Understanding the evidence shows many of today's learners are going to go on to take many jobs and pivot many times throughout their career. This subcommittee is thinking through what data is available. How can it be better collected and messaged? How can career exploration and exposure be incentivized in early years? What infrastructure for employer partnerships is necessary to ensure that even in the rural and remote areas of the State there are those opportunities for career connected learning?

We also have a subcommittee focused on proficiency-based learning. Thinking through how to leverage the opportunities that were created, via the Future of Learning Network via Assembly Bill 110 (2017) and figuring out what flexibilities those opportunities create. Then, where there are still opportunities for growth, to ensure students are learning in a system where they can move on when they are ready and can demonstrate proficiency for their learning. This is going to be digging deeper into creating ample time for teachers and students to engage in that kind of learning and what incentives and supports are necessary for that. Again, professional learning for teachers to engage in this way, and thinking through the role of school leadership in this process.

Finally, we have a subcommittee focused on developing, aligning, and enhancing the public communication of performance metrics for the whole of the system so teachers, students, and communities get the data they need to understand how they are doing, and how they can improve. It is supported by a robust communication strategy that helps to communicate the great work going on in your schools and the opportunities for improvement to communities, business, and families.

To close, here is a timeline of where we are, and where we are going. I hope to have preliminary, actionable recommendations for you by December 10 in advance of the next session. The Commission will continue meeting through the second quarter of 2025 in order to flesh out the details needed for that plan, which will include more long-term planning up until 2030. I recognize this was a lot of information. I am happy to stick around for any questions or defer to Senator Dondero Loop if she would prefer to answer those as well.

Senator Dondero Loop:

As you can see, we have taken on a big project, but we are up to the task and believe Nevada will benefit from this. The Nevada CIEE is designed to deliver on that bold promise of a world-class, future ready education for every Nevada young person. As a 30-year classroom educator, I have lived in education, worked in education, and love education. I believe our State deserves a great education for all our kids.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will open it to questions. Assemblywoman Anderson, go ahead.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

This looks like an extensive undertaking; thank you for taking it on. I was able to look up online the extensive members, but if we could also get a list of the members, that would be wonderful. My question has to do with slide 17, the considerations for policy development. The first bullet has to do with work-based and project-based experiences. Has there been any consideration, or will there be any consideration, to look at what credits are needed for graduation from our K through 12 schools? I know that has been a large discussion over the last few education board meetings and a concern with other people as our community changes.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I am going to hand that over to Mr. Driskell, but yes, there has been discussion.

Mr. Driskell:

Yes, there has been discussion. Obviously, as you know, this is a weighty topic that is going to require considered analysis. I cannot say more at this time. It is on the minds of commissioners that this will be something that needs to be looked at, particularly as we are affirming that we want to refocus what is required of kids on those skills that matter for success in work and life. I would add that meetings are open to the public, and we welcome any input on that topic as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We do not have any other questions from Carson City. Las Vegas, any questions? [There were none.]

We know you have a lot of work; I will be paying attention to the good work this Commission is doing.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PRESENTATIONS ON EFFORTS TO SUPPORT AND GROW NEVADA’S EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL PIPELINES

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we will hear about the efforts to support pipelines from our educational personnel in the State. We will hear from several presenters during this item, including representatives who will discuss AB 428 (2023), which added efforts to bolster pipeline programs in Nevada. First, we will hear a presentation on the Silver State Education Foundation (SSEF) and the work they are doing. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Jeffrey Geihs, Ed.D., Chief Executive Officer, SSEF, and Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Administrators (NASA):

I am here in place of Bridget Bilbray-Phillips, who is our operations person and Acting President of the SSEF. I want to thank you, Madam Chair, and the entire Committee, for the invitation today. I want to open with a few brief comments. The year 1994 was the last year every vacancy was filled in the Clark County School District (CCSD) alone. As Mr. Hanlon

indicated in his comments, there were sporadic vacancies before that in some of the highest need areas, like math. I do not say anything disparaging about hardworking substitute teachers; this is not their fault. They are doing their best. In CCSD, right now, there are substitute teachers in Spanish classrooms that do not know Spanish themselves. It was recently reported, in a high school in CCSD, where there were 18 science teachers in that high school—which is pretty common for a large comprehensive high school—with only one licensed science teacher. We could go on and on with examples where there are substitute teachers working in classrooms who do not have the content knowledge or the pedagogy with the kids but are doing their best. It causes even more frustration for the hardworking educators, especially teachers who are called in to often sell their preparation periods or group kids together.

We, at NASA and the SSEF, believe teachers are overworked and underpaid. At NASA, we wanted to give back. Our way of giving back was dedicating, to date, about \$250 million to the inception of this Foundation. The City of North Las Vegas has invested with us, as well, to the tune of about \$400,000. We are also doing philanthropic efforts in partnership, recently, with the Leadership Institute of Nevada that has produced philanthropic dollars for our Foundation.

I am happy that other legislative efforts have recently passed where we can partner to make a difference in the lives of children. What separates us is that our program brings forward an instructional coach, which you are going to meet in a moment, Sergeant Major Schoolfield. He works alongside the programming in schools—in this case, Canyon Springs High School (CSHS). We already launched and have over 100 students interested. He works alongside a CTE teacher and with the students and their families. We will be engaging with agreements, or commitments, for those students to continue in the City of North Las Vegas, which has the highest number of vacancies, per capita, then any other municipality in our State. Without any further comments from me, but I will be here to field questions, I would like to introduce you to Sergeant Major Schoolfield and Mr. Rothell, who are going to go through information for you.

Kyle Rothell, representing the SSEF:

I am a proud graduate of CCSD and our local university, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). Today we are here to share information pertaining to SSEF and discuss our first pilot program at CSHS that is being implemented in collaboration with the City of North Las Vegas, and its full implementation that started June 1, 2024 ([Agenda Item IV A](#)).

When we first started work on setting up the Foundation in January 2023, the statistics our data experts kept sharing was that Nevada was top three in the nation pertaining to teacher shortages. As the year continued, all statistics showed Nevada was number one for teacher shortages. We believe this is a true state of emergency. The data supports that North Las Vegas schools deserve more investment. North Las Vegas schools, compared to Henderson schools, have three times more vacancy rate with teachers. This is why SSEF made the strategic decision to start their work with CSHS and the City of North Las Vegas.

You might wonder why there is a need for assistance from foundations such as SSEF or why not work with recruitment agencies or other organizations. The answer is the need is so great that what is happening is not enough. Pipeline programs are on the decline in our nation, generating less than 90,000 fewer teacher candidates annually compared to 16 years ago. We believe SSEF can play an important role in helping to replenish our education pipeline programs.

The Silver State Education Foundation has our values, vision, and mission; and we are laser focused. It starts at our core with our value, which is to promote the next generation of our educators and leaders within education here in Nevada. Followed by our vision, which is to support creating a sustainable pipeline of qualified teachers for Nevada. This supports our mission of strengthening our education system by recruiting high quality candidates from the community and helping to reduce the teacher shortage here in Nevada.

The Foundation is made of a rich, diverse group of leaders with a strong education background and experience. The leadership team provides valuable insight and support and has been instrumental in creating a successful teacher pipeline program such as SSEF.

The SSEF model is based on a proven model like Avenue Scholars. The Avenue Scholars model has coaches that start with students, at the genesis of the program, supporting the student every step of the way through the post-probationary status as a teacher. Nationally, we lose half of our teachers after they enter the classroom. We want to have a model that ensures great success of these program recruits. We are honored to have Kenneth M. Bird Ed.D.; Founder, President, and Chief Executive Officer; Avenue Scholars; on the SSEF Board. Avenue Scholars' proven model supports multiple career pathway programs, not only in education. Modeling after Avenue Scholars is what separates SSEF from other pipeline programs. As you can see, the Avenue Scholars model has generated successful recruits and results over the past years. Serving over 3,700 students in 15 years, a successful postgraduation employment rate of 85 percent, and over 250 new students through various pipeline programs each year. At this time, I would like to introduce Sergeant Major Schoolfield to talk further about his work as a career coach.

Sergeant Major Gary Schoolfield, Career Coach, SSEF:

Why is it they hired a retired Sergeant Major to be the career coach? About 15 years ago, Dr. Geihs hired me as the first Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) instructor at Cheyenne High School. They put 252 students, who did not know they were joining JROTC, into my classroom. We kept all but three because they knew we cared. They knew we were going to make a difference in their life. After being a JROTC instructor for 15 years, the connection I made with Dr. Geihs many years ago, had him call me and ask to spearhead this project. It is an honor because we know we have a desperate need for educators.

As you can see, I will be braided in a program that is already established at CSHS with Ms. Angel Samson. She is in charge of the CTE program and also an English teacher. They do have a teaching program already established. This program, that we are spearheading, will enhance a program. We do believe in trunking. We will trunk this program, enhance it, and make it even better. We were led there by Louis J. Markouzis, Chair, SSEF, and Principal, CSHS, who opened his doors. We initially went in to get 50 students to sign up for this homegrown teachers' program. At the end of one day, we had well over 100 students. We are fortunate to have many collaborators also wanting to assist in this implementation.

Mr. Rothell:

Now, we will talk about how we are developing these homegrown teachers. The Foundation has modeled out a ten-year program. As you can see, SSEF started on June 1, 2024. We are in the first year of student recruiting where Sergeant Major Schoolfield is working with CSHS to recruit the first initial cohort. Originally, we were targeting over 50 high school students, but we have almost doubled this projection so far based off students' interest. After students become part of the SSEF program, they will take 30 college credits during their final two high school years, which will help them prepare to become a paraprofessional

and get enough credits to get closer to a substitute teaching license. In year three, they will enter into college. We will be partnering with local universities such as UNLV, the College of Southern Nevada (CSN), and Nevada State University (NSU) to help place these students into a college education. It will be done with the work of Sergeant Major Schoolfield and making sure they have the right classes and credits to become a professionally licensed teacher. Additionally, it is important to note—through the partnership with the career coach—the career coach will help the students to ensure they gain all financial dollars available to those students, whether it comes from the Foundation or other means. The career coach will also help remove any barriers for the student, working in collaboration with our strategic collaborators, such as Nevada’s Department of Education (NDE) or the State of Nevada. After the student graduates from college, they will have all the credits to become a professionally licensed teacher where they will then enter as a novice teacher and, again, be partnered with the career coach to have the support in their first few years. In years nine and ten, we think of the program as a transition from mentee to mentor. We are hoping some of the SSEF participants will become future mentors to future SSEF cohorts and students.

Sergeant Major Schoolfield:

As was mentioned earlier, we talked about the vacancies that have existed since 1994. We have taken a personal charge in making sure we have a program, or pipeline, that will eliminate those vacancies. As the career coach, I am not having eleventh and twelfth graders go through this program, get 30 credits for substitute, go to college, and forget about them. I will be with these future homegrown teachers for a period of ten years. In six years, we will start to see them return to the North Las Vegas schools. I will also be there to help them with job placements. I will know them. I will have established a rapport with them, so I will be able to tell teacher A or teacher B which school is better suited for their skills. This is a long process. The benefit of starting this now is going to pay for years to come. This slide is showing how we are going to prepare these homegrown teachers for returning to the high school classroom—internships, career awareness, gaining a substitute license, and mentoring programs. Mentoring programs are going to come from all kinds of organizations—NASA and SSEF are only a few. Then, of course, employment once they graduate from college and come back home to our City of North Las Vegas.

Mr. Rothell:

This is our projection for what we think the power of SSEF can do with one cohort each year at CSHS. This assumes a cohort of 50 students would generate anywhere from 35 to 45 professionally licensed teachers. By year ten, we think this could be 370 teachers in CCSD. Although, through Sergeant Major Schoolfield’s work to recruit our initial cohort, we are already seeing twice the amount of interest versus our original projections. Imagine the multiple this forecast could have with multiple schools participating and more students interested than our original projections.

Sergeant Major Schoolfield:

As you can see, the attrition rate of teachers is great. Texas is the only state that publishes data pertaining to teacher retention comparing homegrown teachers to those recruited from out of state. The problem is we recruit teachers from out of state, they come and do a fabulous job, then return home. If we are recruiting out of our own State, when they return home in our State. This is why it is important. They are 17 percent less likely to leave if they are a homegrown teacher. For every 1,000 teachers hired, 170 of them will leave the

State—that attributes to \$4.4 million. We are pleased to say that with a collaboration with NDE, it looks like we will start gathering and sharing data collected right here in Nevada.

We are going to continue to work closely with families, educators, and, most importantly, students to ensure their success. I have been on a panel for NDE, and when you have families engaged, combined with dedicated educators, students will excel, and that is why this program will be a success.

We have an empowerment planner recommended by the City of North Las Vegas. Not only am I tracking the students, parents, and fellow educators, but this planner also guides them through the entire process. Here are the things I will personally be doing as a career coach to ensure their success. I will be academically tracking them. Whether it is progress reports, report cards, or a grade goes below our guided point or not. Attendance, we are going to make sure they get up, get dressed, and get to school. Credit sufficient, I heard it mentioned in the last presentation about the credits. We are going to say whatever the standard is, we are going to make sure our homegrown teachers are meeting and exceeding the standard. We are going to make sure that course enrollments— They are taking the classes they need to become educators. Also, extracurricular participation to keep them well rounded. Then, of course, establishing, maintaining, and highlighting those soft skills.

Mr. Rothell:

Wrapping up, when evaluating what it would cost to support the SSEF program, we ran two scenarios. The first scenario shows a budget for one cohort over ten years. The cost over ten years is around \$4 million or around \$94,000 to produce one licensed teacher. In scenario two, we modeled out the cost of the program when producing and supporting a cohort each year. At a ten-year budget, this would be around \$11 million total. A little more than half, but with a ten times teacher return. Additionally, the cost to produce a licensed teacher through the pipeline program was reduced from \$94,000 down to \$45,000, which makes this pipeline program one of the most economical compared to other pipeline programs through different career paths. Lastly, through a partnership with the City of North Las Vegas, we have been able to receive funds to cover the cost for year one. We have modeled that, and we will be able to use those funds to last further into 2025.

You may ask how impactful is one SSEF cohort? One cohort could generate up to 35 teachers, at a minimum, which could impact over 31,000 North Las Vegas and CCSD students over their teaching careers. As previously mentioned, our first cohort is already exceeding our targets, so we expect these projections to be greater. Imagine the exponential power this program has when there are cohorts supported annually and the SSEF partnership is set up with more than one local high school. We believe SSEF will play a big supporting role in helping solve the teacher shortage in Nevada.

Dr. Geihs:

Thank you for allowing us the time to share with you today. If there are any questions, please fire away. I want to emphasize this is not just a North Las Vegas program. We are a statewide organization. We simply felt that was the logical place to begin, given the per capita vacancies there compared to any other municipality. I already had other principals inquire about how we could couple the efforts with their schools. We will do that as we move forward.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Committee, do you have questions? We will start with Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

When it comes to getting the substitute license, is this now going to entail the accumulation of 60 credits while the student is still in a high school setting? What is the plan? Are we going to have specific classes they will be taking? Is it going to be a general education program? I know there could be a discrepancy between our teacher training academies and their focus as well as what is required of a substitute teacher in Clark County.

Secondly, to confirm, once a student goes to this program, they will be committed to teaching in North Las Vegas for five years. Correct?

Dr. Geihs:

The students in the program, working with a CTE teacher and Sergeant Major Schoolfield, will be expected to complete one year of college before they graduate high school. They graduate high school as a sophomore. Part of those dual college credits, between high school and college, will be a highly effective substitute teacher endorsement through CSN—they are one of our partners. As such, once a student graduates from high school and completes another 30 college credits, if the student chooses to, they can then be eligible to apply to be a long-term substitute teacher. Not every 19 or 20 year old wants to necessarily be a substitute teacher; however, we do not want to remove that barrier because some may fit that role well, especially at the elementary or middle school level. Also, when they graduate high school, Sergeant Major will be working closely with that student even before they graduate to apply for paraprofessional jobs in the North Las Vegas pipeline. They will already have experience. We are going to give them a small stipend, through the Foundation, to do apprenticeships at the Canyon Springs feeder alignment. The goal is they become integrated into that school, pre-K through 12, community, and they will not want to leave the area. We are even looking at collegial housing into the future. We have some big plans. I forgot the second part of your question.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I was asking for a confirmation that once students finish this program; they will be committed to North Las Vegas for five years.

Dr. Geihs:

Correct. It was part of our arrangement with the City of North Las Vegas, and I thought it was a fair expectation. In this case, that would be the agreement we would want to engage in with the student's family initially. Then, once the student graduates, we continue that agreement with them personally.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I am going to go to the financing first because this is a lot of money, and we know sometimes funding is the issue. Does the program qualify for any of the funding identified in AB 428, and how sustainable is this moving forward? Is this a pilot before the expansion?

Dr. Geihs:

Senator, I do not know, I have not looked at that bill in particular. We have not sought, nor do we plan to seek, funds from that bill. This is a pilot with the City of North Las Vegas. They are excited about seeing the results. I think our results are going to be promising given the leadership within the Foundation and Sergeant Major with boots on the ground. Right now, I am working with that municipality, our philanthropic dollars, and programming we created from NASA to support these efforts for the students we serve. Assembly Bill 428 is, from what I understand, a great initiative. I like that we are able to help channel the students working aggressively with our career coach to the resources from that bill because they would qualify for that too as potential future teachers with our schools.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I would encourage you to read AB 428, if you have not done that, if that is what I am understanding you to say, because I think it is an important piece of this. While I recognize your partnership with North Las Vegas, as you know, we have a huge school district with a lot of needs. I think we need to be working in a community as a whole and not isolate certain areas. Sometimes those needs, that might be presented in certain groups, are needs in other parts of the district as well. I think that would be an important piece. Also, I am a little worried about the tuition reimbursements, because if we are promising students these reimbursements and then you do not have them in the end—that is where I was going with the sustainability. What if we say to a student, it is going to be this amount of money— On your pathway to developing, one of the things was, “the Nevada licensed teacher, up to \$10,000 reimbursements are available for student support.” At one point in a conversation, say 200 kids signed up, we know maybe not all 200 will through the whole program, but even if you had 50 students and they each got \$10,000. What is the sustainability of that, and what if you do not have the money promised?

Dr. Geihs:

I am familiar and have read AB 428. I want to make it clear; we are not seeking funding from AB 428. To your other point, you are right. We never want to promise a child anything that we would not be able to deliver. It is why we are working closely with the first cohort to see how it goes. Then, we have reporting processes that we are going to work, in collaboration, with the City of North Las Vegas. Hopefully, we will be successful and can expand. We would never promise a child anything we could not deliver.

Senator Buck:

I think this is a great, innovative idea. Personally, I spent 30 hours in a classroom as a paraprofessional during my college experience and can see where you can make this work. I see other jurisdictions wanting to participate, is there is a plan to roll this out to other jurisdictions? Is the City of North Las Vegas stepping in with any funding to help?

Dr. Geihs:

We are going to see how this goes. We have promising data initially. We started working with students in May through Sergeant Major Schoolfield’s recruitment efforts, in partnership with the existing CTE teacher and programming. The hope is to get the CTE teacher’s classes full, so she is not teaching English anymore and teaching students in the teacher pathway program. Then, as we analyze it, as this grows, and as our fundraising efforts continue privately and if North Las Vegas wants to— The hope is to produce wonderful results and say, “here they are; this is innovative.”

When we have something to showcase, we are happy to move forward and have discussions with other municipalities in the State because we are a statewide organization. We felt this was the best logical place to begin given the level of vacancies in that community. I served as a principal in that community for a decade and supervised schools in the North Las Vegas area as an Associate Superintendent. I know the struggles of principals there, and everywhere, but particularly in those schools with a large number of vacancies. This is our starting point.

Sergeant Major Schoolfield:

When I left the JROTC this year, many of my coworkers asked what I would be doing. I can guarantee, those who I supervise plus the new breed of instructor coming in, we will always have committed career coaches.

Senator Buck:

Yes, I think that is key. The mentorship is fabulous, great idea.

Senator Lange:

Last session, I had a bill on this and was working with UNLV, so I think it is important. Are you working with UNLV, and what they are doing? We could not get the bill passed because of the cost, even though everyone thinks it is important, and I see different entities doing teacher pipeline stuff. I would like to see everyone get together and come up with a program that works for all of us, because I think that is more cost effective and the program can be good for everyone.

Dr. Geihs:

I have met with Keith E. Whitfield, Ph.D., President, UNLV, a few times on this matter for the Committee's edification. The Foundation is only two years old, and we have come a long way in that two-year period of time. Yes, we are going to work with UNLV. Throughout the high school career of these students, they will go to two summer immersion programs around education so they can have exploratory experiences in addition to their work apprenticeship. The reality is, I do not know about everybody here, but I did not know what I wanted to do when I was 15, 16, or 17 years old. I finally figured it out my third year of college. Those are the experiences we want to give students. The summer immersion programs are three credits, and they will go, I believe, the summer after their sophomore year and the summer after their junior year. We are working closely with Danica G. Hays, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education, UNLV.

Our goal is to eliminate all barriers for the students as they go through. This is not an overnight fix. We are not going to produce 150 teachers tomorrow. This is a long-term goal. I know the recruitment efforts are wonderful. They are ambitious, and I think it is great, but the reality is, we will not end up keeping all those students because they are going to explore this and decide it is not the route for them. It is okay, because the real investment starts after graduation when they get into their collegial expenses.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for bringing this forward. You brought up my question. I am looking at the last slide where you have a 70 percent impact and 100 percent of how many successes there were. Sometimes being part of a career counselor is telling somebody you are not meant to be a teacher. I want to make sure that is part of the program as well.

My other question is, how do you do your recruitment? Is it just, come in, or is it directed in the application process to make sure you get these numbers?

Dr. Geihs:

What Mr. Rothell did here was a mockup based on approximately 35 students and their impact if it were one cohort, over their career, impacting 31,500 kids. As I said, we are working closely with Avenue Scholars. Their programming in Omaha, Nebraska and Des Moines, Iowa is in at-risk schools. I often say Omaha, Nebraska and Des Moines, Iowa and people think it is all suburban. No, they are at-risk school communities doing other workforce connection pathways for kids. This is who we are working with and modeling this after.

For the second part of your question, I will turn it over to Sergeant Major Schoolfield, because he was doing the presentations and can answer that well.

Sergeant Major Schoolfield:

We initially went to CSHS with the idea of starting there because, we mentioned, Nevada is in an emergency state and North Las Vegas being in even more of an emergency state. We went in looking for 50 highly interested students. Throughout a day and a half, we visited 19 classrooms, explained exactly what the homegrown teachers' program is, asked them who was interested in being a teacher, and showed them the benefits of teaching and the impact they can make. I said to one student, if there is anything you dislike in this classroom or anything that you would like to change, you are going to get to do it when you come back as a homegrown teacher. With the delivery we gave to these young people, amazingly, we went in for 50, and I think the count when we finished was 104.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I often say that as well, "If you do not like it, get that teacher degree." This brings up my last question: you state *teacher*, but is this all education personnel? We are also having a problem with getting enough counselors and other education licensed areas. Sometimes I get worried we are forgetting about those areas. At the same time, I do not want to not look at getting the teacher shortage.

Dr. Geihs:

Right now, we are starting with our biggest problem, classroom teachers. Could this pathway program expand to other personnel in education? Yes. Could this pathway program expand to other industries in Nevada—the medical industry or other industries where we are short of people? Yes, it could. This is the start and after all, we are an educational organization. I want to emphasize this is an enhancement to what already exists. We have no intention, and I will put it on the record, of trying to go after or seek AB 428 funding—that is not what we are about. The AB 428 funding is needed, and I do not know, from what I understand, that it is even enough money to do what is needed statewide and in Clark County, given the nature of our crisis. The interim superintendent of Clark County told me there is approximately 1,300 vacancies right now—that is horrific. You could have 50 people playing in the sandbox or organizations and still not fill that void. I want to make it clear; we want to partner with all entities and all efforts. We have already done that—that is who we are and what we want to do. We want to help. These are going to be mainly first-generation college students. We want to not only uplift them, but then students in the classroom. This is what the Foundation is about.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Sergeant Major, when you said you were going into classrooms, are you also talking to families? Are families coming and are they understanding it is a long commitment? You mentioned a lot of them are first generation college students, are the parents or guardians understanding what this commitment is?

Sergeant Major Schoolfield:

Great question, and the answer is yes. We have already started. I do a Sunday night email to the entire parent and student body of CSHS explaining what we are doing and what measures we are taking. This week's email will be about the benefits of being a teacher. Also, we have hosted in-person meetings. We did the first one in May and another on June 6, 2024. Believe it or not, school is out, and we still had parents and kids attend to get more information. We had one parent asked, what could she do? I told her to bring two parents to our meeting and, lo and behold, they were there. We are getting this information out. We are ensuring they understand what they are signing up for, and how this supporting cast and I are going to be there all the way through the process for their children to become teachers.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Dr. Geihs, I would also like clarification. You said you thought this model might scale to other things. From talking to you, I was under the impression that you were planning on staying in your lane with just teachers.

Dr. Geihs:

Thank you for the clarification. I envision our long-term goal is going to be primarily teachers. But, for example, if a funder came to us at a later date expressing an interest in other workforce connection pathways, that may be a possibility. Right now, there is a lot of work to do in filling classroom vacancies, and to the Assemblywoman's question, potentially counselor vacancies, school psychologist vacancies, and other vacancies in and around education. It may occur in the long run after we produce results in this field where we are currently focused.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we have Dr. Varner and Dr. Hays representing the Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation (NITEP). We are excited to hear about your program as well. Go ahead when ready.

Danica G. Hays, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education, UNLV:

It is great to see you today, and we are excited to share updates on NITEP ([Agenda Item IV B](#)). For those that do not know, NITEP is an entity housed at UNLV, but it is a statewide educator workforce initiative. For several years, it has been one critical piece to a larger puzzle of trying to increase, diversify, and sustain an educator workforce. I want to thank the Legislature for your ongoing support, because not only does this support our educator workforce—as many of you, as former or current teachers, know—without our K through 12 educators, we do not have an opportunity to enhance the vitality of the Nevada economy and workforce overall.

Today, we are going to briefly share with you the components and impact data, particularly from the last two sessions, as well as challenges and opportunities. Before I do that, I publicly want to acknowledge the strong partnerships we have with the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) office across NSHE institutions, as well as with the Clark County Education Association (CCEA), our school districts, and charter school organizations. It takes a village. As we talk through this, one of the ways we have been able to keep this cost effective for the State is a strong partnership with our UNLV central administration, who has worked with us to leverage other dollars to make this work. I will now turn it over to Dr. Varner.

Kenneth J. Varner, Ph.D., Director, NITEP, and Associate Dean, Academic Programs and Initiatives, College of Education, UNLV:

We are going to go through data to give you a picture, and the story of change that represents NITEP from when we took it over several years ago until now. It is a program that is continually evolving to figure out how we best serve Nevada's needs. Initially, this program started with the idea of serving traditional students. By the time we are done with our presentation, we are going to talk about how the landscape has changed. Nontraditional student populations represent, in a lot of ways, the future when we think about paraprofessionals, school support staff, and others—the homegrown component.

From 2020 to 2024, we served approximately 147 students, 60 percent of whom were students of color. In the last two years, we had the distinct pleasure of partnering with sister institutions at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and NSU to also include fellows from their institutions. As Dr. Hays shared, while we are the host of NITEP, it is important all Nevadans are served statewide. We will talk later about the initiatives we are working on. It is important to us. Dr. Hays and I have spent the better part of the last 18 months on the road from Elko to Esmeralda, from Nye to Carson City. While we have a strong partnership with CCSD that matters, given its volume and size, every district is facing similar teacher shortages, and that is part of our commitment.

The NITEP fundamentally tries to deal with six aspects. Educational engagement and providing pathways for preservice teachers to do things that help them develop as teachers besides being in the classroom. A strong foundation to their support, as well as community engagement. We want preservice teachers to know they are also serving their community beyond the classroom in the school and by leveraging those relationships and partnerships, it makes their work easier. We also want to embed professional development that is world class and helps teachers know, from the early time of their training, this is a continuous journey. Senator Dondero Loop talked about how long she has been in education and does not stop learning. Part of the pathway through professional development is making sure teachers understand how they develop over time and continue to ask questions as the landscape changes. How we prepare someone today will not reflect the landscape in five years, and they need to have the skill set to develop those inquiries. We also embed research where we are giving preservice teachers the opportunity to serve as researchers and ask questions. What do they care about knowing the answer, too, as a teacher? How can they find the sources of knowledge and not rely on others to tell them? We provide mentoring and micro credentials, in alignment with AB 428, making sure teachers have access to high-quality professional development, particularly around parental involvement, family engagement, and multicultural [education] without cost to them.

For the record, here is the number of hours and impact, but it is important to know it is not just a scholarship program. Scholarships alone have not moved the needle in Nevada. It is wrapping around these supports and making sure the engagement is there. We do not want

to entice people to be teachers by saying we have money, and then they enter the classroom. Any of us who have been teachers know, once you get in the classroom, it is a different story than how you were prepared. Part of our commitment is a post-program support to make sure in the first three years of a teacher's career, they see us as being a partner with them still. This gives you a sense of the magnitude of the hours—about 25,000 hours of engagement for NITEP fellows. Also, 21 research projects that have helped to inform how we, as a higher education institution, can think about what teacher preparation looks like.

We divide the strengths of this program into four areas. We think about recruitment preparation, retention, and responsible stewardship. One of the things NITEP has helped reveal—that has allowed us to branch into apprenticeships, which I will talk about in a second—is the idea that beyond scholarships, we need to provide concierge level supports to students, so they know they do not have to deal with the infrastructural hurdles that higher education presents. We provide student success coaches. We embed the professional development. We seek to create flexible and responsive programming for students and preservice teachers, and through partnerships with RPDP and CCEA, we also look to provide three years of post-program support during those critical years in a teacher's development.

This slide has some numbers inverted, and I am going to send a corrected version for the record. The Fiscal Year 2024–2025 projected direct supports and wraparound supports are inverted. The support is mostly direct support, not wraparound and indirect support. One of the things we continue to learn is how to do the work of preservice teacher preparation statewide in the most cost-effective way possible that leverages resources but does so in a responsible way.

Next year, to talk about our traditional students, we will welcome 25 new fellows. We extended the offer to all four four-year granting institutions in Nevada and our sister institution, NSU, is partnering with us. We will have 25 new fellows, along with layers of teacher leaders and senior fellows that we can continue to invite educators into the fold through NITEP.

Branching into our apprenticeship students—in 2023, we were recognized as the first registered apprenticeship teaching program in the State of Nevada, which is exciting. We have 509 registered apprentices. Since 2021, working with paraprofessionals and school support staff, we have had over 1,100 participants in the program. By leveraging the supports, resources, and ideology NITEP has brought to bear, in that program, we have an almost 95 percent graduation rate. When we think about what it looks like for the rest of NSHE and traditional programs, this is a significant change. It helped us to understand it is not just tuition dollars that students need; they need wraparound supports. We are working in 250 school sites statewide and maintaining a high level of student diversity, which we believe is significantly important to how we move the State forward.

When we think about the challenges, personnel to run programming is a significant challenge. A lot of the efforts in the State have provided strong tuition dollars for students, but I think NITEP has shown us, systematically over a number of years, that has not moved the needle. How we have sustained funding—to address the concerns in the earlier presentation—and do so in a responsible way that comes in at a dollar amount that is reasonable. We have been able, since the last session, to drill down and get to the most responsible, careful number possible about what that looks like.

Dr. Hays:

I mentioned in the beginning, this is one critical piece of a large puzzle—not just at UNLV, but statewide. We hear about the exciting projects from our constituents here today. One of the things I would like to add is, we already started work on helping to implement AB 428. For example, this summer, we have our initial cohort of 58 youth apprenticeships. Thirty-five of those are in Clark County, and the others are statewide. We are working closely with our school districts, CCEA, and others to make sure that is successfully implemented across the State. If there are ways, we can weave the components of NITEP with the other elements we are doing and other entities are doing to be cost effective, that is our mission moving forward.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation. I am sure we have a number of questions. We will start with Senator Buck.

Senator Buck:

How do you market this? I see an untapped marketing potential in our elementary schools. We have a lot of parents who are volunteering, and their kids are now in elementary school. I know that has been a significant area. How do people find out about you? Maybe connecting to principals and in schools to send out this great program where they could be a fellow and can take them through the whole process of becoming a teacher in their child's school?

Dr. Hays:

This is one larger piece. To wrap around this, we have initiatives and entry points no matter how much college experience you have as an adult learner, and even as a high school student, to start thinking about this pathway. At the present moment, we have formal employer agreements with seven of our school districts statewide. Through those partnerships, we work with human resources and other parts of the school districts that reach down into the schools, with principals and teachers, to not only attract students who might be interested in entering higher education, but the families and parents that have been working in the schools. They have a passion for working in schools and maybe never thought college was for them or did not have the opportunity. We advertise various components and initiatives.

Dr. Varner:

The Assembly side has heard this before, but the Senate side has not. One thing that is important about what Dr. Hays shared and your question, when we think about the Wizard of Oz, a lot of focus was put on the yellow brick road and how it got to Oz, but no one thought about how the people from Oz got there to begin with. Grow your own is the most important way. Thinking about all the other pathways that exist to becoming an educator—not just a teacher, but also a school psychologist or school counselor. As many of you know, I am the proud son of a 67-year-old freshman at UNLV. It is never too late. When we think about the ways in which parents and community want to get involved with teaching, it is important we keep exploiting, in the best way possible, the multiple ways and the people who already live within the ecosystem of schools that have gone untapped. Some of the powerful work with our teacher apprenticeship program, supported by NITEP in part, has been the way in which we started with paraprofessionals, but they are not the only folks in those schools. Those of you who work in schools know, in our program we have

school bus drivers, custodians, office workers, and people who work in the lunchroom that say, "I have been doing this for five, six, or ten years. I know something about kids and want to make a difference. Can I be a teacher too?" We say, of course. Creative pathways are going to be the direction NITEP wants to continue taking. We do not want to get rid of traditional pathways; that is not what I am suggesting. The traditional pathway, that one road into Oz, cannot be what we spend all our time thinking about if we are going to address the critical, not only teacher shortage—let us call it what it is—a strong workforce shortage in Nevada that has a huge impact on the economy, not in just K through 12 schools.

Senator Buck:

I think, and this is a message to principals, as you see parents volunteering for hours, approach them and ask if they have ever thought about teaching, and why not teach there? Does NDE help or have a forum where they can direct people to the program that may be best for them? Is there a website or platform where principals can direct potential applicants?

Dr. Varner:

Nevada's Department of Education is a strong partner with us. When you approve the money, they are how the money gets to us. They provide a lot of the oversight, and we are in constant conversation with them about how to best market that program. Two things I think are worth noting. Through an Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funded program, we tried to reach out with the other four-year institutions. They know their students better than we know them, and how can we work as sister institutions towards trying to think about how to best support teachers. One of the hopes for the next session, is NITEP could expand to make sure the community colleges have a role in NITEP. They are also an important part of the pathway that too often goes unnoticed. The current structure of NITEP facilitates folks at the major portion of the degree. I think there is room for thinking about not only the multiple people who exist within schools, but also the multiple pathways people need to take to get to college and the degree. It is not always going to be through the four-year institution. We look to have a more robust dialogue as the next session comes.

Along those lines, NITEP is not meant to be proprietary in the sense of holding all this information. Anything NITEP supports, with the funding you generously support, we want to give back to anyone in the State. All the professional development is available to any citizen of Nevada through our website; they can access to those resources. Classroom teachers that are not in NITEP can still benefit from the post-program support resources we developed. While it is meant to help preservice teachers, we see it as having a cascading effect that can help anyone with an interest in moving Nevada forward.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

The micro credentialing aspect, how does that work, and what kind of arenas are those micro credentials going to be viable in?

Dr. Varner:

We have a few different ways in which the micro credentials— Micro credentials are complicated, and everybody has a different use of those words. At UNLV, it means something different than what we are talking about. It is micro professional development; we initially called those micro credentials. The biggest way we do that is through the

Enterprise Learning Management System (ELMS) and working through CCSD's platform—this is available to all teachers statewide—and making sure there is asynchronous professional development available to teachers. We also learned from our nontraditional students that time bound activities are not necessarily the most supportive, especially when teachers have their own families and other responsibilities. Being able to have 15-hour professional development-oriented type noncredit courses that we offer in partnership with ELMS for our first five, and they deal with things that typically traditional programs have not spent a lot of time on and are responsive to real life situations. Homelessness and housing vulnerability is one of our topics, and thinking about how teachers address that. We have now branched off in a partnership with RPDP to offer these micro-courses. Thinking about two examples that will be live this August—one is for high schoolers to learn the skills of tutoring elementary youth. We know if an adult tutors in elementary youth, that is fine, but it has a profound impact when a high schooler, who is a proximal peer to an elementary student, can do that. We now have a training to provide that for high school students. We will also have training, that will be live in August, that can help anyone who wants to work in the dual and concurrent enrollment space. I was a high school Spanish teacher, it does not mean I was prepared to teach a high schooler the ideas, through the lens of college, for students who are neither full college students nor solely high school students. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas has worked to develop that through NITEP so it can be available to everybody in the State, at every institution. The training can help people in the dual and concurrent space, without cost to them, to learn how to sharpen their skill set in engaging high schoolers in dual and concurrent classrooms. We are using those, through that micro-space, to help people edge up their skill set.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I should have asked SSEF this question as well. Is there any kind of interview or screening process? I want to alert people of the profession they are going into, but also ascertain we are going to invest in them to do the right thing for them. I wanted to be a teacher from the time I was probably two years old. There was never even a thought, I always wanted to be a teacher; but there are people who want to become teachers who may not know, and we may not know if they are going to be able to go through the whole program.

Dr. Varner:

We talk with people before, and it is important. When NITEP started, it was traditional preservice teachers that were typically 18 years old and entering the profession. There was an interview protocol and process. We have expanded to include many different people on the pathways into teaching. The paraprofessional who is saying no one paid attention to them and they desperately want to be a teacher is a different conversation than we are having with someone who is out of high school wanting to enter. We even had to differentiate the way we have these conversations. Now we are thinking about tools. There is a tool called VideoAsk that helps us record the interviews with time to think about it and be analyzed. Part of what we are asking is not just, do you want to be a teacher? Do you know the reality? Do you know there are shortages? Do you know how hard it is going to be? We do not want it to sound deficit. We are all about a positive conversation, and the honor it is to teach. One of the things we ask everyone is how do you plan to move Nevada forward as a teacher? We want them to have insight around what it means to be a Nevadan, to serve Nevada, and to understand the resiliency of Nevadans. It is an important part. We do not want to prepare people who then go to Arizona, California, or Utah. Not that we do not want to help those states, but we want to keep people here. Part of the onboarding through the interview process is to find out their motivations to do this. Do they understand what they are getting into? How can we learn to support them through what

they do not know yet? What are they thinking about how this works as a teacher can move Nevada forward? If it is not teaching, we can help them think about the proximal fields like social work, school counseling, or school psychology they might have interest in as well.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I appreciate that because after my first year of college at UNLV, one of the things they had us do was a self-assessment survey of, do you want to teach high school? Do you want to teach elementary? We had this self-assessment that put things in order. When I graduated, there were three teachers who got a job, and I was one of the three teachers. The others did not because we did not have any vacancies for them. Now, fast forward, we are the exact opposite. We cannot produce enough teachers. I also think it is extremely important that we not put people in a position to be an educator and then, two years later, have them change their mind. It is something I feel strongly about. When I was teaching, I watched people come in and go out. It is a lot of investment for us through NITEP to have them leave after two years and give up. I do not mean give up in a negative way. It is okay if they cannot do it, because you should never be in front of kids unless you want to be in front of kids. I think it is important we have an assessment piece and also high-quality educators who want to be in front of our students.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

On slide four, you talked about the fellow engagement impact and mentioned 18 unique partnerships with 10 different organizations. Can you give us an idea of the organizations involved?

Dr. Varner:

The Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth is one and the Boys and Girls Club. We partner with all the sister institutions in an interesting way. One of the things the preservice teachers are working on—in terms of community engagement—is doing virtual college visits, because as we serve more students in the parts of Nevada that are more frontier and remote, college visits are difficult, and we want them to know about every institution. It is not a recruitment strategy for UNLV. We want them to go wherever they are going to be happy. We have partnered cross-institutionally to prepare virtual visits with all the sister institutions. Those are some of the relationships we have. One of the things we also do through a unique partnership is, we are working with schools in Chile to help teachers develop more English language acquisition development (ELAD) competencies outside of Nevada. This is key to how it moves Nevada forward. If you look at ELAD, we do not want this to be a deficit conversation, because it is not. Kids knowing more than one language is a strength—that means something. If you can do English plus something else, you are ahead of the game. Sometimes it is hard to get enough perspective while you are here. Through that partnership, they get to work with bilingual students who are extremely valued for being bilingual. Then, we start working with transferable, durable skills that will help them do that work here. We are trying to flip the conversation to a positive one. We have a partnership there as well.

To Senator Buck's question earlier, one I wrote down, and now is going to be on our team, is we need to have a parent organization group that can also work with NITEP fellows beyond being fellows themselves. What I know about parents is they send you the best thing they have every day and have a lot of hope for what we are going to do, but often are not talked *with*. They are talked *to* about what we think their kids need, but they are not

talked with. Thinking about how we can expand a partnership with parental groups next year is also a priority.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Excellent, I appreciate the good work you are doing. Thank you for the presentation.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

You mentioned that you are aligned with AB 428. Does that mean you are currently working with some of the schools in Clark County or that you are starting the alignment? What schools are you working with at this time?

Dr. Varner:

With AB 428, we are working in alignment in two ways. First, I mentioned this earlier, one of the components of AB 428 is a requirement that teachers do not incur out-of-pocket costs for the professional development required for licensure as it relates to parental involvement, family engagement, and multicultural. We worked with RPDP to make sure we have that as a viable pathway for current teachers. In terms of the youth side, we are proud to have 58 youth apprentices statewide who are, as we speak, engaged in this work. They are getting apprenticeship hours, introduction to education, and the diversity class as well. It will continue in the fall and spring. It is a three-year program that involves two academic years (AYs) and three summers. Of those 58, 35 are CCSD students at Moapa Valley High School. We also have a partnership with Bonanza High School and West Preparatory Academy, and they should begin in the fall. Then, we have 15 with a charter school in Las Vegas. We have four students in Elko and four students in Pahrump. In the fall, we will have Carson City and Hug High School in Washoe County doing this work as well. Nevada's Department of Education has found our youth apprenticeship program to be in compliance with the components of AB 428. We are trying to give the youth the same advantage. It is a more cost-effective approach when we can work with the youth to get them through some of the college instead of waiting until they are 18 years old.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

This is wonderful. My other question is about the apprenticeship program, and you mentioned it with that answer. You and I have talked a few times about the traditional student teaching program and possibly trying to make changes to that. You mentioned the recruitment and apprenticeship; what does that look like? Is it the traditional student teaching where somebody comes in and takes over a classroom? Or is it more observing? What are the elements that go into this apprenticeship program?

Dr. Varner:

It looks a lot of different ways. It is this Wizard of Oz thing again. It is multiple pathways. It is not a one size fit all. We are proud of a pilot partnership with CCSD where we had eight traditional student teachers in two schools in pairs. We had special education and elementary student teachers. They were able to work in a classroom together and be hired by the district as long-term subs, which they are qualified to do. Thanks to the Legislature's passing of SB 291 (2023), which removed the requirement that prohibited earning income in the first four weeks of student teaching, they were able to get a yearlong engaged apprenticeship and now, in their first year of teaching, will finish the second year of that apprenticeship. The apprenticeships were registered with the State of Nevada through the State Apprenticeship Council, Office of the Labor Commissioner, Department of Business

and Industry. It requires 2,520 hours, minimally, of engaged paid work experience in teaching, with growing sets of responsibilities. We can serve paraprofessionals, long-term substitutes, and even our youth apprentices can start to earn these hours. This is what we are doing with those traditional students.

For nontraditional students, folks who are paraprofessional school support staff already, they are able to continue in whatever role they are in. If they are a long-term sub, they continue in that the first year. We finish the academic portion of their program, along with the first half of the work hours. It is a completely aligned, embedded program that is not on top of. It is trying to bring the two ideas together—that you work, and you earn; some institutions call this earn and learn.

In the second year of the apprenticeship, which is their first year of teaching, they are continuously supported. When Dr. Hays mentioned these employer agreements, those seven districts—and we are convinced we are going to get to all 17 quickly, that is a strong commitment of ours—have also made a commitment to ensure that, unless there is cause, those folks have access to their employment for the two years of the apprenticeship.

We are working together on evaluating the skills and competencies in a way we do not see in the traditional sense, where you have a supervisor and they come out and see you. We are now looking at two sets of journey workers. Every apprentice has at least two classroom teachers—licensed teacher journey workers, that come from the labor side—and at least one from the management side—a licensed administrator, who has to make more than a passive commitment to these folks. They have to be in their classrooms, working with them, and trying to triangulate data points. Also, help those “mentor teachers,” who we now call journey workers, grow in their own skill set. I was trained traditionally. When we talk with traditional teachers, they are sometimes having a hard time conceptualizing how to support a new teacher who was trained differently from how they were trained. We have professional development obligations to those folks as well, to make sure they are ready for the challenge of what it means to mentor and support a teacher who was trained in a different way than they were.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Do you pair up with the other universities and four-year institutions to provide this service? Or is the current journeyman apprenticeship program only offered through UNLV?

Dr. Varner:

To be clear, to separate out the NITEP portion from the apprenticeship portion, our apprentices benefit by also being NITEP fellows, but NITEP fellows are not exclusively apprentices. With NITEP, we partner with all the institutions, but UNLV is the only registered teaching apprenticeship program in the State of Nevada. We are on record, though, when we encourage the other institutions to think about that, and we would encourage them to do it. It was mentioned earlier, everyone's efforts need to be combined together towards addressing teacher vacancies. We do not have a proprietary claim over apprenticeships, but we are currently the only one engaged in that. It is important to put on the record, the word “apprenticeship” gets used a lot, but it has to be a registered apprenticeship for it to be an apprenticeship. I cannot call what I am doing an apprenticeship by giving a residency or more time in the classroom. You have to meet the Department of Labor standards and go through their process with accountability as well. We are currently the only Registered Teacher Apprenticeship Program in the State and look forward to being joined by others soon.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I know with the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), if they do not commit to coming to Nevada and working in Nevada, they have to pay back. Is there a system like that? Are we guaranteeing these folks will stay in Nevada?

Dr. Varner:

There are many programs in the State, and they each have slightly different rules. The Teach Nevada Scholarship has its own rules, and that incentive is a bonus after five years. The Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching Scholarship has a claw back that works a little different, they take back. It goes back to Senator Dondero Loop's question. We need to have critical conversations with people, before we commit the resource to them, about who they are, what they are trying to do, and what they are trying to accomplish. We are seeing, not only a high graduation rate with our students, but we are also starting to see retention, and retention in places that matter. North Las Vegas is certainly important, but there are a lot of Title I schools all over the State that need teachers. We are finding the grow your own model we are leveraging NITEP with now—the UNLV fellows are mostly coming from the apprenticeship track, and they are already in schools that are typically Title I schools. They have been making a difference for a long time and do not have the certification yet. We want to make sure we give them the proper skills and supports to do that work, but we are not seeing them move. We are seeing a 95+ percent retention rate in those Title I settings, which is phenomenal and important to us as well.

Dr. Hays:

To add to Dr. Varner's points, I think what has been successful in keeping folks in Nevada—yes, there are claw backs and other incentives in these funding sources—are those wraparound supports. Everything from interest in teaching to three years post-program support. We know if we can keep most teachers for three years, they will stay, but what has been incredible is from the beginning, we have cohort-based models developing a community of teachers, and we are staying with them even three years. It is like a reunion with folks who have graduated, and they are coming together for these wraparound supports. I think that has been incredible to keep them in Nevada as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we will move on to Dr. Larson-Mitchell, Interim Superintendent for CCSD. Please begin when you are ready.

Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent of Schools, CCSD:

We are grateful and value the opportunity to share information with you regarding the work related to teacher pipeline efforts in CCSD ([Agenda Item IV C](#)). The teacher pipeline efforts are broad and driven by work across our District and State. We look forward to being collaborative and impactful partners in this work and grateful for the many hands at work for our students. We know the number one school-based variable that impacts student achievement is the classroom teacher. Over the next few minutes, we will share CCSD efforts related to recruitment and retention, spotlighting a few initiatives along the way, and we will then touch on the impact of those efforts to the vacancy trends within the School District. At this time, I will turn it over to our Chief Human Resources Officer.

RoAnn Triana, Chief Human Resources Officer, Human Resources, CCSD:

We employ a variety of strategies and partnerships to recruit high-quality teachers from diverse backgrounds and experiences. These include: (1) collaborating with local colleges and universities; (2) engaging with soon-to-graduate education majors and recent graduates; and (3) highlighting our compensation and benefits, professional development opportunities, and supportive work environment. Our student teacher placement efforts involve working with universities to place student teachers in our schools, providing them with mentorship and hands on experience. We offer employment pathways to student teachers who show strong potential and align with our culture. We strengthen relationships with teacher preparation programs to ensure future placements.

We partnered with The New Teacher Project (TNT) to recruit high-quality educators. This is a two-year program leading to an alternate route to licensure (ARL) certificate and then a master's degree. For the last five years, TNT has placed 125 teaching fellows at CCSD schools. Teach for America recruits college graduates to serve as teachers, typically in low-income communities. This program is conducted in partnership with UNLV. Our relationship with Teach for America allows us to bring motivated and mission driven teachers into our schools. Since 2017, the District has hired teachers from the Philippines through the J-1 Cultural Exchange Program. The District focuses its hiring of J-1 candidates specifically in the high-need areas of special education, elementary education, mathematics, and science. Through this rich cultural exchange program, we are afforded the opportunity to diversify our teaching staff and enrich the experiences of our students through culture exchange activities and ideas. This year will be our most diverse cohort to date. We are going to have teachers from India, Jamaica, Belize, Portugal, Kenya, and the Philippines.

Additional external efforts underway include a partnership with the Teachers of Tomorrow ARL program, recruitment of business and industry professionals, military spouse and family recruiting initiatives, a targeted marketing campaign in Southern California, and targeted social media marketing in areas experiencing workforce reductions. We also participate in multiple virtual and in-person hiring events, both locally and nationally.

Teachers who are part of the community are invested in the success and wellbeing of our students. We grow our own by recruiting individuals from the local community, enhancing the cultural and social ties between schools and the neighborhoods they serve. The Paraprofessional Pathways Project (PPP) was initiated in April 2021 as a pathway to teaching for our support professionals. We realized that many future potential teachers were already employed as support professionals and substitutes, and they needed a little bit of support to transition into teaching roles. The PPP is a no cost program leading to a bachelor's in education within a year. The first cohort, in partnership with UNLV and NDE, began with 35 students. The program has expanded significantly with the latest cohort starting in May 2024 comprising 219 students. Overall, 129 have completed the program and entered the teaching profession. Additionally, 102 recent graduates are in the pipeline and will be eligible to apply for teaching positions within the next few months.

The accelerated alternate route to licensure program (A-ARL) is an innovative fast track program for individuals who have already earned a bachelor's degree, in a noneducational field, who are interested in teaching in Nevada. Developed in partnership with the CCEA, the Public Education Foundation, UNLV, and other partners, this program uses a cohort approach that values relationship building and nurturing a community of learners. The best way to move Nevada forward is to prepare diverse individuals with other diverse individuals who bring rich and unique experiences to the table. The goal is to develop a community of educators to serve our students. The first cohort in April 2022 had 83 students and all

83 graduated in May 2023 with a master's degree. We have 151 new enrollees this year. To date, the CCSD has hired 152 A-ARL graduates.

Beginning in March 2024, the District allocated \$1 million towards scholarships for tuition and application fees for 150 employees with a bachelor's degree to enroll in the iteach ARL program. The iteach program is a fast track, self-paced ARL program which offers our employees another option as a pathway to licensure. A diverse teacher workforce benefits all students, particularly students of color. At the same time, students need teachers who know content. Both qualities are essential for a strong teacher workforce, and both are achievable. The March enrollees were made up of 50 percent non-white, 30 percent bilingual, and 45 percent have a graduate degree or higher.

Later in the presentation, you are going to hear about our CTE programs, and how we are building future educators and providing students with a pathway into teaching professions. These programs demonstrate our commitment to diversifying and strengthening our teacher workforce. Investing in our current employees and new recruits ensures we provide high-quality education to our students. These initiatives are crucial steps toward achieving a robust and inclusive educational environment for all.

In May, we launched a new teacher recruitment campaign titled, "We Are Vegas. We are CCSD." The Campaign emphasizes the benefits of teaching in Clark County. It showcases the abundant entertainment, sporting, cultural, and recreational opportunities available in Southern Nevada. We highlight our recent salary increase, the absence of State income tax, and the lower cost of living in the Valley compared to the high cost of living in California. The Campaign was strategically launched in response to recent reductions in force in many Southern California school districts, aiming to attract effective educators to our school district. We have a comprehensive plan to assist those affected by workforce reductions. Our goal is to replicate the strategy in other districts facing similar reductions. Presently, we have approximately 264 candidates in our recruitment pool from this initiative. Our recruitment team ensures personalized interactions by contacting each candidate individually. We created the website teach.ccsd.net specifically for this Campaign, making it easy for candidates to find information about teaching in CCSD. This website is prominently featured in all our advertising efforts targeting Southern California. The Campaign video highlights the similarities between living and working in Southern Nevada, appealing to a potential candidate in Southern California. A virtual hiring fair is scheduled next week, providing an accessible platform for candidates to engage with us. I would like to hand it over to Ms. Moore who is going to talk more about how we are growing our own students.

Gia Moore, Director, Career and Technical Education Team, CCSD:

Since the School Year (SY) 2017–2018, CCSD has adopted the Teaching and Training CTE program to nurture future educators and provide students with a pathway into teaching professions. This program offers a comprehensive curriculum covering educational philosophies, child development, learning theories, diversity, lesson planning, instructional methods, student assessment, and creating supportive learning environments. In year one, students take Teaching and Training 1 to learn the basics of the education field. In year two, they advance to Teaching and Training 2 to deepen their knowledge. In years three and four, students benefit from dual credit courses with NSHE institutions, advanced studies, externships, or pursuing a double completer status and related pathways such as early childhood education.

All CCSD students have the opportunity to participate in the CTE pathway. They can enroll in this traditional program or take advantage of other pipeline initiatives, such as what we

heard about this morning from our partners at UNLV. The Rebel Start program is the first registered youth apprenticeship in the State of Nevada. Nevada Learning Academy, we are looking to expand access across Clark County. This is a project in conjunction with our veteran teachers in the Teaching and Training program. They are developing that course, and it will be available in the fall of this coming school year. Then, school choice options: we have our magnet schools or eligible change of school assignment schools. Since the advent of this, there are currently over 4,400 students enrolled in this pathway, marking a 390 percent increase since its implementation in 2017. Additionally, we have over 1,000 students enrolled in dual enrollment coursework with our partners at UNLV and NSU, and UNR will be adding a pilot program at some of our schools in the fall as well.

While we make a concerted effort to recruit students into this program, we have a priority to make sure we are keeping the students in that program once they are enrolled. Once students make progress in the program, we will pair them with experienced mentors to provide personalized guidance and support. Professional learning opportunities, like workshops and seminars, will expand their skills and networks. Eventually, we will have students participating in the same professional learning we offer our educators in CCSD. Internships and externships will offer practical experience, while senior capstone projects will encourage innovative application of knowledge. We will continue to celebrate our students' dedication in completing this program with our future educators signing day and alleviate financial burdens with tuition reimbursement opportunities. These comprehensive strategies will ensure our students are well prepared and motivated to succeed.

Ms. Triana:

Teacher retention is a districtwide initiative involving collaboration beyond the human resources team. We offer competitive salaries and comprehensive benefit packages. We implement targeted incentives to further support and retain our teachers. We ensure the presence of high-quality leaders within our schools. Providing mentorship and coaching to teachers is a key component of our strategy. Continuous professional learning opportunities are available to help teachers grow and excel in their careers. We promote teacher leadership to empower educators and recognize their contributions. Recognition programs are in place to acknowledge and celebrate the achievements and dedication of our teachers. We provide the necessary tools and resources to help our teachers succeed in their roles. Now, I would like to hand it over to Dr. Ellis, who is going to share about the other ways we are investing in our employees.

Cailin Ellis, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent, Leadership and Professional Learning Division, CCSD:

The Leadership and Professional Learning Division was created over three years ago to intentionally invest in our employees through the development of a professional learning leadership pipeline for instructional educators. The pipeline has three specific goals: (1) to provide comprehensive onboarding and induction support for employee success that are new to a role; (2) offer relevant and job embedded professional learning to support employee growth and development; and (3) serve as a coalition to support employee engagement, providing opportunities for increased impact, job satisfaction, and career advancement.

The pipeline includes professional learning pathways for support professionals, new teachers, teacher leaders, new administrators, new principals, and executive leaders. These employee groups are provided with induction, mentoring, professional growth, and career advancement opportunities to ensure the necessary supports are in place for employee

success, increased job satisfaction, and improved retention rates. The professional learning components within each pathway are tailored to facilitate educator transitions into new roles. For example, the new teacher pathway—a two-year support plan—is designed with three main components, including an induction academy, mentoring, and professional growth opportunities. These components work together to enhance educator credibility and self-efficacy and also support the retention of our new licensed educators. In addition, new teachers have the opportunity to extend their own learning and professional networks through a variety of optional professional learning and social events. Events are scheduled throughout the year to provide an opportunity for new teachers to cultivate their sense of belonging in our community with the goal of expanding their network of support and long-term retention.

Ms. Triana:

The District is appreciative of the Governor and the State Legislature's recent historic financial investments in public education. While it is still early to measure the impact of those investments, we continue to monitor trends related to teacher vacancies across all our schools. While enrollment has decreased consistently by almost 9 percent since SY 2016–2017, the number of teachers has consistently, though slowly, increased—with the exception of the two years post-Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19).

Hiring more teachers reduces the class size, which is beneficial to student learning. Special programs require additional teachers regardless of enrollment numbers—for example, special education classes. We are seeing high teacher retention rates overall. The retention for SY 2021–2022 was 90.71 percent; for SY 2022–2023 it was 93.11 percent; and data is not yet available for SY 2023–2024. Unfortunately, teacher vacancy rates vary significantly across the District. Generally, schools in the urban core, centering around central and North Las Vegas schools, report significantly higher numbers of teacher vacancies. The school level demand for teachers is high. Principals are serving their individual school community, seeking, as we do for all schools, smaller class sizes and high-quality teachers. While we allocate funds at a per pupil level under the State's Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, that does not translate into equitable distribution of human capital at the school or classroom level for students.

Some of the mitigating strategies we are doing—providing ARL recruiting events at schools with the highest number of vacancies. They are invited to participate and interview recent graduates from our ARL programs. We had a fair at the East Las Vegas Community Center, which resulted in 22 hires. We had a fair at James Madison Ullom Elementary School with the TNTP students which yielded 29 hires. We are in the planning stages for a fair at Vegas Verdes Elementary School with iteach graduates, and we expect to have about 20 hires there.

We also do community recruitment events held in communities surrounding schools with the highest number of vacancies with the purpose of hiring support staff professionals from those communities and building the talent network for teacher pathway programs. We had an event at the East Las Vegas Community Center, which had 266 attendees and 37 hires. At Doolittle Community Center, we had 361 attendees with 65 hires. At Dr. William U. Pearson Community Center, we had 362 attendees and 78 hires. Of the 362 people attending that fair, 46 percent indicated they had an interest in becoming a teacher. Utilizing the “your pathway to teaching starts with CCSD” marketing message, we can capitalize on the community's interest in teaching by first hiring someone as a support professional and then encouraging them to enroll in a pathway program and provide the support while they are enrolled.

Dr. Larsen-Mitchell:

Once again, we are grateful for the many hands at work for our students. As the community comes together, it is great there is such a strong effort from many fronts. We are grateful for all our partners across the State of Nevada who are doing everything they can to help our students.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I was mostly looking forward to hearing about what was in AB 428 that required the Teaching Academy College Pathway Program to be in every single school—that is what I wanted to hear about. The CTE stuff we have been doing for a long time, and it has not been bringing—that was the catalyst behind AB 428. What is going on? Is this going to be in every school starting in the fall like it was required in the bill?

Ms. Moore:

We have been making a concerted effort, as mentioned prior. We have only had the robust pathway since SY 2017–2018 in terms of the Teaching and Training program and have gained significant success with the 300 percent increase of enrollment in that program. Every CCSD student has an opportunity to participate in a teaching and training program. We have a full traditional program at 34 of the schools. When I say eligible schools, these are schools that are both eligible with the 250 students or more enrollment under the bill, as well as schools offering it under that enrollment. That is the traditional offering at 34 of those schools. Then, we have nine schools that will also be offering programs. As you heard earlier, at Bonanza, West Prep, and then at Moapa Valley, they will be offering the Rebel Start program. Students also have an opportunity to take place in of a plethora of choice options, which we do a concerted effort in recruiting for each year, which is at our magnet schools and our career and technical academies, as well as our change of school assignment options. In the fall, we did a campaign to promote this program and new option. We did a career exploration week highlighting the Teaching and Training program to let students know there will be potential funding for that upon graduation of the program. Then, in order to make sure we are making the biggest effort possible, as Dr. Larson-Mitchell mentioned, we are leveraging as many partnerships as we can. One of them is with the CCEA. We meet with them biweekly and collaborate. It has been great. We try to figure out ways we can expand this to more of our students, and then look at ways we can improve as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

The bill requires this program to be in every school. It is great you are doing other things, there is more than one way. But the bill requires the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program to be in every CCSD school. Is that happening? Will that be happening in the fall?

Dr. Larsen-Mitchell:

We mentioned the 34 and the 9 at this time. It is being offered to every student in CCSD to participate. The program will not be specifically at every school, but it is being offered to every single student in the District with avenues to engage.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Any questions from the Committee? Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

A couple of questions about the pipeline program. This is something I was excited about. As a freshman legislator last year, I was able to get hands on into creating this broad program that is now going to have teacher academies in every high school here in Clark County and work with NSHE in creating a tuition abatement program in a process that is going to excite young people about becoming teachers. My concern is we have not seen as much of an establishment of these academies throughout the high schools. We have a program at Rancho High School, and there are avenues available for students across the District. This hands-on approach, the Academy, with a tiered program—a first year, second year, and third year program—I am also hearing there are online applications available as well, and I do not know if that is the best pathway forward. My real concern is, are we making a concerted effort to implement the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program as pursuant to AB 428? What is the plan for the upcoming school year and the following school year? I think there is a lot of hope and opportunity in how this bill will be implemented, and how it was first formed. I want to give my colleague, Assemblywoman Backus, a big shout out; this was a heavy lift. We believed we had something in place. It is concerning to me, not only as a lawmaker but also as a teacher, that it is not being implemented as vigorously as we would have liked to see.

Dr. Larsen-Mitchell:

We have made concerted efforts. If there are ways we can do better, we would welcome the opportunity to hear about those ways. Ms. Moore, do you want to add on to anything you shared earlier with your concerted efforts?

Ms. Moore:

We have made a concerted effort in rolling this program out. My experience in the School District, over the last decade, has been rolling out programs specifically related to the magnet schools, career and technical academies, and CTE programs. What we have found is that we have to provide students with the information and benefits about our programs, but there are other components to it. One of those is making sure our counselors understand the benefits of this program, that will be in our next phase. Then, making sure that information gets disseminated to our students. We had promotional items that came out, through our Counseling Department, in that initial phase. We are looking at expanding that. The second piece I alluded to is the mentorship piece. Like many of us, I am an educator today because I was inspired by a teacher. We are working with CCEA on implementing a mentor program. We think that is important. Often, that is a child's first introduction to thinking about going to college. Those are some of the things we have implemented. Then the experiential piece. Once we get students in there, getting them out and doing externships, apprenticeships, and those kinds of things. It helps us build the momentum of making teaching attractive for our students.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

What has the relationship been like with NSHE? What kind of programs are you developing, specifically in regard to the tuition abatement? It is something we are promising our young people who are getting involved with these academies. Are there any goals you will be working towards this upcoming school year?

Ms. Moore:

We have a robust partnership with our institutions, specifically UNLV and NSU. We have grown our externship pilot because of our partnership with NSU. Those partnerships are significant. We have expanded our dual enrollment options significantly over the last couple of years, because we want our students to have exposure to college level coursework while they are with us and have those supports. Those partnerships have been significant. In terms of the tuition, we pay for students' dual enrollment, if they express economic need, through grant funding. Then, we work with our partnering institutions, as they have other funding sources that have been able to help supplement our dual enrollment aspect of this program.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I have a couple of clarifying questions in reference to the Chair's question. While I may understand this program is not in every school right now, if I am in a school, and the program is not in my school and I want to participate, how am I getting that piece? Am I transported?

Ms. Moore:

How are students getting information about the program? They are getting it through multiple means. We do concerted recruiting efforts through our choice options and then they are provided this information through their counselors. We identified there needs to be improvement on getting the information out to our students, and that is something we are working on with our partners, specifically with a marketing piece. If a student wants to take this program and there is not enough interest at the school for it to be viable, they can take the program through one of our magnet programs, our career and technical academies, or one of our change of school assignment options. They also have Rebel Start, which started this summer, and it is another option. We realize there are multiple entry points, as Dr. Varner outlined this morning. Then, what will be new coming in the fall is, one of our eligible schools, the Nevada Learning Academy, will be offering that for their students and other students who want to take it. Part of that is we did not want to have students leave their school necessarily, but still give them the option to have exposure to the program. We are trying to close all the loops and make sure students have as many varied options as possible.

Senator Dondero Loop:

If I am in Cheyenne High School, and I want to take the program, but I have to go to a certain school. If I do school choice, would the transportation be my responsibility? I am trying to ascertain— Follow the law of AB 428, but make it work if you are in the process of building this out. The law says it has to be in every school, but if you are going to sister those schools while you are building it out, how are students getting transported so they can be part of the bill?

Ms. Moore:

It is why we have multiple pathways for students to participate. It may be offered at their school; a large majority of our students are taking it through that CTE pathway. The other option is students are taking it through the Rebel Start program or with the choice programs, they do offer transportation with the choice programs, with the one exception for the change of school assignment. This is why we wanted to work diligently, especially with our veteran educators, in creating that curriculum for the Nevada Learning Academy.

It closes an additional loop. They still have that option, and there are no barriers to taking it.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I want to make one clarification. Another part of the bill was that every school had to have a dedicated employee working on the implementation. Is that happening?

Ms. Moore:

Each school, if they are offering the full Teaching and Training program, has a dedicated teacher who is identified to teach the teaching and training pathway. If they are offering an alternative option, then they have to have a point of contact at each school who can disseminate that information to the students.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am not sure that is what the law requires, but we can talk about this offline. I am going to Assemblywomen Anderson and Hansen for questions, go ahead.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I also have numerous concerns about how this has been implemented, but I will take those offline because I know about our time element. My major question has to do with the retention rate. I understand it is at 7.9 or 8 percent, or something like that. How is it happening for the people coming back to the workforce? I know somebody who was with NDE, came back to CCSD after being gone for four years, and was going to take a significant pay cut. What is happening with people coming back to the workforce in Clark County and, more importantly, is their pay truly competitive with the different charter schools?

Ms. Triana:

I am familiar with that situation. We are still working out things with CCEA to make sure we are on the same page in regard to the memorandum of agreement (MOA) that was passed moving forward.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

If I may, it is sad that somebody had to know somebody to be able to get that attention. How many other situations are we in where we might have people who left our profession, especially in Clark County, coming back now there has been this significant investment in education, and are going to be caught up in this again? If they have not been teaching for two or three years, are they being paid less than brand-new teachers who have not taught or had any experience?

Ms. Triana:

As I said earlier, we want to make sure we are on the same page with CCEA and the MOA. I personally contacted every person who was affected, and I am familiar with each one of them. They all have my personal cell phone number. We are making sure we have clarity moving forward so everybody is clear on the pay as to who is considered new and who is considered returning to the District. We have a little bit of work to do with that.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you. As for my other concerns, especially around the Academy, I will be following up with you individually.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

On your targeted recruitment marketing slide, you mentioned targeting San Diego, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Why those markets? This is a nationwide problem. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, 44 percent of states report they are having trouble with recruitment. When I look at the top ten that are not having trouble, I am curious why we are not going towards Colorado, North Dakota, or Missouri. They are not having the trouble we are. California is on that list of the top ten that are having trouble with recruitment. As a business owner, we have to do recruitment for plumbers who require four years of apprenticeship and four years of night school, two nights a week. I feel the pain of recruitment, and I know we have to get creative. We are 22 in the nation for starting pay and for these other states, their teachers' starting pay is lower. It would seem that could be a draw. What was the mindset to go into a state that is already having trouble recruiting?

Ms. Triana:

I became the Chief Human Resources Officer in early March. Soon after that, I learned California was going to be laying off around 2,000 employees, and they would be getting their pink slips on May 15. From March to April, we worked with our Marketing Department to develop and partner with a company called Odyssey. It took some time. It is the reason we targeted Southern California, knowing we have a lot of people who come from California already and move to Las Vegas. With what we learned from this marketing campaign, we plan to replicate it because we are using commercials and targeted social media efforts. We plan to replicate it with other districts experiencing those reductions as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for being here, and I am sure we will have more robust conversations about the implementation of this bill.

I am not sure if Assemblywoman Backus is available, I know she is chairing the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Revenue in the other room. If not, she has Mr. Vellardita who is going to give us an update from the people who worked diligently on this teacher pipeline bill, AB 428. Begin when ready.

John Vellardita, Executive Director, CCEA:

I appreciate the opportunity to provide, from our perspective, an update on what we thought was a significant piece of legislation. Assembly Bill 428 was passed with bipartisan support, supported by the Governor, and invested heavily by the Legislature with tuition reimbursement for folks who become teachers and then recommit to teaching in CCSD.

I want to start with my organization's commitment to this issue. When the pandemic hit in 2020, we had a huge shutdown of the economy in this State. It was clear that education is an integral part of the economy, and we needed to improve the workforce to diversify the economy. We commissioned a report by the Anderson Economic Group, LLC., to assess what would be emergent industries and how we can improve workforce development in this State. They identified those industries, but also said there is a disconnect between

K through 12 and higher education, and it could be improved to develop better workforce development in the State. In 2022, we commissioned UNR and Columbia University to do a study that said, can we create a model for our State that integrates K through 12 with higher education that has, as a goal, to improve workforce development to meet the needs of a growing and diversifying economy. This was the genesis of AB 428. The Teaching and Training CTE program is not the pipeline that AB 428 is about. What you heard previously is not what AB 428 is about.

Assembly Bill 428 is about going to a student and saying, "How would you like to have a career teaching?" We will guide you through it. Through your secondary high school experience, you will gain dual credit. We will assess, academically, your needs, so you can have support for success. We will assess any other socioeconomic issues you are facing so we can try to remove those roadblocks. We will partner with higher education to offer dual credit, at no cost to you, so you are academically acceptable to a Nevada higher education college or university, to go into the school of education. To complete it successfully and then return and teach in CCSD and have your tuition abated. A vision that says here is a career with no student debt, a job with a pension, and a give back to your community. This is the vision of AB 428. We started in Clark County. It required, in every high school, a teacher academy with staff dedicated solely to teaching these kids about teaching. Dedicated staff, a counselor, not a paid substitute who is going to come in and try to shepherd people through. A counselor who is professionally trained to assess the needs of these kids academically and the socioeconomic challenges they have.

This has not occurred to date. I had a conversation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, NDE, Jhone Ebert, the other day. I said we would be hard pressed to find many, if any, students in Clark County that can talk about what I said, as a vision. You have a career, you have a job, you are not loaded with student debt, you give back to the community, and you teach in these schools. The front end of this program requires outreach and marketing. Not one flyer, but outreach to parents and students about this vision I outlined. We have not seen that. I think part of the disconnect, beyond not having a partner willing to implement this, is there are challenges with implementing this. Senator Dondero Loop, you highlighted some. If we had to do this over again, we probably should scale it back rather than have all high schools—but that is not where we are. We are not seeing any of the high schools having a significant, robust program.

I am joined today by Dr. Pearson, who did a lot of the research and has been trying to help implement this. We are not the employer, but to try to shepherd it through with the school district. I am also joined by Mr. Stewart, who played a significant role in helping to draft the legislation and work with Assemblywoman Backus and many of you who were part of this bill. Before I turn it over to Dr. Pearson to give you an update on where AB 428 is, I will have Mr. Stewart give you an idea of the investment the State has made, and you approved, to make this program successful.

Daniel H. Stewart, J.D., Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP, representing CCEA:

Having worked with a lot of you during the last legislative session on this bill, and Assemblywoman Backus, there are two things I want to highlight when we talked about the investment. The way this was structured was to be a front-end investment and a back-end investment. The front-end investment was, to paraphrase from *Field of Dreams*, "if you build it, they will come." Essentially, we are going to make a commitment that if you build it in the high schools and market it, it will create the demand by sharing the vision. By sharing the idea this is long term, with a degree, a job, no debt, and give back to the community. The front-end investment is in the schools to share that vision. In the back-end, it was an

appropriation of \$10 million to the Office of the State Treasurer. My understanding is, based upon the record performances of the market and the wise investment from the Treasurer's Office, has already made significant interest funds. Those interest funds were meant to grow in perpetuity so tuition could get paid for the students. The problem is we do not have that link up for the whole program. I do not know, by law, which programs would qualify for that. There was a question about whether looking at the AB 428 money. The money is supposed to be linked to that startup, so there is the incentive for when they are recruited in the program, but also, so the promise is kept. So we do not have a pool of money there available for certain programs, but when they complete it, their tuition is paid. The money is growing, it is money sitting there. Every year we wait, potentially, students currently in our high schools miss out on the chance to have that connected investment and have their tuition paid for on the back end. Like I said, investments in the front, investments in the back, and create an integrated program for these homegrown teachers to learn here, teach here, and stay here.

Brenda Pearson, Ph.D., Director of Strategic Initiatives, CCEA:

I started off working on the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program after the legislative session. Shortly after the legislative session, there was an email that went out to all CCSD administrators banning them from working with me regarding the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program. It is significant to mention, because it put a stop to the work I was able to do, and the work we are going to be doing with our schools.

To date, I had 18 schools I worked with that should be running the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program. Every school with more than 250 students should be managing this program and having this program rolled out next year. Currently, nine of those schools are not. Keeping in mind the reason we have this pathway is so we can diversify our population and our teachers as they enter. If we are offering something along the line of a change of school assignment and there is no bussing to get to students to this pathway, then how are we going to be turning these students through? Additionally, CCSD was supposed to advertise for this. One marketing flyer went out and students do not know about this program, as Mr. Vellardita said before.

I can talk to you about my experiences in the school district when I was going around and had visited each of the schools that have the program. There were wonderful examples, but down to other examples where the Teaching and Training program looked like a student sitting at a desk, reading a book. We are moving from a Teaching and Training program, which is career exploration, to a Teacher Academy College Pathway Program, which is a career pathway. The transition is not happening. This is of concern. The components of the bill ask for one full-time teacher, at least, to be focused at each school; that is not happening. We also do not have the advertisement going out—that is not happening. We have an assessment that is going out to students—which will be going out—but it has not, as of yet, and it has not been completed. There is so much unfinished business that has not been happening. We need to focus on equitable options for all of our students. The curriculum that is included within the bill is required for students to be exposed to within the teacher academy college pathway model; although, none of the instructions have been given to the counselors nor have they been given to any of the teachers. We are starting the school year without any information about new curriculum that is supposed to be supported by our teachers.

Mr. Vellardita:

We could talk forever on this. We are frustrated. We are vested in this. It should be successful if it is supported. We do not doubt the leadership of CCSD does not want to have a classroom filled with a qualified teacher. We think that is there. It is in everybody's interest. We do not think there is any disagreement around, we have vacancies that have to be filled, and we have not had a robust strategic pipeline that has ever filled them. It is why you get presentations like you had earlier today where everybody tries to throw something against the wall and say, "Here is a good idea. Let us try this." Then they come in 2025 and ask for \$1 million in State dollars to help fund this program. We have a program here, and it has an opportunity to be successful, but we are a year out from the last legislative session and six weeks out before school starts. Again, if you have questions, we will take them. I will ask you what I asked Superintendent Ebert. We would be hard pressed to find a kid and their parents in CCSD who can say, there is this wonderful program career with no student debt, job at the end. It does not exist.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Questions? Go ahead, Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I had a question about the duplicator nature of the programs out there. We were talking about CTE, teacher training programs, we have AB 428, and today we heard from NITEP and SSEF. Are these programs working towards a common goal, or is this causing more complexity or more of a problem in regard to addressing the main issue—which is creating a pipeline from our schools into our universities and back into the profession itself?

Mr. Vellardita:

I want to believe that most folks who say they would love to get more teachers into the professions are trying to work to that end. We just learned about this development at SSEF, it is interesting. One of the schools they are highlighting, CSHS, could be part of the teacher pipeline, and the money that goes with completion of that is already in place. Yet, there is this development that has taken place. We think the work that UNLV, the presentation you heard today, is good work. It is encouraging. I think there needs to be more of a discussion on how to integrate that work into AB 428, but AB 428 has to have foundation, and the foundation starts with the school district.

Mr. Stewart:

I want to add, when it came to the curriculum that was going to be taught in these academies, it was largely left open. More of this was the structure. To the extent that other organizations come in and fill the curriculum—what they are teaching—as long as it meets the rigors of putting them on this five-, six-, and seven-year path with linkage and assessments. I believe there is a great deal of flexibility, but it is getting that foundation in first, and then plugging in this other stuff.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I do not think this is the end of this discussion. In the interest of time, we are going to move on, but this is not the end. I know CCSD wanted to respond, we will get that response in writing from you and make sure it is available, and we will have continued conversation. Thank you for being here.

AGENDA ITEM V—PRESENTATION ON CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND WORK-BASED LEARNING PROGRAMS AND DESIRED SKILLS OF GRADUATES, INCLUDING BUSINESS SECTOR PERSPECTIVES

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will move on to a presentation on CTE and work-based learning (WBL). We will be hearing additional perspectives on this topic later in the meeting, but this presentation will give us an opportunity to hear from the perspective of the business sector. To present these items, we have former Senator Scott Hammond with the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (GOWINN), and he is joined by Mr. Anderson with the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB). Please begin when you are ready.

Scott Hammond, Executive Director, GOWINN:

We are grateful to be here. Hopefully, by the time we get done, we will be able to explain the advantages with the specializations we have, partnerships, data-driven solutions with the Nevada P-20 to Workforce Research Data System (NPWR), linking education to the workforce, talking about career pathways, and so forth ([Agenda Item V](#)).

We are going to talk about GWDB, but we are going to start with GOWINN. The GOWINN was created in 2016 via Executive Order and codified in State statute in 2017, under former Governor Brian Sandoval. Our work is to bring the community, businesses, and education together. We are supposed to try and figure out what needs to happen in the workforce space for businesses to be successful and for education to help the community get together—that is our main priority. As people like to say, we are the tip of the spear, trying to bring all of these together.

The GOWINN Advantage refers to the partnerships we have with GWDB and the data we collect. One of the things I am excited about is the NPWR system, to ensure people are policy driven using the data we are collecting as a State. Right now, we have different programs, GOWINN is managing and we subgrant out, including Project Supporting and Advancing Nevada's Dislocated Individuals (SANDI). We were one of nine states to receive money during COVID-19, and that project will be wrapping up sometime this September. We may have the ability to extend it until December because we have funds left over, not as much as other states, but we have some. We would like to put together a Veterans program with any remaining funds. We also have the Accelerating Nevada Apprenticeships for All (ANAA), H-1B, and State Apprenticeship Expansion grants. There are a lot of things we are doing with the T-Mobile Settlement Projects, including helping UNLV with the teacher pathway program. There is a lot of programming we are doing.

This slide describes the GOWINN Advantage, the whole purpose, and why we were created—to make sure these partners know about each other. If there is a program that comes up, we make sure we bring in the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, and we might bring in the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED), or the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR). We are there in case programs come up that need specialties or if agencies need to bring different specialties to the table. We have different partners that we put together as needed, depending on what the program is designed to do.

Going back to NPWR, this slide describes NPWR—it is a data gathering program. It came about because of legislation we passed. Nevada's Department of Education, NSHE, and DETR were the first to be mandated by legislation to give their data. Since then, through

memorandums of understanding (MOUs), we added data from different agencies. We are continuing to gather more data from other agencies as we extend invitations through additional MOUs. We started to allow researchers to come in and figure out what they could do with the data. Then we have a forum. During the first forum in December, the researchers delivered a presentation on the data they collected over the course of six months. Our second forum will be this year. We awarded additional dollars to researchers this year. On the next slide, you will see the entities that received additional funding from us to do more research in that area.

We are hoping, in the end, it creates policies we can deliver to you that are data-driven and have research backing everything. What we would like to see are data-driven solutions in in-demand occupations. We work in conjunction with GOED to develop this in-demand occupations list so other entities will be able to understand where we should be driving our workforce. This applies to K through 12 and beyond; that way, they all know exactly what kinds of industries and jobs are in demand. We update that information every two years, and are working to find a way to do that more often to keep up with the demand as it is shifting all the time.

The next slide talks about linking education to the workforce—AB 428. Our office has been tasked with helping to implement all three of those pathways, not just the teacher pipeline. In AB 428, it was asked that we develop two additional pipelines, and our office chose healthcare and clean energy/advanced manufacturing. There was not a lot of money in AB 428 for the other pipelines. As a matter of fact, I do not think our office got much money at all, other than being funded two positions. We are currently working with UNR's Tech Hub. They were in the second round of getting additional funds from the federal government, which brought in money in the form of workforce. We reached out to different businesses within the lithium loop to figure out how we can create a high school pipeline of workers in mining, manufacturing, and recycling of lithium. We are trying to be more creative in creating and developing these pathways. We have somebody here who can talk more about that if you need to.

Lastly, when talking about getting ready for the workforce of tomorrow, we are working with a company called MIDAS to develop a platform. The platform will be a place where learners—regardless of age—can find available internships, apprenticeships, WBL, as well as housing a digital wallet. One of the things you keep hearing about are microcredentials, credentials, and other types of educational programs. Where do people put those so future employers may know what they have? We are going to create an amazing system, a platform that employers will want to use. Employees will want to do research, learners will be able to access it in schools, and they will have the ability to link into these platforms and other workforce programs that already exist. It will be a one-stop shop.

We will go right into the GWDB and the overview. The primary purpose of the GWDB is to be a convener for industry, labor, and government leaders dedicated to innovating workforce development for the State of Nevada. The Board is made up of 31 members representing a variety of different businesses, as well as agencies—Titles I, II, III, and IV. They work together to find out what is going right with workforce development and where we can make improvements. The private sector businesses are there to say, "This is what is going on in our world. How can we help you to help us." There is a lot of collaboration going on; it is an active board right now.

We just finished our Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) State Plan. It was accepted by the federal government and is now being funded. It is a four-year State plan.

We fund it for four years, and every two years, we might have to make corrections or additions to it.

For the first time ever, along with the WIOA plan, the Board decided we needed a strategic plan. How do we implement the plan? How do we get to the nuts and bolts? How do we find the numbers that show what we are doing, and how we are doing it? This is the first time a strategic plan has been put together. The Governor looked at the strategic plan, which was completed, and wrote a letter of support explaining what we are trying to achieve. What I am excited about is it helps us to continue the work when we said, "This is what the plan will look like." Now, we have subcommittees and other members of our Board who are going to be working with the Titles to make sure we are putting the effort to achieve the plan. It is the implementation arm of the WIOA State plan. We are excited that we have taken this extra step to make sure we are achieving everything we set out to do in the WIOA plan.

We wanted to make sure you were able to see the business perspectives on student success for the workforce since it is changing all the time. We know education, and how we deliver education is changing all the time. You heard microcredentials mentioned several times. I refer to the microcredential world as the Wild West because everybody is offering microcredentials in different areas, without knowing the validity they have and whether the person looking at it is saying what you are learning is applicable to the field you might get into. Does that company recognize everything you have been taught in an education class? One of the things we are always trying to do is solve that issue. We are going to bring unity to this microcredentialing Wild West, and other credentials that exist.

The Board is concerned about the development of soft skills, which is why we have a couple of different subcommittees with the GWDB. One of the subcommittees is the Barriers Board; they look at the barriers preventing people from getting into the workforce. We also have one on childcare. We wanted to make sure childcare was not a barrier to getting into the workforce. We recognize that after COVID-19, a lot of women were trying to get back into the workforce and some of the barriers were childcare. We are actively seeking answers to these problems, questions, and barriers, and trying to come up with ways to bring more people into the workforce.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Committee Members, do you have questions?

Assemblyman D'Silva:

Can you go into the research grants more? What are they exactly? What focus will that research be on? Is there any specific interest GOWINN may have related to the information you are trying to get from those grants?

Secondly, I did not know there was an advanced manufacturing component. I think that is a great opportunity for the State. Are there any specific types of manufacturing bases you will be looking at developing over the next few years?

Executive Director Hammond:

The research varies, but it is focused on workforce. How do we increase the workforce? How do we make work better? Slide eight shows the different entities that received funding, as well as a snapshot of the research they are doing. The first one, *Strengthening Nevada's P-20 Teacher Pipeline: An Assessment to Meet Workforce Projections*, was done by CCEA

through funding we gave them for that research. Also the *AI-Enhanced Education in Nevada and its Transformative Impact on Workforce Development, Employment Prospects, and Tomorrow's Job Market Proficiencies* by UNLV. All of these have something to do with the workforce and, in particular, how it could impact the workers of tomorrow to get more people into these pipelines. There are a lot of applications that come in. This last time we had over 30 applications. We were not able to fund them all due to limited funding, but we try to spread that money out as much as possible. We were selective; we wanted to make sure everything that was being researched would have a positive impact on getting more people into our workforce in the future. It is about making sure there is information out there for policymakers and that it is data-driven, so your decision-making might be easier.

Hugh Anderson, Chair, GWDB:

Let me make sure you are left with the number 42,000. There are 42,000 missing individuals in Southern Nevada, in Clark County alone, who are no longer engaged in school and are not in the workforce.

How did advanced manufacturing come to the fore? The Board—through our partners, Workforce Connections and Nevadaworks—has established what are called, “industry sector partnerships.” Historically, around the country, the other GWDB’s tell the industries what they need. We turn that table over. The industries come to the table, we sit against the wall, and we find out from them what they need. Advanced manufacturing is a perfect example. If you think about what is going on in North Las Vegas and go through the industrial corridor. A company like BOXABL is creating small home units that can be put on a flatbed and delivered to a site. You have a fully developed home in a matter of hours—that requires advanced manufacturing from design to construction and implementation. Those are the kinds of practical things we are trying to deliver with the Board and WIOA. As you know, the federal government has many well-intentioned concepts. Our job as the GWDB is to turn that into something actionable. Our Board is made up of true business owners who keep asking, “Where is the data? Where are the metrics? What are the milestones? Show us the results.” It helps us work with our partners in the Title offices to make sure that as they try to deliver the resources to their clientele, it is answering the need in the community.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have two questions. The first one has to do with the information about beginning career exposure early in middle and high school to promote awareness. Is that done through the school system, or if there is a different item you are envisioning at this time?

Kenneth Evans, Vice Chair, GWDB:

Part of our mission as the GWDB is to ensure there is equitable access to opportunities. By that, we talk about awareness and access on the front end and a livable wage and substantive career path on the back end. To specifically answer your question, one of the things we have been looking at is, are people aware of our workforce development system? Specifically, we address that through Nevadaworks in the north and Workforce Connections in the south. But again, we ask them, are people aware of what you are doing? Do they have access to what you are doing? To give you an example with Workforce Connections—this goes back to the 42,000 disconnected individuals—if we only use traditional methods to market, we are not going to reach a population like that. On the other hand, if we put marketing materials in a fitness area or drop-in location, we are going

to reach individuals we might not normally reach. How do we do that? We ask them. We are making more of an effort when it comes to marketing and publicizing what we do to talk to the individuals or representation from those groups. Yes, we still use the traditional methods, but at the same time, recognize there may be room for improvement in terms of awareness and access. We are willing to do nontraditional things as well.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I appreciate that because I am looking at everything that is being asked to be added into our school system, and I am wondering where the time will go. My other question is for Chair Anderson. You mentioned the 42,000 southern Nevadans. Do you know what that number would be for disconnected individuals in the rest of the State?

Mr. Anderson:

I would be lying if I said I knew, but I think I heard a number of around 60,000 altogether statewide. One of the things that evolved from the business connection was as Jaime Cruz, Executive Director for Workforce Connections in Southern Nevada, expressed his concern about the missing 42,000, he was the first entity in the entire country who started putting the JobConnect facilities, with wraparound services, outside of a main office. They were the first to embed one in the Vegas Chamber. The nice thing about that concept was that he got a national award for innovation because he did not ask permission, he just did it—nobody thought to ever do it before. He was sharing his lamentation about the missing 42,000 to a health club owner and the owner says, “I know where those folks are, they are in my gym. They work out eight hours a day and are either at home playing video games the rest of the time or couch surfing. Why not put one of those in my facility?” Jaime did, and they are getting traction from that.

Executive Director Hammond:

I wanted to add a couple of things to Assemblyman D’Silva’s question earlier. If you look at slide eight, there is research on this topic done by Grant McCandless, Consultant to Workforce Connections. In particular, he is talking about the potential economic and fiscal benefits of connecting over 30,000 disconnected youth. He used the number 30,000, but we know now it is greater than that. You can see everybody is concentrating on these issues. We have recognized the barriers, impediments, and issues, and there is research being done in those areas.

In addition, during the SANDI Grant, our office was tasked with trying to identify these careers and find a pathway so students, as young as elementary age, would be exposed to potential careers. As part of the SANDI Grant, there was a system put together called CareerExplorer—I believe you can access it through the library system—but that is another issue we will be addressing with MIDAS. We want to connect more education in that system, to be a sister companion program to the CareerExplorer, so students know the specific jobs in each industry, and what it requires to get into them. It is no longer needed in every job to have a four-year degree. It is a matter of what kind of credentialing you need—speaking of microcredentials. The system is going to be designed to try and explain to them what the job is, what is needed, how you get the job, and where you can get that education. Where can you get those credentials? What institution offers them? It will all be included to help instruct parents and their students on what is needed for these things.

Mr. Anderson:

We are concerned about the most vulnerable of our population, just like you are. We do not want our young people self-selecting out because they do not think something is attainable, especially if they come from a community where they do not see aspirational career paths modeled for them. We need to reach into the schools and show them the possibilities early. They too can be whatever they want to be, and it does not always require four-year degrees or advanced degrees. There is nothing wrong with those if that is what you aspire to, but there are many other ways to earn a financially secure career, not just a job.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Any other questions? [There were none.]

**AGENDA ITEM VI—PRESENTATION ON HIGHER EDUCATION FEES,
INCLUDING AN OVERVIEW OF EXISTING WAIVERS AND RELATED DATA
PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 72 (2023)**

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we have a presentation from NSHE on higher education fees in Nevada. The presentation will include a discussion of the fee waiver program in place, as well as statistics related to the programs. Please introduce yourself and begin when ready.

Patty Charlton, Interim Chancellor, NSHE:

I wanted to start by thanking the Committee for this opportunity to talk about fee waivers within NSHE ([Agenda Item VI](#)). Fee waivers are an integral part of our priorities of promoting access, student success, and equity within higher education in Nevada.

It is necessary to share information about the fee waivers and to look at current fee waivers to see what is working and what we might need your assistance on. You will hear from our team about the recommendations for addressing fee waivers. We know this is a policy committee, but we also need to tackle the rising cost of waivers as well as higher education in whole, and how that affects our students within our institutions—you will hear recommendations related to this as well. As new waivers are introduced each session, we urge the interim Committee to consider our recommendations. We look forward to working with you during this interim to potentially bring forward bill draft revisions for the 2025 Session. We are going to start with the presentation and are available for questions to follow.

José Quiroga, Research Analyst, Academic and Student Affairs, NSHE:

I will echo Chancellor Charlton in thanking the Chair and Committee for the opportunity to present today about the fee waiver programs, and this important topic in addressing affordability. My goal will be to provide you with an overview of fee waivers, how they affect affordability and the cost of college; and to present our recommendations for enhancing fee waiver effectiveness and sustainability.

To begin with a shared definition of fee waivers—fee waivers are a release from the requirement to pay certain educational costs that would typically be borne by the student, such as the base registration fee and other special course fees. While fee waivers are very beneficial to students, they can also result in foregone revenue for colleges and universities. This is an important part to mention because typical financial aid usually has a funding

mechanism for any aid that goes to a student. I will pause to talk about what I mean by registration and other fees. This might colloquially be called tuition, so I may use tuition at some point in the presentation. What I mean is what an in-state student pays directly to the institution in order to go to class. There are technical definitions of what that means, and I am happy to discuss that if there are questions. With that definition in mind, I will try to quickly go through all seven of our fee waiver programs and pause and highlight important characteristics of each.

We have the National Guard fee waiver, which is the oldest existing fee waiver. It was established by the Nevada Legislature in 2003, and it supports Nevada National Guard members, their children, and spouses. It covers base registration and certain laboratory fees for State-supported undergraduate and graduate programs, excluding professional schools like law, medical, and dental schools. It is important to note because that was traditionally what was covered by fee waiver programs, starting with the National Guard fee waiver. The National Guard fee waiver not only is the oldest but also the largest, both by student population and fees waived.

Next, we have the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action fee waiver. This waiver serves children or the widowed of a prisoner of war or missing in action service member. This is an important, though smaller, waiver due to the population. It covers State-supported undergraduate and graduate-level programs, and it waives base registration and laboratory fees. This waiver was adopted in 2009 by the Nevada Legislature.

Moving forward to 2014 for the next fee waiver, this was established by the Board of Regents and also applies to service members. This is for active duty service members because there was an identified need where military benefits pay for the registration fees—that is the bulk of tuition—but there was a hole there for special course fees, technology fees, and other fees students pay. The Board of Regents created this fee waiver that was opted into by institutions. This one is slightly different in that it covers a portion of all fees.

The Board of Regents established the Foster Youth fee waiver in 2018. It serves students who were foster youth in Nevada at 13 years of age or younger [should be “or older”]. It covers State-supported undergraduate and graduate-level programs and waives all registration and laboratory fees.

In 2019, the Nevada Legislature established the Purple Heart fee waiver, which benefits service members who were awarded the Purple Heart. It does not require the Veteran to be permanently stationed in Nevada, so it may go to other Veterans as well. The courses are the same as covered before in that they are undergraduate and graduate-level; however, most importantly, it is the first fee waiver to cover professional schools, including law, medical, and dental schools. Unlike the other fee waivers we discussed, this fee waiver only pays towards the balance of registration and other mandatory fees after other federal benefit programs have been applied. If you heard of “last-dollar programs,” that would not be a perfect description for this, but it is closer to that end of the spectrum than our other fee waivers. I would note that AB 279 (2023)—under the leadership of Assemblyman D’Silva—expanded this fee waiver, not only to Purple Heart recipients, but also their dependents.

The Native American fee waiver was adopted by the Nevada Legislature in 2021. Under the leadership of Assemblywoman Anderson, AB 150 (2023) expanded this waiver as well. It serves students who are enrolled members or descendants of an enrolled member of a federally recognized tribe or nation that meet one of several criteria that establishes a nexus to Nevada. The courses covered here are much wider, they include not only

State-supported courses but also self-supporting courses, short-term courses, professional courses, and any class offered at an NSHE institution. It waives base registration fees and all other mandatory fees. We are looking at more of a first-dollar program. This was changed with AB 150.

The most recent fee waiver program, established by the Board of Regents, was the Congressional Medal of Honor program adopted in 2023. This waiver is for a member or Veteran of the armed forces who is a recipient of the medal of honor or their children. Now, because of this small population overall, we have not yet had recipients of this waiver.

Now that we have looked at the basic characteristics, the following slides illustrate the number of recipients' amounts waived under each program, the demographic breakdown of recipients, and persistence data.

We see the number of recipients in each program for the last five years, from 2019 to 2024. We have seen a growth in the number of recipients across various fee waiver programs. Especially notable are the increases in the Native American fee waiver that was only established in AY 2021–2022; however, the number of recipients has more than doubled, closer to tripled, and a large part of that increase may be attributed to the expansion of the waiver enacted in the last session. As we look at the National Guard fee waiver program, it remains the largest waiver in both recipients and fees waived, which we will look at further on the next slide. In this slide, we can see the major growth in the grand total of recipients, a little over 60 percent.

As we look at the fees waived, the financial impact has dramatically increased from \$2.7 million in AY 2019–2020 to an estimated \$6.1 million in AY 2023–2024, as of April 1. It is likely it will grow slightly. It reflects the increase in utilization of these waivers, and in certain cases, expanded eligibility and fees eligible for waivers, as was the case with the Native American fee waiver—which saw the largest increase in fees waived due to expansion. As previously noted, the Nevada National Guard fee waiver remains the program with the most fees waived, but its pace of growth is more moderate.

We have demographic data we collect to review the equity and access of many of our programs. This is a race and ethnicity breakdown. Our latest available data is for the AY 2022–2023 and shows the racial and ethnic distribution of waiver recipients. This data is self-reported. We do have a “not reported” category and a “two or more races” category that may include the other races and ethnicities. What we see here is that we have a diverse population of recipients. One category we received questions about before is the Native American fee waiver race category, and why it is not 100 percent American Indian or Alaskan native. A student does not have to self-identify as Native American; they have to meet one of the fee waiver categories of being either a member or a descendant of a member of a Native American tribe or nation. They may identify as one of the other racial categories, or they may be in the two or more race category as well.

The last slide in this section is about student persistence, which we define as fall-to-fall student persistence. It is measured as students who received a fee waiver in fall 2022 and either graduated or enrolled in fall 2023. I will note some of the percentages have a low overall population. Wherever you see 100 percent, 0 percent, or even 33 percent, those were small populations of perhaps two, three, or four students, whereas all the other categories have a more robust population size. Notably, our two largest fee waivers, the Nevada National Guard and Native American fee waivers, have overall high student persistence rates at most institutions. I will commend our institutions and the work they do to support students. Students utilizing these waivers are seeing their academic advisors,

financial aid advisors, outreach programs from diversity centers, and other support programs throughout our schools; those support these persistence rates.

In this next section, I will review how fee waivers affect affordability. We will start with the shared definition—a fee waiver is the full or partial release from the requirements to pay registration or other fees. However, as we looked through each waiver, I hope you have been thinking about the differences and commonalities among the waivers because they are important. The way we structure a fee waiver can change how it impacts the student's affordability to go to college. Depending on the characteristics of the fee waiver, they may impact affordability by directly paying for student tuition and fees; combining with other student aid to pay for indirect costs like housing, meals, and other costs; and encouraging Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) completion and degree completion. Degree completion may not be thought of traditionally as a part of affordability, but the most expensive degree is one that a student does not complete and does not gain the full benefits of degree completion. Another important concept I want to introduce is the difference between a last-dollar and a first-dollar program. With last-dollar waivers only paying for the balance of tuition and fees after other aid has been applied and first-dollar waivers paying for tuition and fees regardless of other aid. Thus, a student's financial assistance may pay for other educational costs. These are not black and white; it is not a dichotomy. Sometimes a program may be toward the last-dollar or toward the first-dollar ends of the spectrum, but they may be in a spectrum as opposed to fully one or the other.

Now that I have discussed affordability concepts, let us look at numbers. In this table, I have gathered the typical fees at each institution for an in-state undergraduate student, living off campus. These costs can change depending on certain factors, and these figures are publicly available. Financial aid offices gather these through surveys, reviewing local real estate data, and collaborating with each other to get to these numbers. This concept of cost of attendance is federally regulated and used in financial aid calculations. I would be remiss if I did not point out that NSHE institutions ranked among the top five most affordable colleges and universities in western states in all categories, including undergraduate and graduate students and community colleges. This looks at the tuition fee portion of the cost of attendance. However, other costs, such as housing and food, must be taken into consideration for a full understanding of affordability. As we look at the chart, we can see that even for our R1 research institutions—that have the highest tuition costs—the cost of tuition and fees are less than a third of the cost of college. The highest portion of costs are room and board, especially in Nevada. We have seen those increase dramatically over the last few years. A takeaway from this chart is interventions that seek to address affordability cannot be solely focused on tuition and fees but must consider cost more broadly, or at least partner with other types of aid that look at those broader areas of cost of attendance.

This leads to the next slide about other aid available for students who may receive a waiver. How are they going to meet their other costs? If they do not have other aid, it would mean working longer hours, which may lead to not being able to be a full-time student or dedicate the time needed to get through school—that is financial aid. I thought it was important to include the broader context of other financial aid disbursed. In AY 2022–2023, NSHE institutions disbursed \$683 million plus in student aid. In contrast, fee waivers that year amounted to \$4.1 million. This is not to diminish the impact of fee waivers, but to highlight the importance of creating waivers in a way that aligns with overall financial assistance for students.

This leads me to the last section of my presentation, the recommendations. We are grateful for the opportunity to provide the recommendations and lessons learned as we implemented fee waivers over the last 20 plus years. In short, we propose standardizing eligibility

requirements, standardizing covered courses by fee waivers, and establishing a long-term funding source.

The first recommendation, in no particular order, is to standardize eligibility requirements. A challenge we see is not all fee waivers require the completion of the FAFSA. I know this was a particularly challenging year for FAFSA; however, it is the first step students take to fund their higher education. For much of those over \$680 million disbursed in aid, FAFSA is key, so we want to align with that requirement. The second portion is that fee waivers have disparate continuing eligibility requirements. Many of them require a 2.0 semester grade point average (GPA), but that is not the same as the federal requirement for satisfactory academic progress (SAP). Satisfactory academic progress gets complicated quickly, but for most programs, it is a 2.0 cumulative GPA and a 67 percent completion rate of all courses attempted. Aligning those together would mean aligning the fee waiver requirements for federal student aid. Students would not have different requirements for different programs; they would know what they have to follow, and it is more forgiving because it is cumulative, as opposed to a semester GPA. Currently, a student with a 4.0 GPA could have a tough semester and lose their fee waiver eligibility if they have something that goes wrong for a single semester, as opposed to the SAP that is cumulative.

The second recommendation is to standardize courses covered. When I discussed each fee waiver, you may have noticed that some programs traditionally started by only covering state-supported and nonprofessional programs, whereas the more recent fee waivers include both professional and nondegree programs. An issue here is because many of these fee waivers do not have any funding attached or have funding attached at a lower level than what utilization is, a relatively small number of students using a fee waiver in a self-support program can make the program unsustainable. This is also true for professional programs with smaller class sizes. A recommendation would be to standardize the covered courses to be the state-funded courses applying toward an undergraduate or graduate degree, excluding professional programs. It is one of the hardest recommendations to make because this would be the only recommendation that would reduce eligibility for some students. However, I believe this would lead to a more sustainable program in the long term because it is an easy-to-understand list of courses that we already use for many other fee waivers.

My next recommendation would be to standardize the fees waived. We talked about the last-dollar versus first-dollar. Some programs cover some laboratory fees, and some cover all laboratory fees. This gets complicated for students and creates issues of equity. A lot of it has to do with the different programs created over the last 20 years, so the thinking as each program was created led to different fees being waived. The recommendation is simple, standardize the fees covered by each waiver. Hopefully, that would be a first-dollar type of program. However, it would be more costly, so it is something that would need to be considered exactly how that will be done.

Finally, the last recommendation is to establish a long-term funding source. As we discussed, fee waivers have increased from \$2.7 million in AY 2018–2019 to \$6.1 million in AY 2023–2024, and we expect those costs to continue increasing. The recommendation would be for state-mandated fee waivers to create a state appropriation and fee waiver account—similar to the state scholarships—and to have a base appropriation on projected cost for the following biennium, especially when programs, like the Native American fee waiver, expand eligibility going with a cost of two years previous. Although still appreciated, this will cause a shortfall. This would ensure the long-term feasibility of programs and fee waivers.

With that, I will reiterate that fee waivers are vital for making higher education accessible and affordable to our students. We recognize the importance of fee waivers and the work this body is undertaking in reviewing them. I believe our recommendations would enhance the effectiveness, fairness, and sustainability of the programs. Thank you for your consideration. With the Chair's permission, we welcome any questions.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for that presentation. We will start with Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

My question stems from the extensive conversations that I had, as well as other members of this Committee and lawmakers, with the previous Chancellor about creating accounts that could help with paying for the issues that come from the fee waiver applications and making sure they are sustainable and long term. What is the process for establishing those accounts? Will they be specific to the classification of students, such as Veteran or public servant, like teachers or abatements for folks who are going to be part of these teacher training programs? What are the funding sources, are they private sector or the federal government?

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

We think the opportunity to work with the Legislature is probably our best first course of action. We are grateful for the last session, where there was an appropriation provided for the Native American fee waiver. As you can see, that has been wildly successful. We had the opportunity to present to the Interim Finance Committee last week and are grateful for their support in filling the hole. If we can work holistically with the Legislature to identify how to best approach this, to ensure we have sustainability in the long term, I think would be important. We do leverage as much as we can in private funding—through donations and donor support—for scholarships for students, but as you saw earlier, the cost of attendance is much larger than the registration, tuition, and fees that are provided. Every dollar counts for a student. All these programs meet the need of the State of Nevada, and we know, over time, it is going to continue to grow. As we talked earlier, about the teacher education pathway, we need to find ways and the Legislature has done that. There is funding that has been placed in the savings account with the Treasurer's Office for when those students come through the pipeline, and eventually come to higher education for the completion of their degree programs. Finding ways that are creative, that we can work together, is a great approach.

Senator Dondero Loop:

How does this work coupling with other scholarships? If you receive the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship or other scholarship, does this go into effect first or do the scholarships go into effect first?

Mr. Quiroga:

It depends on the waiver. The most generous waivers will pay for registration fees and other fees completely. Other scholarships could go to the student to pay for their rent, housing, transportation, and everything else. Some scholarships are not set up that way; they will only pay the balance of registration fees and other fees. The Purple Heart fee waiver, for example, if a student's Pell Grant fully covers their tuition and fees, they would receive no benefit from the fee waiver. It does depend on the fee waiver, and why one of our recommendations is to standardize that. Ideally, if there is funding available, the fee

waiver would pay first, take away those fees, and allow other aid to help a student's overall cost of education.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I think I might know the answer to this, but I would like to hear your opinion. What happens with a child who is adopted?

Mr. Quiroga:

Do you mean a child who went through foster youth or overall?

Senator Dondero Loop:

Overall, adopted child of any of these categories.

Mr. Quiroga:

There are specific parts of federal aid that will allow a student who was adopted, after a certain age, to be eligible for additional federal benefits. However, currently, none of the fee waivers take that into account. For example, for a service member who qualifies for the Purple Heart fee waiver, as long as the child was legally adopted, they would be eligible for the program. I hope I answered your question, but I am happy to answer any follow-ups.

Senator Dondero Loop:

To clarify, if I adopted a child at two months, one month, or two days, and that was my child, if I was Native American, a prisoner of war, or National Guard would that child still qualify?

Mr. Quiroga:

Yes. As long as you adopted that child, and it is a fee waiver that passes on to dependents, they would be eligible.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we will go to Assemblywoman Anderson.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have a question regarding the standardized courses covered. I appreciate our conversation earlier this week. To make sure I have the idea of the recommendations down, [certain professional programs—I think] there is an online social work class that some university systems offer—that would still be covered, but other professional programs, like wine tasting, would not be. Is that how you see this? Or is that going too much into the weeds at this time?

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

There are several ways we could approach that question. Our first recommendation could be a course that leads to professional licensure or certification, or one that has a component of a stacked skilled credential, which does happen in our community colleges. We would look forward to working with the Legislature to refine what that might look like.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Would this still include law degrees and medical degrees, as well as higher education beyond a bachelor's degree, under the standardized course coverage?

Mr. Quiroga:

We look forward to working with the Legislature and the Committee to define the exact details. The current recommendation would be to exclude law school, medical school, and other professional programs, because they are self-supporting and that is what we mean in our definition of professional programs. This also excludes self-supporting courses that can be either at a graduate level or nondegree seeking short-term courses.

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

I think the biggest issue is the affordability of the lost revenue that impacts the institutions. They have gaps in funding across the system, so we would work to provide a stable funding source. This is revenue lost by the institutions and means the cost of those programs is now spread over another student population. We look forward to working with you and perhaps if there are those types of accounts we could fund and look at an ongoing revenue stream that could offset those losses to the institution, and still provide that benefit to our community and our State.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I look forward to those discussions.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I had a question about your recommendation on the standardized fee waived. Obviously, first-dollar and last-dollar are issues, but your recommendation is not asking that everything become last-dollar, or is it? It would seem to alleviate some of the burden on the institutions if it were last-dollar. Is that at the detriment of anyone? It would seem to be the same for the student, but it would have less of an effect on the institution, but that is not the recommendation I am seeing here.

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

We recognize there are different populations that are supported by these fee waivers. We do recommend a program that requires the FAFSA to be completed for all students. There are a lot of benefits to our institutions, and the State, for having the FAFSA completed for all the students who receive this aid. I think it is important because of the opportunities for other funding that may come into the State, and also make those students aware of other opportunities they have. To that benefit, if we could standardize, the last-dollar approach would be a reduced cost, but it would bring other aid to the table.

The other component to requiring the FAFSA is to be consistent in the types of fee waivers that are provided. It reduces the confusion for a student because there are programs where everything is covered. In other cases, some fees are covered, and some are not, so it does help that financial planning for the student as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

It does not look like we have any other questions. Thank you for your presentation and the recommendations. I am sure they will be addressed in the next legislative session.

AGENDA ITEM VII—UPDATES ON THE WORK AND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE

[This agenda item was taken out of order.]

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am excited about the next agenda item. We are now going to hear a presentation from the Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL) which submitted its annual report. To speak on this item is Senator Wiener and Youth Legislator Walsh. Senator Wiener, would you like to start by saying a few things?

Senator Valerie Wiener (Ret.):

It is a privilege to be here to support the Youth Legislators as they represent the program. The Nevada Youth Legislature was started in the 2007 Legislative Session, and I am proud and humbled to be the author of the bill that created the program. I attended a conference on civic engagement and got the idea of having a program for young people. I thought, we are going to do something in Nevada.

We started it as an annual term, which was modest, and then we went to a two-year term. In the first year of the program, Youth Legislators, who are appointed by their State Senators, take an oath of office. Their work mirrors the work of an elected representative in government. The first year they learn skills development and message accountability, constituent outreach, presentation, and negotiation skills and so on. They have town hall meetings, and they need to learn how to represent themselves in the program and what they do publicly, so they have several outside assignments.

The second year starts with training in August. We will bring the south to the north and Youth Legislators will gather in Carson City to learn about the bill drafting experience from idea to advocacy to passage. During the training, they are going to learn a lot about the legislative process. They will spend the two days learning up to the point where they will work with the ideas they want to bring. Next year, the second year program will each bring a bill proposal and present it to the entire NYL—21 members. At the first meeting in September, they bring the vote down to seven; in October, from seven to two; and in November, we have full legislative hearings on each measure, that is when they determine which bill— Mr. Killian is gracious to help us with fine-tuning the bill draft language, and they finalize that in January.

The bill is introduced, and it goes to the appropriate committee. We have NYL Day in Carson City where they come and testify on their bill before the appropriate committee. They advocate with Legislators in the building, and we finish with carrot cake, which is our tradition. We have an amazing program and amazing youth legislators. I will turn it over to the year one Chair to present the annual report.

Youth Legislator Alexa Walsh, Former Chair, NYL:

I want to thank Chair Bilbray-Axelrod and Committee Members for taking the time to let me present today. I was the Chair of NYL for the 2023–2024 Term. My term ended this month; however, I did submit a report to the Governor about the first year of the Youth Legislature for this two-year term ([Agenda Item VII](#)). Each month we had trainings to learn about the legislative process, how to present, and the Open Meeting Law. Specifically, it was message accountability skills, effective listening skills, power presentations, negotiation skills, and ultimately, a training on town hall meetings which we had to conduct in order to hear from

our constituents, youth, and fellow peers to make sure we would accurately represent them in the upcoming year.

Our first year was marked by a lot of new opportunities. We had the opportunity to elect a few Youth Legislators to the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education. Youth Legislator Rios is here as well, in Las Vegas, and he was elected. The first thing that was new that we did was include testimonials in the annual report, which was not something that had been done before. Youth Legislators were able to share their specific thoughts on trainings, meetings, the year overall, and the impact the Youth Legislature had on them.

The northern delegates were also able to participate in a meeting with international delegates who wanted to create something similar to NYL in their own countries, which was a new opportunity and unique. They did it twice. It was optional because only the northern delegates were able to attend. However, it was a fabulous opportunity and a lot of the Youth Legislators in the south would like that to happen as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for that presentation. Senator Wiener, did you want to add anything?

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

As Chair Walsh mentioned—an opportunity for expanding the impact of NYL. We did have international delegations that came through UNR who wanted to learn more about the Youth Legislature. The program is distinctive globally, and they wanted to speak with the Youth Legislators. I created a special training, social hosting training, for the youth in the north. It is our goal to provide the same opportunity for delegations that could be invited, when the new campus is open for the government experience, to work with UNLV to create a similar opportunity in the south.

We received feedback from these Legislators as well as from many of the delegates—Tina Ashdown, Program Facilitator, Research Division, LCB, would have more information. They had candid conversations with our Youth Legislators. Some of them were surprised and did not know how to respond to the idea that young people had a voice in government, especially that they get a bill. Ours is the only program in this country, and in the commonwealth countries because I visited two of them, to have a bill that is required in law for them to be able to present. Statutorily, they are allowed the bill. Having young people have the voice they have is distinctive. One of the meetings had 15 delegates from 14 countries—that was one of those visits. The last one was Papua New Guinea, and prior to that we had Serbia. We have done it in the north, and we are eager to see about doing it in the south once we have the capacity at the new facility.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

It is great that we are the only one that gives them a bill. I had the opportunity to have that bill come before my Committee in the last session, and we passed it out, and it was great. I have had conversations with UNLV about possible bill drafts as well, maybe there is synchronicity there that we can continue to talk about.

Members, do you have any questions?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

First of all, I had a chance to meet with the student legislator that represents my area. What seems to be the overarching issue? Were there consistencies you saw during this last session of your meetings?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Overall, safety was the number one issue. Whether it had been the presence of illicit substances on campus or gun safety, a lot of it revolved around safety. Some bills were about food allergies and students who may be more susceptible to diseases and illnesses than other students. Safety was the overarching topic within our discussions.

Senator Wiener:

One thing we found that was universal among the Youth Legislators from the first year experience was the idea of going into their town hall meetings. They have to market them. They mirror the Legislators. They would go in with certain things they wanted to talk about—their ideas for legislation—because they are going to make their own proposal, and they came away learning things they did not know. Some were shocked. They had no consciousness around some of the issues the students at their town hall meeting shared with them. A life lesson that will forever be with them is being open to what you do not know.

Of the bill proposals from the last cycle of the NYL, 6 of the 19 that were submitted, dealt closely with mental health. It is a huge issue when you get that from the young people themselves, so they proposed a better ratio of counselors to students or more school psychologists. Mr. Killian knows finding uniqueness—drafting each one a little differently so they would be distinctive among the six. It was an overwhelming thing we saw in the town hall meeting reports as well—mental health among young people.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have another question for both the outgoing and incoming Chair. Did you already know about this program? Is that how you joined it? Or were you recruited to become a part of this program?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I will admit, my mom found it on Facebook—that was how I found out. The time I got in, this last year, was my second time applying. The first time I did not make the cut, but I tried again. I go to Liberty High School, which is a comprehensive public high school in Southern Nevada. There was not a lot of outreach for the NYL, I had not heard of it. I know a lot of my fellow Youth Legislators had heard about it through their schools, but through my experience, I did not, and Facebook was my avenue.

Youth Legislator Sebastian Rios, Chair, NYL:

I had a school faculty member bring it to me. Similar to Chair Walsh, I applied both years, and I did not get it the first year, but the second year I was lucky enough to have the opportunity to enter the program.

I would like to add another point. I am not sure if Chair Walsh had a similar experience, but something our town halls did that I noticed was, I had a lot of students come to me after who said, “Wow, I did not know about this program. Please tell me more.” They were asking

me specific questions about the program. I would say the town halls were an excellent opportunity not only to learn about youth mission and vision, what their ideas for the future were, and their questions on legislative perspective, but also knowledge about the program. I got a lot of questions, especially after the fact, asking "What is the Youth Legislature about? How can I apply? How does it work?" I think that served another great purpose there.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

What school are you from?

Youth Legislator Rios:

Leadership Academy of Nevada. We are an online charter school for the State.

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

One of the challenges has historically been getting the word out. It is not that the effort is not there, we can always use more assistance. We reach out to school counselors and school administrators. We will likely do all of this again—working with our Legislators to look for young people in their district to appoint. When we have the opportunity, I will go with Youth Legislators to speak to the student council organizations or other leadership organizations. We are as befuddled as to why there is not more understanding about the program. However, the applicants recognize the substantial commitment, the two-year full time commitment, it requires. There may be others out there who have been interested and have heard about it. It is a huge commitment, and we have amazing young people say, "I am in for the full game." They show up for everything, that is who these young people are. They are leaders among leaders, and they are also humbled to be with each other. One of the things we do every month is have a paired activity focused on the training we did that month. We pair them up and they have conversations with colleagues they might not meet in the other part of the State. We give them an assignment, they do the activity, and they get to learn about each other. They are growing relationships in the program and beyond the program, in terms of the leadership, familiarity, and collegiality. It is a big commitment, but the ones we have apply are in for it and it shows in their performance and growth.

Chair Bilbray Axelrod:

I have a question because both our outgoing and incoming Chair said they applied twice. Does that seem to be the trend?

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

No. I did not know that until I heard that today. It is up to the State Senator. Sometimes we have many applications and sometimes we have a district that is difficult—you have several applications and the next time you do not get any. We try to help them find applicants, but it is up to the appointing Senator as to how they select their representative. They work with their Assembly Members and collaborate with them.

When I wrote the bill for this, I was intentional to make it legislative, to embrace the entire Legislature in the experience. I could have used the language "Youth Senator," but it never even crossed my mind. Youth Legislators represent everybody in this body and, equally, both houses are essential in the success of the program.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for being here today.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—UPDATES ON THE TASK FORCE ON POWER-BASED VIOLENCE AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PURSUANT TO ASSEMBLY BILL 245 (2023)

[This agenda item was taken out of order.]

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We are going to move to [Agenda Item VIII](#), this presentation will be on the Task Force on Power-Based Violence at Institutions of Higher Education. To present, we have Dr. Gunn, the Task Force Chair, and Ms. Charlton, the Interim Chancellor of NSHE. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Interim Chancellor Charlton, Previously Identified:

Thank you for this opportunity to provide an update to the Committee on the NSHE Task Force on Power-Based Violence ([Agenda Item VIII](#)). We are anxious to provide this update to you. As you will recall during the 2023 Session, there were updates to the legislation and the work of the Task Force, a comprehensive task force which you will hear about momentarily. It includes representatives consistent with the new legislation. We look forward to any questions you might have following the presentation.

Elizabeth S. Gunn, Ph.D., M.B.A., M.F.A., Dean, School of Liberal Arts, Sciences, and Business, Nevada State University, and Chair, Task Force on Power-Based Violence at Institutions of Higher Education:

It is an honor to serve the institutions, NSHE, and our students in this capacity. I am appreciative of those who sponsored and cosponsored this legislation. It is an important intervention in our State, and we are leading the nation with this legislation. There are nine other states with similar legislation mandating this kind of work. I applaud the lawmakers and those involved ensuring we are doing the best by our community, higher education, and students. Briefly, I will mention those other states—Louisiana, New York, California, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Illinois, Connecticut, and Maine. We are in good company there. The presentation before you will present a background of the work we have done and major milestones, followed by a couple of forward-looking thoughts as the Task Force thinks about the next cycle of its work.

The Task Force came about in the 81st Legislative Session and was originally called the Sexual Misconduct Task Force. Under that legislation, the Task Force was convened. Our members were appointed, we elected our Chair and Vice Chair, and began doing the work outlined in the legislation. In the subsequent legislative session, the bill was updated to AB 245. During that time, we were midway with our climate survey, so we paused, updated, and amended the survey that summer.

It is important to note in the bill that our work begins in Section 5.9. The section that comes before is K through 12. The next few slides show the required iteration or membership designation in the Task Force. I am appreciative to the members who are serving, as this is important work, and their membership represents a breadth and range of expertise that is impressive. They are volunteering their time, expertise, and service to this Task Force.

We have:

- Interim Chancellor Charlton;
- James Martines, Chief General Counsel;
- I serve as the Chair;
- Erin Frock, a representative from a community college—who has been with us since the inception of the Task Force;
- José Meléndrez from UNLV; and
- Michelle Sposito, Title IX Coordinator for UNLV.

We have a few students, as required by the legislation:

- Lisha Allison from Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC);
- Kevin Leon-Martinez, who just graduated and is leaving us, so we will have an open seat and an appointment forthcoming; and
- Lindsey Wolterbeek, an undergraduate student at UNR.

We also have:

- Dr. Tabor Griswold from UNR—who has served as Vice Chair since the inception of the initial legislation;
- Dr. Kavita Batra, a medical professional and biostatistician at UNLV;
- Dr. Alison Netski from UNLV—who has also been with the Task Force since inception;
- Shaun Mabanta, who is a campus victim advocate at TMCC;
- Christina Hall, Interim Director of The Care Center at UNLV; and
- Jordan Fischette with Fraternity and Sorority Life at UNLV.

To frame our work and provide you an overview thus far, we were originally working with the definition of sexual misconduct—under that definition was sexual assault. The new legislation, AB 245, broadened the definition to include power-based violence, which is a best practice across institutions of higher education in the country. It scopes out so the definition can include additional factors, and those are outlined in the bill and reflected here.

As I previously mentioned, some of the work we have been undertaking concurrently with the change in legislation is the survey. Here is the language from AB 245 that speaks to the climate survey on power-based violence. In the next few slides, we will walk you through a timeline of our work, those slides are interspersed with background definition details of the work of those milestones.

We convened for the first time in February 2022. At that meeting, we reviewed the current instruments, data, and programs across our institutions that had to do with sexual misconduct. Based on that information, we asked additional experts to come and present on the best practices, statewide and nationally, about power-based violence sexual assault. This was in April 2022. From there, we began working with the survey center at UNR to craft a draft of the NSHE-wide survey on sexual misconduct. Because we know and understand the complexities of the issues we are addressing in the survey, an expert came and spoke with us about how to best craft a survey, knowing that potential survivors might be taking it. We kept that in mind as well.

Moving into 2023, we were successful in unanimously voting to approve—as a Task Force—that we recommend the survey to the Board of Regents. A couple of months later in June, they approved it with Special Project funding from the Chancellor's office.

A little bit about the survey itself—there are 11 sections: (1) Campus Policies and Procedures; (2) Bystander Readiness; (3) Reporting Observations; (4) Alcohol and Sexual Opportunities; (5) Power-Based Violence by a Perpetrator; (6) Relationships; (7) Interpersonal Violence; (8) Abuse Norms; (9) The Perpetrator; (10) Unwanted Sexual Experiences; and (11) Unwanted Sexual Conduct. When we were deciding how to craft the survey and what to focus on, we were provided with a few options. Assess the extent of sexual misconduct and power-based violence at institutions of higher education. Assess programs and protocols—which we had already done to some extent with the initial presentations, but we did not feel like we were at the point in our Task Force journey to do that quite yet through students' perspectives. Another option was to ascertain practitioners' needs relating sexual misconduct and power-based violence at institutions of higher education. Again, we decided as a Task Force the most important thing to do was to start at the ground level and assess students' perceptions of the prominence of these occurrences on our campuses. There you see the categories that assess that perception.

We spent time revising the survey after AB 245 became law in July 2023. We amended the survey to align with power-based violence versus more specificity of sexual misconduct. In fall 2023, the survey was administered across our institutions that enroll students. Some students were excluded because they were not over 18 years old, for example, and a couple of other minor items there. In the fall, we had our first meeting of the new iteration of our Task Force and the election of new officers under the new legislation.

Taking a closer look at the survey results, if you recall, as I delve into this deeper, this is one component of the legislation. Concurrent to working on the survey, we started to inventory the processes, programs, and procedures at our institutions to consider what is working well. The survey results show we are doing some amazing things and students are responding positively to what the institutions are providing and also to start thinking about a gap analysis further down the road. The survey is one component of our work. You can see the list of institutions with respondents.

This is about as high level as it can get of an overview of the findings. Generally, the findings were positive. We did not find significant pervasive issues across institutions, but that does not mean they are not there. The students who took the survey, this is their perception and perhaps that is the reality, we hope it is. Further analysis will help us to understand what is happening in a more nuanced and granular level, but our initial results are extremely hopeful and positive.

Returning to our chronology and milestones, the results of the survey were presented to the Task Force in March, and earlier this month they were presented to the Board of Regents. Looking ahead, we plan to continue to inventory our processes and programs and look for a gap analysis. For the data analysis, we garnered funding through the Chancellor's office at the Board of Regents meeting in June, and we will continue to follow items in the legislation. Specifically, I will mention a couple of them—in Section 7.4 of the bill, there is language around possible policy development, in Section 7.7 there is language for the Board of Regents to designate advocates at each institution, and Section 8 refers to programs and preventions. Those are additional items we are working toward as a Task Force.

The last slide is a couple of notes of thanks to the members of the Task Force, the Board of Regents, our Chancellor for her guidance and time, the Survey Center at UNR, and especially to the students who completed the survey.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation. It looks like a lot of students from UNLV participated. I am surprised. It seems like that is a smaller number from UNR. Do you have any idea why that might be?

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

We recognize that, overall, we had a low participation rate. I think part of that is a factor of building awareness with the legislation passing at the end of the 2023 Session and being able to facilitate this survey that was in the process of being updated and to deploy that. We know it is an awareness, but there is also some level of discomfort with this type of survey. When you look at the size of our institutions, UNLV does have the largest full-time enrollment. The College of Southern Nevada has the largest total head count of students. We are going to continue that work. I think that is one of our top priorities, building awareness and also building a comfort level as we move forward to the next iteration of a survey deployment.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Any questions from the Committee? Assemblywoman Hardy.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

How often do you plan to give this survey?

Dr. Gunn:

I believe the legislation says we may give it every two years. This gives us plenty of opportunity to analyze what happened, what went well, what we can improve, and update the survey. We have begun talking about attaching incentives to the survey. We would work through the Chancellor's office with the institutions to ask them to incentivize students taking the survey. We recognize there is room for improvement and a better response rate. This is the initial launch of the survey, as the Chancellor mentioned. We now have a bar and know where we want to go from here.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My question has to do with the Title IX information—if that has also been part of these responses. If I am understanding correctly, the bill itself only dealt with student complaints, or are there also faculty complaints that are part of this information? Is there a plan to possibly include faculty information in the future?

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

The bill does include that this is deployed to students. One of the things that higher education in particular has been awaiting, and this did happen, is that the United States Department of Education (U.S. DOE) recently issued new regulations as it pertains to Title IX, those will become effective on August 1, 2024. Right now, we are deeply engaged in the process of analyzing those new U.S. DOE regulations and passing policy revisions. We will be bringing those to the Board of Regents before the August 1 deadline. We can certainly keep you posted on any nuances. As you can understand with the U.S. DOE, I think it was about 400 pages of regulations. We are going through those and were waiting for those. They were released in, I believe, April.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you because that is not an easy thing, I am sure, to wade through. To verify, I know there have been complaints or concerns around faculty members—sometimes they are students—but has there been any outreach on that, or is this only for the students?

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

This survey in particular was only for students. There is awareness and communication that happens at our different institutions, and we could bring that back. I anticipate with the passing of those new regulations, heightened awareness. We can let you know if surveys are a requirement. We provide information regarding Title IX, that is something we can do by our institutions as well.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Who developed the survey?

Dr. Gunn:

The development of the survey was a multi-part task among representatives on the Task Force as well as researchers with whom we consulted across the system, mainly at UNR. There was a previous, less comprehensive iteration of this survey that was issued at UNR and maybe one other institution. It was a local version of the survey. We adapted it and reviewed the survey again with experts at our survey center—we have biostatisticians and experts in survey development on the Task Force.

Senator Dondero Loop:

Were there any questions asked if students were a part of fraternities or sororities, involved in sports or not, or were part time or full time? The only reason I ask is because I can see where if a student is less involved or more involved, it could skew how they feel.

Dr. Gunn:

Yes, there are demographic questions in the survey, and we have that information. One of the next steps of our survey, and this is one of the action items with the Board of Regents, was to fund additional data analysis—data diving—to look for correlation across demographics with some of the answers and survey findings.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Would it be possible for the Committee to see the survey?

Dr. Gunn:

Yes, of course. The instrument and findings report are available on the NSHE website as well, but we can certainly do that.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I would like to see that. Any other questions, Committee? [There were none.]

AGENDA ITEM IX—PRESENTATION ON DUAL AND CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT AND MICROCREDENTIALING PROGRAMS IN THE STATE AND RELATED STUDENT OUTCOMES

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Moving forward, we will hear another presentation from NSHE on dual and concurrent enrollment in Nevada. To present, we have Interim Chancellor Charlton and Vice Chancellor Archer.

Interim Chancellor Charlton, Previously Identified:

We bring to you today a presentation on dual and concurrent enrollment within NSHE, as well as microcredentialing programs within the State ([Agenda Item IX](#)). As mentioned, Vice Chancellor Archer will present, we also have Mr. Singleton here in support, and representatives from our institutions should you have any questions following the presentation.

Daniel Archer, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, NSHE:

I want to clarify when we talk about dual enrollment for the purposes of this presentation, we are talking about when a high school student takes a college course while in high school. We are casting as broad a net as possible here. There are three primary modalities through which this occurs. The first is more of a partnership format where a student takes a class at a high school, and it is taught by a high school instructor. This is something that certainly increases access. It helps lower socioeconomic students and students in rural areas because you remove that transportation barrier because the college atmosphere comes to the high school. This is our number one means by which dual enrollment occurs, through partnerships between higher education institutions and high schools. The second one I want to touch on gets into the dual enrollment that occurs at a college campus. As an example, a student goes to high school in the morning, leaves at noon, goes to the college campus, and takes classes among other college students. The last modality would be a high school student taking an online college course. It is equally important to emphasize the diversity and the offerings—it could be a general education course such as English, U.S. History, government, or college algebra, but could also be something that would be in a technical field, like automotive classes that would count for dual credit. You also have people who are career-oriented but do not necessarily want to go into a technical field. It has been touched on several times today, trying to increase the teacher education pipeline. We have a lot of folks taking pre-education or introductory education classes during their junior and senior year to prepare to go into elementary education programs after they graduate from high school. There are a wide variety of offerings.

This slide exemplifies the significant growth that has occurred. We went from 3,000 to nearly 15,000 over this eight- or nine-year period. This has largely been fueled by increased partnerships between high schools and higher education institutions. This creates opportunities for K through 12 and higher education to connect and strengthen relationships. It gets a high school teacher and a college teacher in the same room that are in the same discipline. There are opportunities for them to connect, collaborate, and cross-pollinate. There are great opportunities for synergy. We are always trying to explore ways we can increase collaborations with K through 12, and this is certainly a huge driver in doing that work.

This slide exemplifies the growth according to each campus. The CSN has been the largest provider and that is consistent with national data. Larger metropolitan area community

colleges have been the bigger providers when you look at this nationwide. This only goes to AY 2022–2023. It is important to note this did not capture the most recent years data set. This is a visual representation of what you just saw. You see CSN at the top, there has been a little bit of ebb and flow. In the long haul, everyone has gone up when you compare AY 2014–2015 to AY 2022–2023, which is the most recent data set we have published.

This slide shows the dual enrollment according to race ethnicity. You will see significant shifts here. We went from majority White in AY 2014–2015 to a majority minority in AY 2022–2023. I surmise this is a result of changing demographics, but also having more intentional relationships and partnerships and more diverse communities with those high schools. There are significant changes. The Hispanic population is the biggest slice of the pie on the most recent data set at 33 percent.

This slide shows the persistence rate. We are looking at the percentage of students who completed a dual enrollment course in a given year at an NSHE institution and, subsequently, enrolled at an NSHE institution the next fall. When you break that down, nearly two out of every three students who participated in dual enrollment subsequently enrolled at an NSHE institution the next fall.

This shows the top ten courses when it comes to dual enrollment. It is important to note this is aggregate data. These are the seven institutions total. You see English Composition I and II, these are classes that virtually all undergraduate majors need. They are at the top, and there is a clear line of demarcation when you look at the numbers. It is by far the most popular course. We did unpack this data and look at it by institution and there were differences. One of which is UNLV, it is a little unique in that their top two courses were education courses, which is great. I think they are in line to be a huge contributor to AB 428 and planting seeds to get more Nevada residents into the teacher education pipeline. Western Nevada College (WNC) and NSU also had education courses in their top three, the others all had general education courses in their top three as well. As an outsider who has worked in two other higher education systems, looking at our system top ten, there were no surprises. I have looked at these types of lists before, and this is what I am accustomed to seeing. It is common with what you see in other states.

This shows the Nevada graduates by year who have a dual enrollment credit. If a student took at least one dual enrollment course, they are included in the count according to the year in which they graduated. You see significant increases when we compare AY 2012–2013 to the most recent year we have captured, AY 2021–2022. It is a 371 percent increase—more and more students are graduating with dual enrollment credit.

This exemplifies the college-going rate. What we are looking at is the percentage of Nevada high school graduates who subsequently enrolled at an NSHE institution within a one-year period after graduation. We are comparing those who participated in dual enrollment versus those who did not participate. You will see significant differences when we look at the dual enrollment, in the darker shade of blue, versus the nondual enrollment category, which is in the lighter shade. There is nearly a 30 percent point difference in the college-going rate based on the dual enrollment participation piece. I think this is a significant factor to increasing access.

This slide gets into persistence next fall. When we look at Nevada high school graduates who enroll at an NSHE institution in a given year, the question is, what percentage persists to the next fall? What percentage of these students are retained from one year to the next? We are comparing those who participated in dual enrollment versus those who did not participate. You will see significant differences, a 10 to 11 percent point difference when we look at more recent years. I think this reiterates the point that students who participate in

dual enrollment are better acclimated, more confident, and they have better study skills. The list goes on and on.

On this slide you will see there has been a significant increase in credentials awarded to dual enrollment students, particularly with associate degrees. We went from eight in AY 2012–2013 and have elevated to 337 in the most recent data set. Skill certificates have also shown increases. These are less than 30 credit hours and can typically be knocked out in a semester or two depending on how they are structured. An example would be a certificate in data analytics where students have opportunities to learn about modeling, forecasting, and predictive analytics. You have significant increases when we look at the credentials that have been awarded to dual enrollment students.

This slide gets into the completion rates by high school graduation year. What percentage completed a college credential, by year, six years after they graduated from high school? Again, we are comparing dual versus nondual enrollment. You will see significant differences, about 19 percent, when we compare the most recent year. We look at this pragmatically. We are always asking, what are the pragmatic things we can do to move the needle in higher education? Dual enrollment is clearly one of the simple things we can do. In terms of best practices that absolutely work, this is one of them because it increases the probability of one going to college, persistence, completion, and collaboration between K through 12 and higher education. This is something that checks a lot of boxes in terms of our initiative work and moving the needle.

We have links to the various dashboards. I encourage you to check them out, and you can contact me if you have questions. I also want to encourage you to check out the appendices section. We have a profile for each of our seven institutions where they highlight their partnership faculty qualifications, as well as a student spotlight to tell stories of the participants in our dual enrollment programs across the State.

I briefly want to touch on microcredentials. These can be credit, but in a lot of cases, they are noncredit. They focus on a particular area, or a skill set and can be in a variety of areas. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas, has one specifically designed for a high school teacher who is going to teach an economics course. You have a scenario of a high school teacher who has taught a variety of social science classes, and the principal comes to them and says, "You are going to have to teach economics next year," and they do not have a strong economics background. They created a microcredential that breaks down the basic concepts and principles to put that teacher in a position to teach economics in an effective manner. There are plenty in the information technology (IT) field that allow students to acquire and build the skills needed for an industry certification. Another one I have seen specializes in nonprofit fundraising. People change jobs and land in jobs where, all of a sudden, there is a fundraising component. "I have never asked anyone for money. How do I do that?" There are some niche areas. The point is to rescale, upscale, and focus on a particular area. Typically, these are done at a departmental or college level. We do not want to put a lot of onerous requirements in terms of rigid approvals on these types of things. We want these to be nimble so the colleges and universities can respond to industry and partner needs. We also acknowledge the need to build infrastructure. Our Workforce Development Committee is a subcommittee of the Board of Regents, four board members focused on that particular area, and they are tackling that issue right now. We talked about this at length and are trying to do more in that noncredit space; at our most recent meeting in June. We can measure the impact and reach of our noncredit program, which includes microcredentials. This concludes my presentation; I will stand for any questions.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Committee, do we have questions? Go ahead.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I am a big fan and advocate of dual enrollment. I wish it was around when I was in high school, I could have gotten so much of my college knocked out at a more affordable price point. As a dual enrollment teacher at Rancho High School, I know many teachers are looking at serving as dual enrollment adjunct professors, and that is one of the partnerships NSHE wants to build with the school district. What are the salary levels? Is it different institution-by-institution? Does a teacher at NSU versus UNLV versus CSN have different salaries as adjunct professors? Are there any caps put in place? I know there are teachers who may want to teach six or eight courses and that could be a significant augmentation to their own wages.

Vice Chancellor Archer:

We do have a cap. They can get a \$1,000 stipend and an additional \$500 for supplemental professional development throughout the semester. The majority of our institutions have adopted that. One or two may have been on the fence on whether to raise it up to \$1,500. We are almost aligned, and I think we will probably be there soon.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

Do you know what the salaries are per school? Is that information school specific? What is the per-course wage for a teacher who takes on the role of being an adjunct professor?

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

We have representatives from each of the institutions, and they would be best to respond to that question as far as what each institution is doing. These are typically instructors who are at the high school and providing concurrent enrollment at the same time as they are teaching their normal course load. This is a stipend that is provided to address the additional requirements associated. The actual adjunct rate, if that individual was at a college campus teaching, would be a different rate because we have part-time faculty rates as well.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will talk about that but let us keep you here first.

You used concurrent and dual interchangeably, but from my understanding, they are different. Could you put a finer point on that?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

I would say the core difference we are talking about are typically called concurrent enrollment partnerships. This is when you have a high school teacher teaching a college course. It is a different dynamic. It is not in a traditional collegiate atmosphere because it is going to be at the high school.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

How do we determine the high school teacher has the necessary credentials to be teaching a college level course? Because they are getting college credit. Is NSHE overseeing that?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

It is more of an accreditation piece and the accreditor allows the institution to set their requirements. The main thing is they are consistent with how they do that. Their off-campus offerings at the high school would be consistent with what they do on campus when students take classes and are walking into the big lecture hall on campus.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I appreciate that answer; however, I do think that is a role for NSHE. When we are talking about all the institutions, that should be a level playing field for all. To that end, I think there is a role for NSHE to also parse out who is doing what dual enrollment. If you are in southern Nevada, CSN would get this part of the pie, NSU would get this part of the pie, and UNLV—an R1 institution—maybe has less. Then northern Nevada—UNR—has some. You mentioned education is key. If there are gaps, then we can fill in. I do think, as NSHE, you should have more of an active role to make sure our students are getting those college level classes we are promising them.

Interim Chancellor Charlton:

Our Board is actively working on this. We respect and align with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities on accreditation for those purposes, but this is an active conversation. One of the things we know is important is to shore up policies and procedures in this space. We recently had additional conversation in this space using the national landscape, and where there are opportunities for shoring up that opportunity for us.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I know we have had many conversations about this. I appreciate your willingness to take this. Assemblywoman Anderson has a question, then we will hear from the institutions.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My first question is about when there are current employees, professors, or adjunct professors, or whatever the case may be. At this time, is there a requirement at each university or community college for them to have a master's degree? Or is that also a decision of each higher education institute?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

In most cases, the community colleges prefer that. I think there is some wiggle room if you have an experienced teacher, who has a good track record teaching the advanced placement courses, to have opportunities for those folks to be able to teach. I think most do require a master's degree as a baseline.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My second question is more of a comment. Thank you to the Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) President for highlighting one of my students. I am excited to see him being highlighted here.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I am impressed with the statistics and growth. Some of that is seen all the way through to graduation from college in the six-year frame. How is NSHE increasing access for students for dual enrollment?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

I think it is trying to be intentional about looking at the high schools we are not at and trying to examine where we can further partnerships. This is something one of our Regents, Michele Cruz-Crawford, Ed.D., requested at the most recent meeting—that we take a tally of where we are and where we are not, and try to focus and prioritize those underserved areas. It is something I think we are going to be talking about at our upcoming Board retreat. It is a topic that is of timeliness.

David Singleton, Academic and Transfer Policy Analyst, NSHE:

As far as access goes, of the public high schools in the State, there are only five that do not have service from one of the seven teaching institutions right now in the concurrent and dual enrollment space.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I am grateful for the rural schools my District covers. I know there is a presence there and it has been a benefit. My second question, as we are talking about the teachers in the high school setting who are being asked or inquiring to be involved and teach these courses, are they doing this willingly and getting additional pay for it?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

Yes, that is correct.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I had a question on slide ten. The Nevada high school graduate and NSHE capture dual and nondual enrollment credits, are these students going on to NSHE institutions? Or are we capturing all students who took dual enrollment and going elsewhere?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

This is only in NSHE institutions. If they are going to California or wherever, we are not capturing that.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I will invite representatives from the institutions to come up. We will start in Carson City since you are already sitting. Will you say what you are paying concurrent versus dual. If you are doing both, are you giving the same amount of credit? If someone has a college professor, do they get a different amount of credits than a high school teacher, or is it based on the class?

Karin Hilgersom, Ph.D., President, TMCC:

We have various dual enrollment models. In the model TMCC actively pursued, built, and invested in, we tend to deploy adjuncts to high schools. There are four models, but to answer the question directly, we pay \$1,010 for lower division credit to our adjuncts. If it is

a three-credit class, that would be \$3,030 for the adjunct faculty. For the dual enrollment stipends, which we will begin in the fall, we are looking at between \$500 and \$1,500 a class, and it is in line with the NSHE code. I do not have that memorized today, but it is probably identical to what WNC is planning on doing. The stipend would go to the teacher. In that model, which I consider low impact, the only thing that is collegiate, in my opinion, is a curriculum. The medium impact model is where we deploy a faculty member who is highly qualified and who often also teaches on our campus with a master's degree or higher. The most popular program at TMCC is when a high school student drives to campus and fully integrates into a college class. Unfortunately, that is not subsidized by the State as it is in other states. It would be wonderful if we could get there.

J. Kyle Dalpe, Ph.D., President, WNC:

We have similar stipends in place. Currently, it is about \$300 per section plus the \$500 training stipend. Most of our numbers are on the lower end of the spectrum being a smaller school with budgets. Our adjunct rate for part-time people teaching nonhigh school students is \$900 per credit hour. The first numbers I gave you are for the high school affiliate or co-enrollment instructors, provided the district allows the money to go to the high school instructor. There are collective bargaining agreements that restrict that a little, but we do work with different school districts through our MOUs.

I did want to hit the access question that came up. We currently work with eight districts and three charter high schools statewide. We had our biggest Jump Start College class this year, with 168 students receiving their associate degree—the largest in the campus' history. We have 41 percent of our enrollment right now as dual enrollment students in the high school, on campus, or online. One thing on access that we are also trying to mitigate is making sure student A and student B in the same class both have the same opportunity to earn dual enrollment because likely it is students who opt into it in some of the smaller districts. We want to make sure there is scholarship money available in ways that a student in need can access the college credits because they are doing the same work at the same time.

David Shintani, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education, UNR:

I oversee our dual credit initiative at UNR. We have two models for dual credit at UNR. We have the classic dual credit where students come to campus, and the concurrent role model, where the majority of our dual credit students are. We started this about three years ago at the request of the school districts to come in and address the gaps they saw in schools that were underserved for having access to college courses. In Clark County, at least half of the schools we are in are Title I schools. We feel like this is an important way to provide access.

Our model is a little different than the other institutions. We have a faculty member who is overseeing each course we teach—a faculty coordinator. They will provide training and syllabus course materials at the pre-term training, and then they meet weekly with those teachers and go over the previous week's work and what is coming up in the future. We are finding this partnership works best in the sense it provides us with the ability to partner with the high school teachers who are the experts on providing content to a high school audience. We provide the college level content, and we work together to make sure the course materials are taught at the same rigor and standards that we do on campus. We ensure that by doing quality control at the end of each term, by assessing student learning on the course, using the same rubrics we use on campus, and also looking at the grade distribution and make sure there are no large differences occurring.

In terms of what we pay our concurrent enrollment faculty, we pay them \$1,000 per section per semester. We also pay \$500 for the professional development because we ask quite a bit of them to work with us. For on-campus temporary instructors, I think the minimum amount is about \$3,500, so we feel \$1,000 for teaching the same courses that we would have a temporary instructor on campus teach is reasonable.

Kate Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D., Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs, UNLV:

I will start with characterizing our concurrent enrollment and dual enrollment. We have ours under an umbrella that we now call the Rebel College Accelerator program. Concurrent enrollment is in partnership with high school teachers in the school district. Dual enrollment is when students come to our campus and take classes as any other student would. As you heard earlier from President Hilgersom, the latter is not funded. Those students who come to campus and engage in dual enrollment pay full price, but those in concurrent enrollment in the high schools do so at a dramatically discounted rate. We are currently at about 1,500 concurrent enrollment students who we work with in CCSD. The number has grown significantly in the last year, and we project another 500 student increase to cap over about 2,000 students this fall. We are growing in this space, and we see concurrent enrollment as an important point of access for students to start their college experience early at such a dramatically discounted rate. Many of our students need that economic benefit in order to attend college, thrive, and graduate in a timely manner.

In terms of paying instructors, like UNR, we pay \$1,500 per instructor—a \$1,000 stipend on top of their salaries and a \$500 stipend for ongoing professional development.

I think the third question related to how we qualify instructors. I will say we have worked on that tremendously in the last two years. We had higher requirements in the past that made it difficult for teachers to participate in concurrent enrollment. We worked with our faculty and established a new model we deployed about a year ago. If high school teachers have a master's degree in the discipline in which they are teaching, they become fully qualified to be concurrent enrollment instructors with UNLV. If faculty members do not have a master's degree in the area they are teaching, then we have alternative pathways to qualification. If those folks have taught in the discipline for a long time, have taught in international baccalaureate or advanced placement, have graduate credits towards a master's but have not completed the degree, or have had honors and awards—we look at a whole holistic approach to the skill set and experiences those teachers bring. It is possible to qualify to do concurrent enrollment at UNLV without a master's degree in that teaching field with the support of the faculty and that discipline at UNLV. Those faculty who are in the qualification process are mentored by a UNLV faculty member who has a terminal degree in that field and experience. In some cases, like in English, we offer a course to those faculty, and they can enroll in a graduate level class at UNLV and completion of that class qualifies them as fully qualified concurrent enrollment instructors in English.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I should have asked the other folks in Carson City this also, but can you think of any way we could make this program better?

Dr. Hausbeck Korgan:

I think we are in agreement these opportunities need to be afforded to all students in Nevada. We are not currently in every high school across the State, and that would be a big goal of ours. We are eager to move into whichever school CCSD is willing to welcome us into and to partner beyond CCSD. You heard earlier from Dr. Hays about our innovative

programming and education. They are working with schools in northern Nevada, beginning this fall. I think expanding so there is complete access for students all across Nevada—regardless of whether they are rural or urban, what type of school they are in, et cetera—is a goal for all of us.

Secondly, it would be helpful to afford students the opportunities to have partial funding to engage in dual enrollment, not only concurrent, in their high school. I think that would open pathways to more classes and opportunities for students. We can always do better providing more support to those high school teachers. We are continually looking for ways to integrate them more on campus and treat them as full faculty who are engaged. For example, at UNLV, we are working on including them in all of our teaching and learning programming starting this fall so the same pedagogical workshops, training, and opportunities are available to those instructors. Those are the things I think would improve the program overall.

Dan J. Corsi, Ed.D., Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, CSN:

In terms of our concurrent dual credit program, where the high school teacher is teaching the CSN course during their contractual workday at the high school, we pay \$200 for the course. We are not offering a professional development stipend at this time. For the dual enrollment, where the student is visiting our campus or taking an online course using one of our full-time or part-time instructors, it is the standard CSN adjunct rate of \$925 per credit hour.

In terms of credentialing, we follow CSN's credentialing policy for all instructors, whether they are at a high school or on our campus. It would require a master's degree in the subject area for those disciplines where a master's degree is applicable. A number of areas we teach, like in our CTE space, there are no master's degree. It defers to either a bachelor's degree and/or a combination of skills, experience, industry credentials, or certifications. Within our policy, there are provisions for an individual who does not have a master's degree to teach in one of those traditional disciplines with a master's degree, but that is a departmental case-by-case decision when we look at that application coming in from a teacher at a high school.

In terms of overall improvement, intentionally looking at how the funding stream for this program is occurring from the State or within the school districts. We find students are taking more advantage of the programming available when there is funding, marketing, and outreach to support the funding. We were fortunate to have a \$500,000 grant that came in last summer that allowed us to put that into the dual credit space in the fall. We saw a nice response from that, but that was a one-shot deal. Where is the funding coming from through the student to the institution? The supporting outreach and the marketing to help promote that would go a long way in terms of improving the access for students because we have a lot more capacity to offer, and we would love to do that.

DeRionne P. Pollard, Ph.D., President, NSU:

My colleague, Amber Donnelly, Ph.D., Interim President, Great Basin College, had to leave but she gave me her answers so I can respond to you. They pay the typical rate as they would for part-time faculty. Their model is primarily dual enrollment, and they are rural serving institutions. Most of their coursework, about 75 to 80 percent, is delivered online to rural high schools in our State. They do not typically provide a stipend for additional professional development as that is limited or has variances based on the school districts who may not allow them to do that and/or collective bargaining environments. I understand from the Chancellor that we are going to put this in the table and send it to you.

Speaking for NSU, this fall, we will be paying \$650 per course to high school teachers in our concurrent enrollment. All our programming is primarily concurrent enrollment where we are going into a high school and contracting with the high school teachers who are going to be teaching those courses. Those high school teachers typically have a master's degree from a regionally accredited institution, supervisor recommendation from the high school principal or associate principal, approval by each of our department chairs at NSU, and there is a follow-up of evidence of successful teaching as indicated by assessment and student evaluation done on a semester-by-semester basis.

I thought about your last question, and maybe I could be more of a provocateur and talk about where I think there are opportunities for improvements in the way we deliver dual or concurrent enrollment in our State. I had a former Major who used to work for me when I was a president in California. He said, "You higher education people, you know what your problem is?" I said, "What is our problem? Because you are one of us now." He said, "You do this ready, shoot, aim. You do not come up with a plan before you do the work." I think part of what you are hearing in the responses today—and likely what you may hear from my colleagues up north—is that as a State, there is an opportunity for us to work more deliberately around our organizational schema about how we are going to do dual credit and concurrent enrollment, what we call it in the State, how we compensate teachers, and how we go through a process of evaluating geographic boundaries as necessary. How do we talk about mission differentiation? How do we ensure every student has the opportunity to be served? How do we ensure we do not have schools in competition with each other at the collegiate level? How do we avoid cannibalism of other programs? I think that is part of the struggle here. We have divined a system that meets a need necessary in this State. We have one of the lowest participations in college and need to increase that significantly. What we have done is say, "Here is a strategy, but we have not thought about all the tactics that go into that." Madam Chair, I thought your question was a good one about NSHE working with our high school superintendents across the State to come up with a set of guiding principles that address this. We have been doing this for a couple of years, and if we are honest with ourselves, there are parts we do well, and we should tout that. You see wonderful stories listed here, but there are a number of things we do not talk about. In my neighborhood, we call that "the quiet part," the thing talked about behind the scenes. Until we have a group of us sitting in a room and saying, "Let us agree to these sets of things," and talk about them honestly and deliberately and not hide behind any other type of conversation, I do not think we will be well served as a State. That is my observation.

Dr. Dalpe:

I agree with Dr. Pollard on the comment about needing to talk about this at a high-level strategy on what we are doing in the State for dual enrollment—to put the good pieces in, and maybe shut off some of the bad pieces—and create a plan for dual enrollment. I know this is a policy committee but in summer 2020, during the 31st Special Session, the College and Career Readiness Grant, which was funding to the school districts for dual enrollment, was abandoned to help balance the budget. It has never come back, which created a situation where the districts cannot always support every student. This is why we are looking for scholarships, and why we are taking discounts. We will do what we need to get students in classroom, but we have to maintain a positive budget. Some of that funding piece, if it could come back in a strategic way to match the needs, would be good as well.

Mr. Shintani:

What we are looking for in the future is trying to develop more wraparound services to support the students. We are working with the faculty to provide guidance on instruction, but also working with teachers in remote classrooms to make sure those students have

access to tutoring and other supplemental instruction. We want to make sure the counselors and advisors at the schools are in tune with the advisors and counselors at the institutions of higher education, and making sure students are not taking classes they do not need to take. We have to make sure they are not paying for courses they do not need or spending time in courses they do not need.

I think it would also be important, as a State, to develop research groups to investigate the best practices to address early college learning. From our experience, we feel that juniors and seniors in high school learn differently than our college students, but they are not that different than incoming freshmen. Developing a research team of high school, community college, university faculty, and researchers to look at the best practices for us to make sure students are successful. Not only in the dual credit classes, but beyond. Giving them that strong foundation is critical. If we are going to have a unified policy on what is going on and how we execute dual credit and concurrent enrollment, we need to have the school districts involved in that discussion. It cannot just be an NSHE discussion. We need to have the districts, your committees, and other folks involved in that process. We expanded into a lot of high schools; we are in about 35 high schools now. We want to reinvest any kind of revenue we gain from this, which we have not seen yet. We will not see that for a while. Once we start seeing revenue, we will reinvest in hiring more faculty coordinators so we could have a better ratio of faculty coordinators to teachers in the classroom, give them more attention, and provide more access to other types of teaching support they need. That is where UNR is.

Dr. Hilgersom:

I would like to outline three ways I think Nevada could do a better job in dual enrollment, but I also want to say that I got my first full-time teaching job in Washington State in 1987. I have been at this for a long time, and I want to pat Nevada on the back because every institution at this point is trying to do a better job with dual enrollment. I grew up in Washington State, Running Start has been around for over 20 years and is subsidized by the State. Washington State has one of the highest rates of bachelor's degree earners in the country. I came from a model that has been doing dual enrollment well for many years. It is wonderful to work with colleagues in the State of Nevada who are trying. I think it is important we get caught up to the rest of the country because there is a gap.

With that, I have three things. First, equity of experience. Access is not that great when the experience is subpar. I think we need to try to subsidize the real deal. My middle child earned an associate of arts degree before he earned his high school diploma. Freshman year of high school he was a straight-A student, sophomore year of high school he had a couple of D's. I said, "What is happening? What is going on?" He said, "Mom, I am bored." I said, "Why are you bored? Is it the teachers?" He said, "No, my teachers are great. It is the other students. I need a different peer interaction in my life." I said, "Next year you will be old enough to do Running Start." It is subsidized so it was free for me as a parent, he only had to buy his textbooks. Not only did he earn his associate of arts degree two years later, but I think he ended with a 3.9 GPA on a 4.0 GPA scale. He soared. We need to think hard—access that is not real does not necessarily do what it needs to do to keep students motivated in college.

This leads me to my second point, look carefully at your data. You have good trend lines—which I think could even be better—but the question not asked or answered in that data is, are the students we are capturing in these dual enrollment and concurrent enrollment programs the ones who already knew 100 percent they are going to go to college? What we want to do, if we want to provide access, is try to capture the group of students who, in their head, do not think they can do college. Now that we are starting, we

need to find sophisticated ways to assess the success of dual enrollment and concurrent enrollment programs. What you have before you today does not answer the primary question, are we capturing the students who did not think they could go to college? Or is our data capturing the ones who were sure they could, and this is another early college experience.

I will end by saying faculty qualifications are a concern, and I appreciate what my colleagues have said about doing a better job strategizing and planning. The national norm is that dual enrollment faculty—who are teaching courses for transfer universities, not CTE—have a master's degree. It could be a master's degree in education, but they have at least 18 graduate credits in the discipline. If they have a master's in education, they obtain 18 credits in math at the graduate level if they are going to teach math. I think it would be wonderful if we developed a couple of boot camps—one at UNR and one at UNLV—to help teachers get to the 18 credits of graduate courses in a discipline for which they are hired in a dual or concurrent enrollment model. When those high school teachers get those 18 credits, they will go on and finish the master's degree in that discipline, which would be wonderful. Can you imagine how highly qualified those high school teachers will be? Not just to teach dual enrollment credits, but to teach high school students who are not enrolled in a dual enrollment course.

I think there is a lot of work we can do, but it is wonderful to see Nevada is getting on the train. Now, we need to do a better job planning and deciding, as a State, what kind of standard we want to set for dual and concurrent enrollment students.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

You gave us a lot of food for thought. I appreciate it. Chancellor, did you want to say anything? We tasked you with a few things, and you are going to get us information, and we will follow up.

AGENDA ITEM X—PRESENTATION ON CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND WORK-BASED LEARNING PROGRAMS AND RELATED PUPIL OUTCOMES

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will continue our discussion from earlier on CTE and WBL. We will hear from NDE and the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) on this item. Up first, we have Craig Statucki with NDE in Carson City. You can go ahead when you are ready.

Craig Statucki, Director, Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options, NDE:

Today, I will be providing an update on CTE, WBL, and sharing the Department's vision for CTE that we developed with stakeholders across the State in the development of our revised Perkins V State Plan, which was submitted to the U.S. DOE in May ([Agenda Item X A](#)). Participation in secondary CTE is still a significant portion of our overall high school student population. Current enrollment is down 7.9 percent from the SY 2022–2023, but it is still up 2.3 percent from the SY 2019–2020. The majority of the reduction is due to our restructuring of CTE programs and focusing on complete career pathways. Our Office and Department are committed to ensuring our CTE programs are aligned to Nevada's economic needs, and we do this by working with our stakeholders in secondary, postsecondary, and the workforce. Disaggregated data is attached in the appendix of this presentation.

When utilizing graduation rates as a metric, we know our CTE programs are successful regardless of student population groups. Students who participate, at least two years in the same CTE program, graduate at a higher rate than the State average for their student population group.

There are two dedicated funding streams for CTE programs in the State of Nevada. Perkins V is our federal support for eligible secondary districts and postsecondary institutions. Our State CTE funds are utilized only for eligible secondary districts and public charter schools.

As part of CTE, WBL is an educational strategy that offers students the opportunity to connect classroom learning to authentic business and industry experiences. Work-based learning in Nevada is described as a continuum of experiences that help to prepare students for postsecondary education and careers. The goal of WBL is to assist students to be college and career ready through authentic connections to business and industry in a field related to the student's career interest. For the purposes of collecting WBL data that is reported to the State Board of Education and the Legislature in January of odd number years, our office, school districts, and the public charter schools focus on career preparation and career training activities.

The Department is required by the U.S. DOE to revise and submit a new Perkins V State Plan or submit new State-determined performance levels every four years. After review of our current State Plan and based on the educational and economic needs that have changed in Nevada with the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department decided to revise and submit a new State Plan. Between June of last year and March of this year, we held over 30 in-person and virtual meetings across the State with a diverse range of stakeholders in alignment with federal requirements. Here are a few highlights from the significant changes in the Perkins V State Plan. The revised State Plan has three strategic goals, which is down from the 36 strategic goals in the original Plan. We have added two additional reporting indicators for program quality at the secondary level. We have defined high-skill, high-wage, in-demand occupations in alignment with OWINN and WIOA so all workforce agencies are utilizing the same terminology. I appreciate Director Hammond for including those definitions in his presentation. We created an accountability piece for our postsecondary institutions around dual credit since that is a secondary indicator and not a postsecondary indicator. We set large target growth in areas that CTE directors have a sphere of influence over, and we set the State up to work more collaboratively across workforce regions in preparation of the Fiscal Year 2027–2028.

These are the three strategic goals we are developing in coordination with our Perkins V stakeholders. Thanks again to Director Hammond for helping us to create a set of high-skill, high-wage, in-demand occupation definitions we are all using and talking about across the State, so everybody is using the same vocabulary. It has been helpful.

The Department has at least one secondary CTE program of study in each of the national career clusters. I would like to note, there is currently a nationwide review and modernization of the national career clusters. The Department will consider changes to the recognition of specific career clusters once this work is finalized and is in alignment with reported requirements to the U.S. DOE. Our programs support high-skill, high-wage, in-demand occupations across the State in these career clusters.

Since the start of my tenure as Director four years ago, we have added heating, ventilation, air conditioning, and refrigeration; human services—in response to, I believe, Assemblywoman Anderson's concern earlier about a pipeline for counselors and social workers; and a logistic management program which starts the talent pipelines in areas

across the State that we desperately need. I also anticipate, within the next six months, we will be developing a mining sciences and technology program of study based on the requests from some of our rural school districts, postsecondary partners, and business and industry partners. Based on our current timeline, districts and schools should be able to offer this program of study starting with the SY 2026–2027.

We are currently in the process of finalizing our transition of our core sequences and standards to become two-year sequences and allow schools and districts the flexibility to do what is best for students and communities in years three and four and provide students more opportunities to engage in CTE programs throughout their high school career. We believe the revised course sequences will increase opportunities for students to earn dual credit, earn industry recognized credentials, and to provide opportunities for WBL within their current school day.

When we talk about developing a systematic approach in our goals, we are focusing on providing high-quality experiential career exploration in middle school, our existing high school CTE programs, and the transition to postsecondary—whether that is college, workforce, or joining the military. Now that we have completed our transitions and high school programs, our efforts are going to be focusing on the other aspects of our career pathways, the transition from middle school to high school and from high school to postsecondary.

During the development of the Perkins V State Plan, we heard concerns about the current required secondary program indicator being CTE dual credit attainment due to the lack of opportunities across all CTE programs and that only secondary programs are held accountable for this indicator. In the revised Perkins V State Plan, our intent is to capture all the opportunities available to demonstrate student expertise in CTE programs. We have added WBL participation and culminating industry recognized credentials to our federal accountability to improve on the recognition of high-quality CTE program activities across the State.

As part of the request from this Committee, we were asked to share barriers to achieving student outcomes from the passing of AB 256 (2023). I am going to utilize the next few slides to put this in context of our Perkins V program quality indicators as well as addressing AB 256.

The barriers and solutions to students earning dual credit are not new to this Committee. Currently, we are seeing several districts using the American Rescue Plan Act of 2012 (ARPA) Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds to pay for tuition, but those funds are expiring. One of the other items we hear frequently from our school districts is the lack of transparency about consistent teacher qualifications across NSHE institutions. In the majority of our CTE pathways, there is no way for an individual to get a master's degree or 18 additional graduate credits, which is the default criteria for academic dual credit. We need to make sure we have clear expectations for approval for CTE educators as we need a norm system as it relates to working and/or teaching experience. This is an area we are happy to be working on at NSHE already. This work is still continuing, being reviewed, and going forward.

One of the key barriers to industry recognized credentials is knowing what credentials result in students and adults getting hired. There are a growing number of vendors and companies offering credentials and microcredentials, but our focus is on what will get the student employed and not simply adding a line to a resume. Two western states have recently passed legislation related to high-quality credentials and prioritizing those in demand.

Assembly Bill 256 required background checks for any employee of a business, agency, or organization that participates in WBL who directly oversees the participation or has unsupervised contact with a pupil in WBL programs. The Department has developed an employer host vetting that has been updated to include information about background checks for staff supervising students. Most districts are already utilizing their existing process for volunteer background checks. In addition, there were required trainings for harassment, healthy relationships, and identifying predatory behavior in the workplace. Most districts already have trainings available for the educators that are aligned to these required trainings and are utilizing those for their students. Several other districts are utilizing resources and services that were provided by the Nevada Public Agency Insurance Pool Public Agency Compensation Trust (POOL/PACT).

When we talk about the barriers and solutions to WBL, insufficient manpower and funding to effectively implement the requirements of the legislation has come up multiple times in our meetings with our WBL coordinators across the State. Some of the suggestions we received is there should be a comprehensive list of exempted employers, recognized by the State, encompassing professions such as lawyers, doctors, nurses, and others who already have background checks that are a part of their employment practices. Volunteers or employers should not be burdened with the financial responsibility of covering the costs associated with compliance on those pieces. Another thing that has come up is the difficulty in vetting new and previous volunteer employees for a large number of CTE students in high schools. Waivers should be available to parents allowing their students to engage in WBL opportunities with employers if they are not officially approved through utilizing a background check. Inadequate capacity to handle increased workload associated with the legislation's requirements, such as reprocessing vendor volunteer applications, new applications, and conducting background checks. The solution to that is allowing those background checks to be valid for an extended period. One of the things that has been heard, even prior to AB 256, is age has been cited as a barrier by many districts as employers are unable to host students under the age of 18, particularly in health, science, trades, construction, and engineering programs.

Thank you for your time today. I am available for any questions you may have.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will move on to the next presentation and do questions at the end.

Tim Logan, Representative, NASS, and Superintendent, Lyon County School District (LCSD):

We have the opportunity—and hopefully, end in a positive way—where we get to see kids in action in the things, they get to do in our school district and the school districts across the State ([Agenda Item X B](#)).

[Due to copyright issues, the presentation ([Agenda Item X B](#)) is on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/About/Contact>.]

Talking about Lyon County—we have five distinct areas. It is unique being a rural district where you have a small school of K through 12 with 200 students, and then you have Fernley High School, which has about 1,400 students. We have a real challenge with different district sizes throughout our District. We have about 59,000 people in our county.

When talking about WBL opportunities, there is a wide variety—from career fairs, to a guest speaker coming in, school-based enterprises, and job shadowing. We try to make sure we provide different opportunities for students as they come through our schools.

There are great things across the State happening in different schools. The Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program is around year two for us out of Fernley High School. We train our students in basic and advanced tax education. We offer this to people over the age of 60 with income less than \$60,000, as well as disabled citizens in Fernley. This year, we served more than we did in 2022. There were 71 community members then, this year we served 170. We increased by 30 percent. I love it for two reasons: (1) we are giving kids an opportunity to rub shoulders with great veterans; and (2) they are learning a valuable skill that will be useful the rest of their lives.

Another one is our turkey processing in Smith Valley for our K through 12. It is a school-based enterprise. They have to apply, interview, and do a resume to become the manager of the turkey processing. Around June, we start getting the poults, and we raise these turkeys from young all the way up to old. You have to figure out how much food costs are, and what you are feeding them. This year's turkeys are different from last year's because they are heartier, but they are smaller. They are learning as they go along. The last couple of years, a seventh grader has been the project manager of this CTE program. Then, there is the turkey processing that happens the week of Thanksgiving. It is not for the faint of heart. The agricultural students and staff come out, process the turkey, and go through the evisceration station. In the end, they have a clean, wrapped product that is sold to community members. I love the process for these kids to learn where their food comes from, and how it works. It is one of the highlights of our District and probably not something you see in Las Vegas often.

Another one is our Tool Rodeo. We invited Carson City this year. Our high schools get together and learn six steps to wire a light and light switch and have a competition. It is one of our construction skills. We bring in our community members and businesses to help run the competition. It is a neat way to invite our schools together.

This is a tiny home at Dayton High School. We purchased it through, I believe, the Perkins Grant. We are thankful for the opportunity to purchase the kit and materials so we could do a tiny home. The high school students built it from the ground up. I think they are still working on doing solar panels, but they learn to do the electrical and everything through the system. Our hope is to sell the tiny home, not for profit necessarily, but to try and to get another kit to take the next kids through the system. I think Fallon does an actual home and has a contractor they work with. There are great construction things going on in our high schools across the State.

Culinary is one at Dayton High School as well. We had different Governors, Assemblymen, and Congressmen come through here. We have had the gamut of where they have been served by our students. We go from Culinary I, where they learn about food safety as well as pouring a bowl of cereal, all the way to the third and fourth year students where they learn to run the kitchen, be the Head Chef, and serve.

Career and technical education and WBL is not only for our college kids or our advanced students. This is Practical Assessment Exploration System (PAES) labs. It is in conjunction with the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, DETR, and they are largely the ones who help fund our kids. These are for our students with special needs. They clock in and then go to their clipboard to figure out what they need to do that day. They are learning different skills from wiring, learning to saw, cash registers, wrapping a hamburger, and setting and busing a table.

I am not going to go into career fairs a lot. I want to point out this is K through 12, this is not by the time you get to high school. We need to make sure we are integrating WBL, concepts, and career exploration at a young age. Such as military and flying drones, we have had amazing things happen for all our students through career fairs.

This shows the continuum of WBL that can happen from the simple levels of field trips and guest speakers to project-based learning—what we call passion projects—to internships, clinical opportunities, and apprenticeships. This is a continuum you can see from any level at any grade.

Common myths and hurdles was one of the questions asked. It is not just for people who are working and not just for CTE classes, it is truly for everyone. Business partners want to get involved, we need to help them understand what the process looks like, and how they can help. Our communities want to be involved with kids' education. We have to figure out how to make that happen. Education has tons of acronyms, so we need to be careful using that with our business partners and help them understand what we are referring to and try to have that common language.

The two main things we are looking for are to educate our staff and educate our students and families on what WBL is and the opportunities they have. We also need to understand the students' interests and listen to our students. I love that about our previous presentation—it is about the students; they know what they want. We need to listen to them, and we need to hear what our business needs are in the different communities across the State.

Creating business partners—we need to know the needs of the businesses and have clear expectations when we work with them. We need to talk with students as they already have connections with some of their employers, so we need to tap into that. Again, businesses want to help, we just need to ask. There are multiple opportunities with the same employer from custodial to being on the conveyor belt.

I am not going to go into the next slide. We ask our kids what they want, and what they need. This is showing the surveys.

The Governor has the Acing Accountability. For Lyon County, this is one of the things we are focusing on—work-based and CTE opportunities for our students. We want to grow the opportunities for our kids and have more kids involved. It is going to come down to education of what those opportunities are for our kids.

We are available for any questions.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation. I am not sure I have recovered from the turkey evisceration station. You are right, we do not see a lot of that in Las Vegas. It looks fabulous. The cakes alone look amazing. Congratulations on a cool program. Committee, do you have any questions?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

First of all, I am stealing the Tool Rodeo, and I am going to try to get people to do that in Washoe. Do you ever have too many students who want to be part of it? Is it more of a recruitment, or do the students want to be part of it on their own?

Superintendent Logan:

Some of our programs are more robust than others. There does come a point where you cannot handle them all and some we need to grow more.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

What seem to be the programs the students are wanting at this time? What job areas do you think we should be trying to offer across the State more?

Superintendent Logan:

Culinary seems to be one of our big programs and filled all the time. I think a lot of it comes down to the educator. If they love the teacher, they love the program. Great things are happening, and they are going to want to be part of it.

Nicole Taylor, CTE Specialist, LCSD:

I find most of our students want programs where they can be more hands-on. They want project-based learning and options that may not include a traditional four-year degree. They are looking for programs that can offer them an industry credential or WBL opportunities—whether it be work experience or internships—to get experience for the transition post-high school.

Taleah Hinkey, Work-Based Learning Coordinator, LCSD:

It also depends on the area because it is such a broad county. For Smith Valley, it is more agriculture based—the turkey processing, ranch work, that type of thing. In Fernley, maybe is more of logistics—working in warehouses like Panasonic, Tesla—with high-paid entry level positions.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I appreciate that answer because it is about the area. I am going to bring in NDE. Are you also seeing the same thing from the other districts that it is geographically based or different? I agree with you, it is all about the teacher almost always.

Director Statucki:

I think it does depend on the district. We have some expanding agricultural programs within CCSD—no turkey processing at this time, but I am waiting for that budget request—but it depends on that area. One of the slides I included in the appendix has the fastest growing programs of study. Those primarily get driven by Clark because of large numbers, but it is pretty consistent across the State.

We are trying to be responsive to our business industry needs, and what is available in our education programming to support those programs. When you look at those three new programs, those were driven by needs we saw in business, but a key part is, where is our teacher pipeline? Any time somebody proposes a new program of study, the first question I ask is, where am I finding teachers? We can have a lot of successful programs in different areas, but if there is nobody to teach those programs of study it creates problems in terms of expansion. We have been cognizant of how we are expanding, where we are expanding, and what the teacher pipeline looks like. Those particular areas are why we built those three.

Mining is a unique program that is not necessarily teacher-driven, but business and industry-driven. The counties involved want those students in terms of their accountability factors of federal accountability. They could do it on their own without CTE, but they want to be able to count those students in the way they are doing their processes within the district, so we agreed to move forward with that program.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have always felt that CTE should be considered applied mathematics or applied English, not just a CTE credit. At this time, if I am understanding correctly, CTE can only be counted towards a CTE credit. Is that correct? Has there been discussion about allowing it to be counted towards our math and/or English, if necessary?

Director Statucki:

There is a process for school districts to request academic credit for CTE programs. Right now, I believe we have Washoe, Elko, Carson City, and maybe Lyon. Particularly what we are seeing is around science and mathematics. We are not seeing it in English because of the English standards required for those credits. We are seeing a student who may do two years in an agriculture program or two years in another program and can utilize those two years. One of those years could be the third year of science or the fourth year of math and the other one counts as their CTE credit. We are working on that process.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for being here today. I know it has been a long day, but I look forward to seeing more cakes and less turkeys.

AGENDA ITEM XI—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

With that, we are at our last agenda item, which is public comment. Let us see if we have anyone for public comment in Carson City or Las Vegas. [There were none.]

BPS, do we have anyone on the phone lines for public comment?

BPS:

Chair, the public line is open and working, but there are no callers at this time.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you to the members who came today, and a special thanks to those who stayed. Thank you to all our presenters and people watching online. An archive version of today's meeting is available online. Our next meeting has been rescheduled for Wednesday, July 24, 2024, at 9 a.m. I will be in Carson City and welcome members to join me in Carson City, but it sounds like we may have a new meeting room in our new building.

AGENDA ITEM XII—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Crystal Rowe
Senior Research Policy Assistant

Jennifer A. Sturm-Gahner
Principal Policy Analyst

Alex Drozdoff
Senior Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II	Bill Hanlon, Las Vegas Resident	Written Remarks
Agenda Item III	Nathan Driskel, Chief Policy Officer, National Center on Education and the Economy	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IV A	<p>Jeffrey Geihs, Ed.D., Chief Executive Officer, Silver State Education Foundation (SSEF), and Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Administrators;</p> <p>Kyle Rothell, representing the SSEF; and</p> <p>Sergeant Major Gary Schoolfield, Career Coach, SSEF</p>	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IV B	<p>Danica G. Hays, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV); and</p> <p>Kenneth J. Varner, Ph.D., Director, Nevada Institute on Teaching and Educator Preparation, and Associate Dean, Academic Programs and Initiatives, College of Education, UNLV</p>	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IV C	<p>Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District (CCSD);</p> <p>RoAnn Triana, Chief Human Resources Officer, Human Resources, CCSD;</p> <p>Gia Moore, Director, Career and Technical Education Team, CCSD; and</p>	PowerPoint Presentation

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
	Cailin Ellis, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent, Leadership and Professional Learning Division, CCSD	
Agenda Item V	Scott Hammond, Executive Director, Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VI	Patty Charlton, Interim Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE); and José Quiroga, Research Analyst, Academic and Student Affairs, NSHE	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VII	Youth Legislator Alexa Walsh, Former Chair, Nevada Youth Legislature	Report
Agenda Item VIII	Patty Charlton, Interim Chancellor, NSHE; and Elizabeth S. Gunn, Ph.D., M.B.A., M.F.A., Dean, School of Liberal Arts, Sciences, and Business, Nevada State University, and Chair, Task Force on Power-Based Violence at Institutions of Higher Education	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX	Patty Charlton, Interim Chancellor, NSHE; and Daniel Archer, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, NSHE	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item X A	Craig Statucki, Director, Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options, Nevada's Department of Education	PowerPoint Presentation

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item X B	Tim Logan, Representative, Nevada Association of School Superintendents, and Superintendent, Lyon County School District	PowerPoint Presentation This is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6825

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.