



NEVADA LEGISLATURE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 219A.130)

DRAFT MINUTES

September 26, 2024

The fourth meeting of the Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL) for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Thursday, September 26, 2024, at 2 p.m. in Room 165 of the Nevada Legislature Office Building, 7230 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2135, 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 Nevada Youth Legislature'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).

YOUTH LEGISLATORS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Youth Legislator Sebastian Rios, Chair
Youth Legislator Ethan Cohen, Vice Chair
Youth Legislator Elver Alvarez Flores
Youth Legislator Tyler Breeden
Youth Legislator Sophie Cain
Youth Legislator Matthew Chen
Youth Legislator Eric Conyers
Youth Legislator Mackenzie Coughlin
Youth Legislator Kathleen McCarthy
Youth Legislator Jolie Nguyen
Youth Legislator Daniel Obstgarten
Youth Legislator Joshua Park
Youth Legislator Hannah Villatoro
Youth Legislator Toren Wolf

YOUTH LEGISLATORS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Youth Legislator Kyle Allen
Youth Legislator Owen Chang
Youth Legislator Jordan Chong
Youth Legislator Sitara Reganti
Youth Legislator Phillip Rosas

YOUTH LEGISLATOR ATTENDING REMOTELY:

Youth Legislator Alexa Walsh

YOUTH LEGISLATOR ABSENT:

Youth Legislator GYanna Perry

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT TO
ADMINISTER THE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE MEMBER ATTENDING
REMOTELY:**

Senator Valerie Wiener (Ret.), Chair

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Tina Ashdown, Constituent Services Analyst/Program Facilitator, Constituent Services Unit
(CSU), Research Division

Barbara Dimmitt, Senior Research Analyst, CSU, Research Division

Alberto Quintero, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division

Crystal Rowe, Senior Research Policy Assistant, Research Division

Melissa Jimenez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division

David Nauss, Senior Deputy 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—CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Rios:

Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to call this meeting to order. Thank you for being here, and welcome today to this meeting of the NYL.

Before we get started, I would like to share deep gratitude and appreciation for the LCB for creating the bill draft request (BDR) list for this term of the NYL. Thank you for taking your time to put the high consideration and effort for the youth community and for the work we do here for the Youth Legislature. Now, I would like to proceed right on to business, as we have an exceptionally busy and exciting day ahead of us.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Rios:

If anyone would like to provide public comment, please remember to identify yourself for the record. There will be another period for public comment at the end of this meeting.

[Chair Rios called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.]

AGENDA ITEM III—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Rios:

We will move on to the next portion of this meeting. Our primary focus for today's meeting is to begin the selection process for the BDR we will present to the Nevada State Legislature during the 2025 Legislative Session. I want to thank all Youth Legislators for the time and attention you have devoted to preparing your BDR proposals. We are all excited to hear what everyone will be proposing.

[Chair Rios discussed meeting guidelines.]

AGENDA ITEM IV—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON APRIL 11, 2024

Chair Rios:

We will now move on to Agenda Item IV. Our last meeting was held on April 11, 2024. Copies of the minutes of that meeting have been provided to you. I will now accept a motion to approve the minutes. Would anyone like to make a motion?

YOUTH LEGISLATOR ALLEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE
APRIL 11, 2024, MEETING.

YOUTH LEGISLATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM V—SELECTION OF SEVEN YOUTH LEGISLATOR BILL DRAFT REQUEST PROPOSALS TO BE DISCUSSED BY THE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE AT THE OCTOBER 22, 2024, MEETING

Chair Rios:

We will now move on to Item V, which is the selection of the seven BDR proposals. At this time, I would like to ask each Youth Legislator, when called sequentially by BDR number, to move to the witness table to present a brief explanation of your BDR proposal. You will have three minutes to ask questions about the BDR proposal. Following the presentation and question and answer portion, the Youth Legislator will return to their seat.

A list of the BDR proposals was emailed to each of you. While you are listening to each proposal, please consider which ones you would like to move forward for consideration during our next meeting on October 22, 2024. When it comes time to vote, each of you will have three votes. So, please think about which BDR proposals are your top three choices. Additionally, each of you has the option to co-sponsor one BDR proposal. Please think about which BDR proposal, if any, you would like to co-sponsor. (Agenda Item V)

Let us get started with BDR 1. Youth Legislator Breeden, would you please provide a brief explanation of your BDR proposal?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

Today, I am here to talk to you about an issue affecting all students across the State, an issue that can impact both their health and their safety on campus: the accessibility of bathrooms in schools, and how we address drug use among students. Across schools in our State, bathrooms are frequently closed throughout the day as a method of combating drug use. I understand the reasoning behind this policy. No one wants drugs circulating in schools, and administrators are trying to do their best with a large problem. But, in the process, we are unintentionally harming the broader student body. We are punishing all students for the actions of a few.

Let me ask one simple question. What happens when a student cannot find an open restroom? They are left with few options, all of which are disruptive. Students may have to walk to another wing of the school, wait until lunch, or worse, hold it during long class periods. This not only impacts their ability to concentrate during class and becomes a disruptive problem, but it also poses a health risk. No student should have to worry about finding an open restroom during the school day. Thus, we need to rethink how we are addressing the problem of drug use. Closing bathrooms is not a solution, and it is only masking the issue while creating new problems for the student body at large.

Here is the key point: students who are determined to use drugs will find a way to do so even in closed bathrooms. That is why we are proposing legislation today that will protect students access to essential facilities while addressing the core issue of drug use more effectively.

First, this legislation will ensure that a sufficient number of bathrooms are open during the school day. These bathrooms will be proportionate to the size of the student body, guaranteeing that no student is deprived of access to basic facilities. If we set a standard ratio in line with the health district recommendations—1 bathroom for every 300 students—we can avoid broad closures that inconvenience everyone. Exceptions would only be made in cases of emergency or necessary repairs, and schools would need to document those

exceptions clearly. This creates accountability and fairness in how we handle bathroom access, but access alone is not enough.

The second part of this bill focuses on real prevention, empowering those already on the front lines. In this case, I am talking about campus security monitors. Their current job description amongst many school districts across the State includes observing and monitoring student behavior, but they lack specialized training when it comes to recognizing and addressing drug use. This legislation would change that. With this bill, campus security monitors will receive comprehensive drug use prevention training. This will include skills such as identifying the signs of drug use, deescalating situations that involve drugs, and monitoring spaces like bathrooms without needing to close them. Armed with these skills, they will be able to intervene more effectively and reduce the need for drastic measures like bathroom closures.

By taking this two-pronged approach, ensuring that bathrooms remain open, and giving campus security monitors the tools to prevent drug use, we are making schools safer for everyone, not just a select few. We are recognizing the basic needs of students while addressing the very real concerns of drugs on campus.

In closing, I urge you to support this legislation. By keeping bathrooms open and ensuring staff are equipped to handle drug-related issues, we can foster a safer, healthier, and more supportive environment for all students.

Chair Rios:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Breeden. We will move on to the question period. Do any Youth Legislators have any questions for Youth Legislator Breeden?

Youth Legislator Allen:

Looking briefly at what was sent to us by Legal, and in the description, and then based off your presentation, there is a gray area I have. What does the enforcement of this bill look like? And what means would be suggested in promoting the enforcement of both parts of your bill?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

We address that when we are looking for specific documentation on when bathrooms have to be closed outside of the standard ratio set forth by this legislation. So, if a bathroom needs to be closed that will no longer allow the ratio of 1 to every 300 students to exist, then specific documentation needs to be submitted. And if not, there should be a forum in which students can complain about this violation, so schools are held accountable to student safety.

Chair Rios:

Do any other Youth Legislators have any questions? Youth Legislator Chen and then Youth Legislator Walsh will be our last question.

Youth Legislator Chen:

I was wondering what you think about campus security monitors already having a lot on their plate, because they do it all over campus. Do you think having this drug regulation and

prevention training will add to their plate in a way that is ineffective, or do you think it would be integral to their job description?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

I have two answers for that. First, research shows that when we look for drug prevention options, we deescalate situations outside of drug use, making campus security monitors jobs easier, because they are less likely to deal with a fight at lunch if they are deescalating situations from the beginning—which is drugs—which often leads to those high stress situations.

Secondly, we are not looking to make campus security monitors jobs harder, but instead give them skills that will let them actually monitor the student body. Currently, the student body's largest issue is drug use. In order to monitor this effectively, they need to have all the skills in order to do so.

Chair Rios:

Youth Legislator Walsh, as a quick note, I do not think we can see the Zoom screen at any point. If you do want to ask a question, please go ahead and jump on the microphone, so we can hear. You can go ahead with your question.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Yes, my question was already sort of answered. I was wondering if you had specifics on what that training would look like for campus security monitors. I know it was not mentioned prior to that, but campus security monitors in the State of Nevada only make about \$15 to \$20 per hour, which is close to a minimum wage job. I understand what you are saying about not making it harder, but I am wondering how this will not add more on their plate considering there can be fights in school and other things like that. I am wondering what the training specifically looks like, and why you think this should go to campus security monitors and not other personnel on campus?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

Firstly, to answer your question, we already pay for professional training for campus security monitors. In the schools I talked to—Canyon Springs, Liberty High School, Coronado, and Reno High School—I learned that overall, we found there were three to four days specifically dedicated throughout the year for campus security monitor training. Thus, the training days are already there. We need to reevaluate how we are using those days, and how effective they are.

Chair Rios:

Next, we have BDR proposal 2 submitted by Youth Legislator Obstgarten. You can begin when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

Over the last decade, the public education system in Nevada has rapidly gone from below average to dismal. Student performance in reading has been particularly poor, as only 41 percent of students in the State were labeled as proficient, meaning they can read and comprehend at grade level. This has been noticeably worse among third graders, as only 34 percent of them fell into this proficient category. This indicates that the Read by [Grade]

3 outline for early public education, which was signed into effect in 2015 by then Governor Sandoval, is blatantly failing Nevada's schoolchildren. Something clearly must be done so children can learn to process what they are reading, thereby setting them up for longer-term educational success.

To achieve this goal, I am proposing that we require the instruction of phonics in kindergarten and first grade classrooms. And, with that, the training of teachers on how to properly implement this in classrooms. The implementation of phonics instruction has long been a topic of controversy among educators. But new studies show that phonics is the most effective method for teaching children how to read, and how to retain that knowledge. Four states in particular—Colorado, Missouri, Texas, and Wyoming—started requiring phonics instruction in 2019. Those four states have all reported no significant change in third graders reading performance since then, despite the national average declining nearly 7 percent in that same time span. In fact, of the 22 states that reported no significant change, 21 of them had some form of phonics-based instruction required in their kindergarten and first grade classrooms. This decline in the national average, along with the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 pandemic, has partially been proven to have been a direct result of an increased number of non-English speakers in American classrooms.

In Nevada's elementary schools, for instance, roughly 12.8 percent of kindergarteners were learning the English language at school in 2021. Three years later, only 11.2 percent of those now third graders were deemed to be proficient in the English language, showing results roughly 25 percent worse than their English-speaking peers. This shows, yet again, how the current science of reading laws are failing to accomplish their intended goal. Phonics, on the other hand, has been scientifically proven to help students learn to read faster, including students who do not already know English. In fact, learning to connect written text to sounds helps English Language Learners (ELLs) more than any other method. This is especially true for students whose native language is one such as Mandarin or Japanese that uses characters instead of the letters we use in the English alphabet. With the number of foreign immigrants in Nevada trending sharply upward, having a more effective method to speed up language acquisition in ELL students is quickly becoming an even more pressing need.

In addition to the overwhelming evidence showing why phonics instruction must be required in our schools, phonics will also be quite simple to implement in the current curriculum. This bill will create a detailed curriculum structure on which teachers will receive State-sponsored training every other year. While this may sound like an expensive venture, it will only cost the government \$9.27 per student to train teachers and provide them with adequate materials, according to statistics applied by the [Nevada] Department of Education (NDE). If I can improve my education for less than the cost of two Starbucks lattes, I would not hesitate to take the opportunity, and I have no doubt that you all would do the same. In fact, such a low per student cost should cause no significant change to the State's budget for education.

All of this goes to show how helpful requiring phonics instruction would be for the youth of Nevada. This is a cost-effective, simple, and proven-to-work method that, if signed into law, will bring greatly increased levels of achievement to large numbers of children for generations to come.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Obstgarten?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

How would this impact students going into middle and high school? Where oftentimes they tend to decline again and graduate with less than eighth grade levels of reading.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

That is a very valid point. This bill is aimed at kindergarten and first grade classrooms, so its goal will not be to provide immediate improvement to the education system, but rather to start improving the education system from when it is signed into law. So, from the time of kindergarten or first grade, in the decade or so later, there will be noticeable improvements from the point we are at right now when phonics instruction would be starting to be required.

Chair Rios:

Do any of the other Youth Legislators have questions?

Youth Legislator Allen:

I had a question, and then my colleague Youth Legislator Chong had a question to follow.

Have we seen in Nevada classrooms—in kindergarten and first grade levels—a lack of phonics teachings? And can you further quantify the number or severity of the lack of phonics being instructed?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

There are two parts to that question, so I will go one at a time. The first part was essentially the severity of the problem and why it is— I talked about the science of reading laws quite a bit, and those laws currently require no form of phonics instruction. In fact, phonics is not mentioned in the bill. There is mention of phonemics, which is an entirely different subject from phonics. Phonemics is working on sounds and talking, as opposed to reading what is on a page.

In terms of the statistics, I will say them again. There were 22 states that reported no significant change, and 21 of those required phonics-based instruction, and there are only 23 states in the nation that require phonics-based instruction. So, statistically, it shows how efficient phonics are as an instructive method.

Youth Legislator Chong:

I would like to ask you, how would such a phonics curriculum be developed by the State, and when would these standards be implemented?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

I had said while presenting that there would be an outline for a curriculum within the bill itself, which would then be taught to teachers, and the curriculum would start being implemented, ideally, as soon as such a bill would theoretically be passed into law for the upcoming school year. But if not, then as soon as it would be possible for NDE to implement it. If it was passed in the 2025 Legislative Session, ideally the School Year (SY) 2025–2026, but [in the] absolute worst-case scenario, the school year after that.

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

I want to clarify the financial aspect. You said \$9.27 per student. Is that correct? Does that mean that would be multiplied by every single student in the State of Nevada? Is that for each student?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

It would not be for every single student, just for kindergarten and first grade students. I toned it down to per student level for the sake of the presentation. I have the numbers with me right now. Overall, it would cost the State about \$550,000 for a one-time expense for—

Ms. Ashdown:

That is time.

Chair Rios:

We will move on to Youth Legislator McCarthy. Go ahead and start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Before I begin, I want to clarify that my bill does not involve alcohol use. It is only drug use and tobacco. I am not currently, at this time, trying to involve alcohol use in it. It was accidentally mentioned there in Legal. I do not know why; I did not put it in my original BDR.

Hello, fellow constituents. In a 2019 report made by Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, a division of the Health and Human Services, it was found that 4.7 percent of Nevada teenagers aged 12 to 17 met the criteria for illicit drug use disorder. That 4.7 equates to about 10,000 adolescents. While that was five years ago, news reports and statements made by the Clark County Police Department and Clark County Coroner's Office indicate that percentage has been increasing in past years. This means that my bill would hopefully impact, at minimum, 10,000 of the youth in our State.

My bill proposes the implementation of mandatory reporting by all schoolteachers of suspected drug use in their students. With my bill in place, any teacher or other staff member who observes or witnesses a pupil with behavior consistent with drug use must report to an Administrator at their school as soon as possible. Mandatory reporting is nothing new, as Nevada law already mandates reporting for suspected child abuse, suspected bullying or cyberbullying, and suspected suicide risk. For all of these types of reporting, procedures are set in place [for] notifying invested parties, such as parents or law enforcement, depending on the type of report. Adding suspected drug use to that list would help safeguard more students who are putting themselves in vulnerable positions by consuming illicit substances.

Specifically, my bill would intend to notify the parents of students who are exhibiting behaviors consistent with drug use or found to be explicitly using drugs on school property. After a report is made by a teacher, school administrators would notify the parent or guardian of the pupil involved and conduct a parent-teacher conference. Resources would be given to the parent or guardian to help them address the drug use. Follow-up with the pupil would be conducted to ensure they are receiving the assistance they need. During the conferences, school administrators will take necessary steps to make a preliminary

determination if parents or guardians are fit to address the students drug use. If the parents are found to be unable to do this, then and only then, will the school contact law enforcement to perform a house call and possibly involve social services. Administrators will also create a written report of the original incident and all steps taken to address the incident.

One concern that has already been expressed to me is the possibility of mistaken reporting. I want to make clear that reports will not be used to incriminate the students in any way, whether the conference confirms or refutes the suspected drug use. Therefore, if a teacher were to misread signs, possibly due to a student having a medical or mental health condition, it would not harm the student's reputation or record. If the student was determined not to be using, they would easily be able to move on from the incident.

Another consideration is fiscal impact. Because of the presently in place procedures for existing mandatory reporting, little would have to be done to implement my bill into school systems in Nevada. However, teachers would need to receive training to learn how to identify students who are using drugs. This training would probably cost the State money, but existing training has been made by nonprofit organizations—such as Law Enforcement Against Drugs & Violence. Support from one or more nonprofit organizations could eliminate the cost of training. The bill would also implement training on racial neutrality to ensure that racial profiling would not lead to mistaken reporting.

By implementing this bill, adults in the lives of Nevada youth will be able to take the necessary steps to get children to stop using and set them up for long-term success. Over time, if this measure is established, it will curb the number of accidental overdoses among adolescents in our State.

Constituents, I would greatly appreciate your support, because I believe in the potential of this bill. I believe we can save lives and stop the rising trend of drug use in our State. Thank you.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator McCarthy?

Youth Legislator Park:

I understand the point you are trying to make with requiring mandated reports for teachers, but especially because drug use and the patterns of drug use are not a set in stone pattern and a lot of different kids go through different types of patterns. How do we ensure these reports are actually reliable to a certain extent where they are not overusing reports, or they are not being used enough? And how do we ensure specific minorities are not targeted with some of these reports with minorities being overly targeted for patterns when they necessarily are not following the specific patterns? How would we address those concerns?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

For the first part of the question, there will be a parent-teacher conference, which is in place with any type of mandatory reporting. If it is suspected bullying or cyberbullying, there is a parent-teacher conference, and teachers and students can be present. There would be a meeting, and the student would have the chance to explain the situation from their point of view, specifically if they have possibly been struggling with a mental health condition, which can have similarities to drug use symptoms—skipping class, [being] unfocused, [and]

talking about risky behaviors. If they are found not to be using, there will be no penalty for them, and hopefully, because they were exhibiting whatever those behaviors were, they can get the help they need for whatever was causing those behaviors.

For minorities, I mentioned there would be training on racial neutrality to ensure racial profiling would not lead to mistaken reporting. There is already training on racial neutrality for teachers in all incidents that are reported to schools to make sure all sides of the story are considered fairly no matter their race. I would hope that would be enough, but again, historically it is not always, so it is a valid concern. I would hope in the integrity of the teachers and the ability of administrators to figure out the situation fairly.

Chair Rios:

We will go to Youth Legislator Cain, and then [Youth Legislator] Alvarez Flores had his hand up. If we have time, then Youth Legislator Walsh.

Youth Legislator Cain:

Is it shown that teachers are not currently reporting?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

There is not much statistical data. I mostly have anecdotal because I have been reaching out to many teachers. Both of my bosses at my job work at different schools, and obviously my own school, and many have expressed concerns [that] their administration does not know what to do, or what to tell them. There is no policy.

I have heard stories of teachers at schools taking away vapes in class and treating them like phones and giving them back at the end of class, because they go to their admin and their admin does not have a policy to follow. I believe there needs to be a policy, so parents are notified because I do not think all parents know when it is going on. I think it is necessary there is someone looking out for the child.

Chair Rios:

Youth Legislator Chang, I believe, had a question.

Youth Legislator Chang:

You mentioned several times there would be tests or some method to ensure there is no false reporting. I was wondering precisely how false positives would be eliminated.

Ms. Ashdown:

If you have a very short answer, I will allow you to go on, but your timer has gone off.

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Like I said, the parent-teacher conference would allow—and the student would be included in the conference—to explain the situation. If they are not using drugs, they can advocate for themselves and hopefully explain what caused the situation. If it must come to that, and they feel the need that they are not believed, drug testing is hopefully technically an option to eliminate it. But teachers are very sparing in using mandatory reporting. I have heard

from multiple teachers at my school that they have only used mandatory reporting less than five times in their entire career. They are very careful when they use it.

Chair Rios:

Youth Legislator Wolf [with] BDR proposal 4 is next. You can start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Wolf:

Good afternoon, fellow constituents. As we see more advanced technology in our age, the risk of online crimes against our Nevada youth are at higher risk. My bill will implement online crimes against children in Nevada's education curriculum targeting in the ninth grade across public, charter, and private schools. This curriculum will make sure that all Nevada youth are able to prevent, identify, deflect, and report online crimes against children. This curriculum is essential to decreasing the number of sextortion and cyberbullying crimes in the State of Nevada. Right now, I do not have numbers in the State of Nevada. Sorry.

The average Nevada youth spends about 8 hours and 32 minutes online. That is a lot of risk that Nevada youth have online from other people they may not know and other people from different countries trying to gain money and extort them for their money. My bill will make sure they are able to identify, prevent, [and] report this type of crime to make sure Nevada youth are not being extorted for money.

Also, when this happens, some Nevada youth feel shame and fear because they do not want to tell anybody, which ultimately leads to mental health [issues] like depression, anxiety, and sometimes suicide. My bill will make sure that we could get Nevada youth help, so that it does not come to this circumstance where we lose Nevada youth on our watch. This bill will ensure all Nevada youth are able to prevent, identify, deflect, and report online crimes against children and make sure the Nevada youth are safe. Thank you.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Wolf?

Vice Chair Cohen:

I was wondering, would this be implemented and part of the health curriculum, or would it require its own separate credit?

Youth Legislator Wolf:

It would be in the health curriculum. During the one semester they take, it will be implemented in that under the sex trafficking unit.

Chair Rios:

Do any other Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Wolf?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

Do you have any idea how much adding this to the health curriculum would cost the State, either per student or overall?

Youth Legislator Wolf:

I do not know the exact number, but most likely the State will have to come up with the curriculum, and then we will have to train our teachers, so they are teaching the right curriculum. I do not know the exact number.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

My question was answered, but I want to say I cannot specifically see anyone raising their hands. I am sorry if I am cutting you off; I cannot see anybody that can raise their hands. I apologize for that.

Chair Rios:

You are all good. Do any Youth Legislators have questions? I believe we are good to move on to Youth Legislator Chen. Thank you, Youth Legislator Wolf.

This is BDR 5. You can start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Chen:

I want to talk about an important proposal that could significantly improve safety in our school environment, especially during hectic pick-up and drop-off times.

My high school, Sierra Vista High School, took in 3,149 students during the SY 2023–2024, according to NDE. We have one of the biggest school populations in the Valley, and safety issues tend to multiply. This should not remain the norm. Parents are in a hurry, student drivers are trying to navigate the chaos while learning how to drive, and big buses are weaving through it all; it can get pretty overwhelming. That is precisely why I am proposing a bill that would require Nevada's public schools to place one licensed crossing guard at every major stop-controlled intersection on the campus perimeter. This would be in effect during each school's standard pick-up and drop-off times. Why is this necessary? Well, when you consider the 15 minutes before and after school are some of the most dangerous, it becomes very clear. Drivers are often rushing, not fully aware of their surroundings. And let us be honest, students crossing the street can sometimes seem a bit unpredictable.

Without a licensed crossing guard, we see a steady flow of students crossing the street with cars squeezing by and around them. This leaves students vulnerable to [inaudible] parents, guardians, and student drivers. We all want to look out for one another, but with so many moving parts, it can be a challenge. This bill is practical and necessary towards enhancing student safety. It aims to create standardized safety measures across all public schools in Nevada, making this not just a proposal, but a movement towards safer schools. And here is the exciting part, it would be the first bill of its kind. This is not about setting rules; it is about creating a supportive environment for everyone—students, parents, and staff alike.

Knowing that a trained crossing guard is present to help direct traffic and watch out for everyone can make a world of difference. This proposal also alleviates some of the pressure on our campus security monitors, who already juggle numerous responsibilities during pick-up and drop-off times, including checking identifications (IDs). It allows them to focus on other important security tasks rather than managing traffic flow.

What about implementation? This proposal may require political subdivisions to hire more crossing guards for stop-controlled intersections around school campuses. [Inaudible] states that this position pays \$17 an hour in Clark County as of July 2024. However, volunteer

crossing guards licensed are permitted, as stated under NRS 484B.350. Organizations like Dads In Schools are eager and willing to help make our schools safe environments. I met with them personally, and they are all on board.

What do we hope to achieve with this bill? We are looking at improved traffic flow and pedestrian safety, ultimately fostering a safer environment during these chaotic times. As a student at Sierra Vista—and I will emphasize one of the most populated school district populations in the Valley—I have experienced these challenges firsthand, which gives me a unique perspective and a leg up in advocating for this policy implementation.

In conclusion, I want to highlight this proposal is more than words; it is about being proactive and preventing accidents before they occur. Let us unite to support this initiative and work towards making our school environments safer for everyone.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Chen?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Do you have any ballpark numbers on how many additional crossing guards would be needed to support this bill? And any idea on if we have the supply? Being people who want to be employed as crossing guards with the low wages that it comes with to meet that number we need.

Youth Legislator Chen:

To start [with] the second part of the question, it does pay \$17 an hour, and is projected to be 30 minutes before and after school. I understand that volunteering would be sparse.

To answer the first part of the question, because I understand that is the more important part, considering there are around 670 public schools in Nevada on a rough average [and] two important stop-controlled intersections around the school perimeter on average, this would cost about \$4,150,000 a year for 1,356 paid and licensed crossing guards. We have not, with these numbers, taken into account the nonprofits that are willing to help.

Chair Rios:

Do any other Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Chen?

Youth Legislator Allen:

When you say licensing and training of said crossing guards, what does that particularly look like, and what is the financial burden for educational institutions?

Youth Legislator Chen:

I was looking for information regarding that, and across many sources on the web, hiring events happen periodically—more so before the school year starts at different county libraries, specifically in Clark County. People can always contact the Clark County School District (CCSD) Engagement Unit for more information. Regarding training, I wish I could help you on that, but I did not find any information regarding that.

Chair Rios:

Do any other Youth Legislators have questions?

Youth Legislator Park:

With the number of staff in most schools already being low, would we be able to implement a method of ways schools could use current staff and give them training to be part of this program instead of using this fiscal burden to find more people—which is already a low amount—especially volunteers or even people working jobs for a school?

Youth Legislator Chen:

That is a great perspective, thank you for that. Assuming that contract hours are the standard school hours for staff, they could pick that up for the 30 minutes before school and 30 minutes after school to get that extra hour. I am not sure how their contract hours work in terms of after school activities, after school sports, [and] tutoring; but that can definitely be looked at. If you would like more information, I can.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Youth Legislator Chang:

Would it be possible to include student volunteers as part of this workforce?

Youth Legislator Chen:

Under law, they have to be 18 years or older to become a licensed school crossing guard. I would understand if they are with a volunteer organization or are employed under the CCSD Engagement Unit and are 18 years of age, then I can see how that would work.

Chair Rios:

That is time. Thank you, Youth Legislator Chen.

We will now move on to Youth Legislator Walsh for BDR 6. You can start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

It is Monday morning. School starts in an hour. Maybe you forgot to do your homework over the weekend or studied for a big test. Either way, it is Monday. You go into class. The first bell rings at 7 a.m. You chat with your friends. "How was your weekend? Did you see that new movie? Did we have any homework?" It is 7:08. Your teacher begins the lesson. It is math. It is your favorite class and your favorite teacher. It is 7:12. You are taking a quiz. At 7:15, you hear something in the hallway. Your teacher opens the door to investigate with another teacher standing by. There is another loud, sharp sound. Your favorite teacher drops to the ground shot. You look on in horror, watching him bleed to death and listening to his agonized gasp for air. You are listening to him die. It is 7:16. Screams rip through your school. More shots. You hear the pleas of a friend—12-years-old—begging, "Please do not shoot me, please do not shoot me." Two of your classmates are shot. Both of them are dead. You think about your parents, wishing you could see them knowing those

two students never will again. One final shot enters your school, and one of your classmates takes his own life. You are no longer worried about your homework. The situation invades our televisions, our phones, and our lives. Yet you are probably thinking, "Is the situation I describe Apalachee High School in Georgia, Oxford High School in Michigan, or Columbine High School in Colorado?" No, this is Sparks Middle School in Sparks, Nevada, on October 21, 2013. A Monday.

What did these acts of violence and many more have in common? All of these shootings were committed by minors who accessed their parents legally-owned firearms. This epidemic of violence is not just in a homicidal situation. It can affect almost every young person, and it has. I knew a teenage boy in Las Vegas. He had just started high school. He was like any other teenage boy. He loved his friends, hated his homework, and played video games. One day, he invited his friends to his house. His parents were not around, but their firearm was. He pulled out the firearm from an unlocked safe and proceeded to show off to his friends. It was all fun and games. Then a shot. He accidentally shot and killed himself in front of his friends with his parents' firearm. His friends will never be able to forget the sight.

According to EveryStat.org, a database dedicated to gun violence statistics across the country, firearms are the leading cause of death among children and teens in Nevada. Roughly 40 percent of these deaths are suicide. In the State of Nevada, a minor cannot legally purchase a firearm. So, where are they getting these firearms? One answer—negligent parents. No matter the circumstances, these deaths are a direct result of legally-owned firearms being carelessly left accessible to minors. This is why I am proposing a change to NRS 41.472, which currently can only hold a parent civilly liable, meaning they can only be fined—never sentenced to prison—for their minor causing bodily harm with their legally-owned firearm if one of these very specific things happen: (1) the parent explicitly authorized use of their firearm for their minor; (2) the parent knows their child will commit violent acts; or (3) the minor has been previously convicted of a criminal offense.

In the situations I described earlier, none of these criteria applied. A classmate of the 12-year-old Sparks shooter describes him as a "really nice kid." His parents did not authorize use of their firearm. They just carelessly left it out. The boy I knew had no intention to hurt himself. Neither boy had been convicted of a criminal offense. What do the parents of the Sparks shooter say in the aftermath of their son's triple homicide and suicide? One word—sorry; sorry does not cut it. Sorry would not cut it if a minor offered their parents' legally bought alcohol to a friend and that friend died of alcohol poisoning. Sorry would not cut it if a minor accessed their parents legally prescribed medication and overdosed. So, why is sorry acceptable with gun violence? This is why I am proposing to remove the current requirement in NRS 41.472; if the parent or guardian had any knowledge of potential misuse of the firearm and make a violation of this law a category B felony punishable by 1 to 20 years in prison, as well as civil liability.

Nevada youth are dying to parental firearm negligence. We must act to protect those we represent. This bill was something I thought of over four years ago when a classmate brought a loaded gun he accessed through parental negligence to my middle school campus in Henderson. There have been too many incidents to name. You can fix this problem by selecting this bill. I would appreciate your support.

I leave you with one last thought—it is Thursday. In a couple of days on Monday, you will walk into your favorite class with your favorite teacher. Think about it.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Walsh?

Youth Legislator Cain:

If a student is being tried as an adult after an act of gun violence in their high school, do you think it is appropriate to also charge a parent with the same level of crime? Because if you are trying them as an adult, you are admitting the parent has no ability to control that person's behavior, because they are almost an adult.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

My bill has nothing to do with what prosecutors choose to do with their time. It is the fact to make the case—the ability to prosecute parents who are negligent for their firearms. Whatever prosecutors or the District Attorney choose to do in the State of Nevada has nothing to do with my bill. It is to help make the ability to prosecute more broad, because right now a parent can only be civilly liable for the three requirements I named earlier; and that is why I am changing it. Just like we have seen in Georgia, a child took his parents' firearm shot and killed some of his classmates, and their parent is being held criminally liable. That cannot happen in the State of Nevada, so I would like the requirements to change. Whatever happens afterwards is the prosecutor's choice if that answers your question.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

What would your bill do to parents who—for lack of a better phrasing—do not care what their children do with their guns, and they are being purposefully negligent? How would this help prevent that child from then going to do something with that firearm?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

This prevents it in the way that if a parent knows they can only get a slap on the wrist for something—as you said—purposeful negligence. Then with this bill making it, “Yes, you can be held criminally liable [and] go to prison.” It is telling them, “This is what can happen. So, this is why you should lock up your guns because you have a responsibility to do so.” Again, if a parent knows they can just be slapped on the wrist for something as detrimental as their child killing their teacher and two students, like in Sparks in 2013, then they have no incentive to keep the gun locked up besides an own moral responsibility, which, like you mentioned, there can be cases where a parent might not have that, if that answers your question.

Chair Rios:

I think Youth Legislator McCarthy had her hand up.

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

I want to clarify something on the document sent to all of us. At the bottom of your box, it says, “The bill would also make a violation of this law category B felony punished by 1 to

20 years in prison.” Is that meaning you are making a specific crime for this situation? So, the parent would not be tried for the exact same crime as the child, which in these cases would be murder. It would be something specific like criminal negligence.

Ms. Ashdown:

The timer has gone off. If you can answer it very quickly, please do so.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Like I said, whatever the prosecutor chooses to do is past the bill’s scope. However, the law is already written in the statute—NRS 41.472—which is parental negligence of a firearm. I would be making it criminally liable instead of civilly liable. The reason I chose category B felony is because it has that leniency; it can be 1 to 20 years in prison. All other category felonies under that are only 1 to 5. So again, it is to give the prosecutor, judge, and everyone on that sentencing committee more choice. Like I said, the offense could be 20 years, but it could also be 1 or even less because civil liability is still imposed as well.

Chair Rios:

We are going to go ahead and move on to Youth Legislator Allen with BDR 7. You may start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Allen:

We can all walk into any classroom, read anything on the wall [and] interact with our peers and teachers. While we may not be able to solve for X or understand how this country came to be, we all have a basic understanding of the lesson presented to us. But more importantly, we can engage in the classroom setting. We can raise our hand and ask a question [and] say, “I do not understand. I am confused. I need help.” But in Nevada, there are 81,825 plus students who cannot—81,825 plus students who cannot always advocate for themselves; 81,825 plus students who cannot engage during instruction; and 81,825 plus students who do not speak English. None of this is their fault, but there is a burden on our educational institutions to provide said students with adequate resources to allow them to not only learn English at an accelerated rate but actively engage in the classroom setting. This burden, this need is not being met in our classrooms.

In this meeting—in this space, this program—we can change that. But how? We first need to understand the status quo surrounding our classrooms and the impacts for ELLs. In the State of Nevada, there are 481,324 students attending public schools K through 12. Of those 481,000 plus students, 17 percent are ELLs, which equates to 81,825. According to *New America* in an article, “Patterns of Progress for English Learners in Nevada”, ELLs are students who are unable to communicate fluently or learn effectively in English who often come from non-English speaking homes and backgrounds and who typically require specialized or modified instruction in both the English language and in their academic courses.

Nevada sees high immigration rates. In 2018, 587,686 immigrants comprised 19 percent of the population, according to the *American Immigration Council*. We are actively neglecting a major portion of our State's population. What do we see in our classrooms? A lack of paraprofessionals, a lack of modern technology, and a lack of life translators. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 387.028 requires school districts to provide appropriate instructional programs in the native language of the ELL student, when necessary, further enforced by the *State Constitution*.

My bill advocates for those who are not receiving adequate resources when learning English. My bill will require in-person translators, real-time audio translators, and/or the prioritization of teaching English before other curriculum. We need that support in the classroom for both students and teachers, and my bill aims to do just that. I have been asked, "Kyle, why do you care? You are not bilingual; you have never experienced this." But in honors human anatomy, the last period of the day, when I have watched a new student day-in and day-out struggle to interact with the lesson, talk with her peers, and communicate her needs. As I could see in her eyes, the contest of this new learning environment. But more importantly, I saw her desire to learn, thrive, and promote herself in this new environment. Nothing was going to hold her back.

Nevada has an obligation to all of its students—not just some. It is time we start recognizing the issues of all, empathizing but never degrading personal situations, and lead[ing] for change for a better tomorrow in the classroom. Change may be hard; I recognize that, but it is not an excuse for not trying to achieve the best for every single student. It is time we come together to not just advance ourselves but work together to advance everyone.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have questions for Youth Legislator Allen?

Youth Legislator Cain:

Do you know of an estimated fiscal impact for this bill? How much would it cost the school district?

Youth Legislator Allen:

I do not have that at this time. I could further provide that should my bill move forward. But a big thing to understand here is we already have a budget and specialized programs set aside for live in-person translators, real-time audio translators, and the prioritization of teaching English before other curriculum. So, there would be justifications within the limitations of this bill for school districts and for the State Board of Education (SBE).

Vice Chair Cohen:

I had a question about the prioritization. Does that mean the total exclusion of other important classes in the curriculum? And does that mean the teaching of English has to come before everything else?

Youth Legislator Allen:

Yes, in certain terms. We would see English taking up a large percentage of the average school day for these students, but they would also be enrolled in other specialized programs. There would be class time spent outside of prioritizing English. But again, this is not the first priority of this bill. It would simply be in the case that in-person translators and real-time audio translators were not available or if the student needed that specialized prioritization of English with an Individualized Educational Program or a 504 [Plan].

Youth Legislator Chang:

In the thing we [were] sent, you mentioned specifically in-person translators and real-time audio translators. I am not too familiar with these terms. Could you explain them to me?

Youth Legislator Allen:

Yes, I most definitely can. When I say “in-person translators,” this can come in two forms. We see this with paraprofessionals who will act in two capacities in the classroom. So, that will be to actively translate to students who are considered ELLs, but then to also work to be their student advocate [and] to engage them to make sure their work is being completed on time. But “in-person translators” can quite literally be a translator whose sole purpose is to translate actively as the teacher is lecturing or going over a lesson. That would be essentially to allow them to still engage with core classes and potentially electives, but on their own terms as they are actively learning English.

With real-time audio translators, that would be technology in the case a paraprofessional or an in-person translator is not available. That is technology that can translate whatever the teacher is saying to what their native language is.

Ms. Dimmitt:

I believe the time is up, unless, Tina, you want to allow any more time.

Chair Rios:

We will move on to the next presenter.

Youth Legislator Chong is with BDR 8.

Youth Legislator Chong:

Today, I stand in support of a BDR to protect young people in Nevada from the harmful effects of deepfake pornography. Deepfake pornography is a form of sexual content created by uploading a photo of a person to an Artificial Intelligence tool, which creates a highly realistic sexualized photo or video of them. This content is easily spread online, and once it is on the Internet, it never leaves. As technology rapidly improves, young people across the country have been terrorized by deepfakes at increasing rates. Bill Draft Request 8 addresses this issue by outlawing the production and distribution of pornographic deepfakes. It also allows victims to seek private compensation from those who create these harmful images and videos. Finally, it holds websites that host sexual content accountable for their effects on youth.

I know firsthand the damage that altered sexual content can cause. When I was ten-years-old, I received questions from strangers online to post innocent but strange videos on YouTube. One day, I discovered these predators had edited these videos in sexual manners and posted them online. The embarrassment and shame I felt were overwhelming, even though I had done nothing wrong.

Nevada is significantly behind on this issue among the states. If we want to stop deepfake pornography, we must recognize it for what it is—a highly damaging sex crime. More than half of all United States treat it the same way. Bill Draft Request 8 classifies the production or distribution of nonconsensual deepfake pornography as a category C felony. These classifications align with its existing media-related sex crimes in existing law, including child abuse and online sexual predation. Although this classification may seem acute, it primarily seeks to deter deepfake production rather than excessively punish it. Time has shown this goal to be realistic. Deepfake production has significantly decreased within the states that have enacted deepfake laws.

Bill Draft Request 8 also addresses the root cause: youth exposure to pornography. Research links pornography consumption to desensitization and viewing peers as sexual objects, which fuels deepfake creation in the first place. Bill Draft Request 8 follows the steps of nearly 20 other U.S. states in requiring robust ID-based age verification to access or upload sexual content online. Currently, most porn sites only require a user to click a button to confirm they are over 18. Bill Draft Request 8 blocks this loophole by requiring this verification to be done with a government ID, limiting youth exposure to pornography. The extra step of providing personal information also serves as a strong deterrent to posting such illegal content.

Lastly, BDR 8 makes it easier for victims of deepfake pornography to seek compensation for damages. It allows victims to file confidential, sealed civil lawsuits against those who produce or distribute deepfake content, seeking monetary damages per fake image or video. Bill Draft Request 8 is not about punishing silly mistakes. It is about deterring deliberate harmful actions. Creating or sharing deepfake pornography is not a careless mistake; it is a conscious choice to harass and humiliate someone without their consent.

I hope no one else has to experience what I and thousands of young people have endured. Bill Draft Request 8 is a step toward that goal. I yield my time.

Chair Rios:

Do we have any questions from Youth Legislators?

Youth Legislator Chang:

Would this bill require additional enforcement or additional fiscal responsibilities for the State?

Youth Legislator Chong:

Yes, I will answer that question. It would not. It has zero fiscal impact. It only allows there to be an additional crime classification for this type of crime. It allows someone to seek a civil lawsuit, and it allows these porn sites to be held accountable. So, no, it does not require additional enforcement. It relies primarily on reporting.

Youth Legislator Breeden:

Would having to collect IDs in order to enter pornographic sites pose a privacy and security issue [for] who is getting that identification—like requirements? And is that going to stay online forever?

Youth Legislator Chong:

No. According to the bill, it would not stay online forever. These sites can implement this age verification in various ways. There are third parties that do this age verification, and their terms of service state these IDs are promptly deleted. If these sites were to violate the terms and conditions, that would be against the law.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Besides the age verification, how would making this a category C felony [be] specifically helping mostly Nevada youth? Since that is the primary goal of the BDR. I am wondering if you could elaborate more on how that helps specifically Nevada youth and young people.

Youth Legislator Chong:

Yes. It helps Nevada youth by serving as a deterrent to deepfake pornography production. In the states that have implemented this, it has acted mostly as a deterrent rather than as a punishment, which means less people are being subjected to deepfake pornography and it is being created less, which does help Nevada's youth.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions? In the north?

Ms. Dimmitt:

None in the north.

Chair Rios:

We will go move on to Youth Legislator Park with BDR 9.

Youth Legislator Park:

I am here to propose a bill that seeks to address a crisis that has quietly taken the root of our communities and has become a silent generational problem that needs attention—youth drug use. We have all seen the statistics, and about over 15 percent of high school students report using illicit drugs, which include cocaine, heroin, or methamphetamines at least once. Prescription drug misuse is also alarmingly common, with one in seven Nevada teens admitting to abusing prescription painkillers without a doctor's consent. The rise in opioid misuse is particularly troubling, with Nevada ranking among the top states in opioid-related deaths. But these numbers are more than just statistics. Behind each of them is a person, someone who could be a future leader, a future doctor, a future parent, or a future lawyer. Yet, without meaningful intervention, many of them will not reach their potential because they are caught in the devastating cycle of addiction. The reality is stark.

In many parts of Nevada, young people—our students, athletes, [and] dreamers—are turning to drugs at an alarming rate. They are looking for an escape [and] for a way to relieve the pressures they face every day. Why? Because we have not given [them] the tools they need to make healthier choices. Our schools do not have the resources to adequately educate them, [and] our communities do not have sufficient services to support them. When they do fall into addiction, treatment is often too inaccessible or unavailable for minors.

This is why I stand before you today; to advocate for the Youth Drug Prevention and Recovery Act. A bill that would create a comprehensive statewide program aimed at preventing drug use among our youth and offering real recovery options for those already struggling. This is not just another education program. This bill goes further filling in the critical gaps that exist between awareness, support, and treatment.

First, this proposal mandates a standardized evidence-based drug education curriculum in all Nevada public and charter schools, starting from middle school. Currently, many of our schools do not have the resources to properly educate students on the dangers of drug use, especially when it comes to substances, like opioids and prescription drugs, which are easily accessible to many teenagers. Education is a frontline of defense. When young people understand the long-term health risks, the legal consequences, and more importantly, the power of saying no to peer pressure, they make better choices, but we need to give them those tools; but prevention alone is not enough. Many of these children are already at risk living in environments where drugs are easily available or perhaps even normalized. For them, we need more than just words in the classroom. That is why this bill also creates community outreach centers across the State, partnering with local organizations to provide mentorship, counseling, and after-school programs aimed specifically [for] at-risk youth. These centers serve as safe havens, giving young people the support system they need to stay off the streets and out of dangerous situations where drugs are present. For those who have already fallen into addiction and those who feel they have no way out; this bill establishes State-funded rehabilitation services for minors.

Right now, Nevada lacks sufficient resources tailored to young people specifically battling addiction, and that needs to change. With this proposal, we will find youth-specific inpatient and outpatient treatment facilities that are accessible, affordable, and equipped to address not only the substance abuse but also the mental health issues that accompany it. This bill is not just an investment in prevention and recovery; it is an investment in our future. The next generation of Nevadans will drive our economy, communities, and our State forward. The 20 to 30 percent of our population that the youth make up will make up 100 percent of our future. Imagine the impact we could have if we gave our youth the resources, education, and support they need to say “no” to drugs and “yes” to a brighter future. Imagine a Nevada where fewer families are torn apart by addiction, where schools are safer, and where young people can thrive in environments that support their health and well-being.

It is time for us to act, not just as legislators but as leaders who care about the future of the State. I ask you to join me in passing the Youth Drug Prevention Recovery Act, and together we can build a Nevada that protects its youth, nurtures their potential, and provides them with the opportunities they deserve.

Chair Rios:

Any questions?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Can you tell me about any numbers you may have about possible fiscal impact for the outreach centers, the State-funded rehabilitation services, and treatment facilities?

Youth Legislator Park:

Unfortunately, I do not have the exact numbers when it comes to the fiscal impact of this bill. Cost will be involved, especially with all the parts addressed in this bill. But I ask you to consider the alternative—the cost of doing nothing is far greater. The toll on our health care system from overdoses, the strain on our criminal justice system from youth-related drug crimes, and the long-term economic losses when these young people fail to finish school or enter the workforce—all of this is more expensive than funding a program designed to prevent these outcomes in the first place.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

What specific budget would you see this being funded by?

Youth Legislator Park:

Because of the multiple parts of this bill, it is important that we address it separately. For school curriculum, you have to incorporate part of the health curriculum into talking about objective drug education, [like] what we did with sexual education for middle school and high schoolers.

For community, outreach, and treatment centers, it will have a fiscal impact that needs to be measured. I want to work with public and private companies that will allow us to create, demonstrate, and meet these needs in the end and allow us to create these centers that are in favor of youth and trying to reduce the problem in general. We can try to get not only government federal grants or, if it is specific, public and private nonprofits that are aimed at helping this specific issue.

Youth Legislator Nguyen:

How will these community outreach centers ensure they are accessible to all students, particularly in underserved or rural areas?

Youth Legislator Park:

Drug prevention resources [are] a major issue for rural areas, especially in Nevada, where we have such a big disparity between major cities and smaller towns. So, the importance of flexibility in this program does matter. The delivery and potential partnerships with local organizations that are already embedded in these communities are important to consider when you are looking to create these rehabilitation centers or outreach centers for the youth.

If you could implement not only a physical center but online education modules and mobile outreach centers that could supplement in-person programs in these areas where there might not be enough resources to be able to fund these programs, that could still be a viable alternative we could consider.

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

Would this BDR even be possible for underfunded schools?

Ms. Ashdown:

That is time. If you can answer it very quickly—

Youth Legislator Park:

To stress, it would be more focused on districts to provide the resources for these schools to implement this program. It is not going to be like you need a separate teacher, but it would be a specific module and almost like a curriculum class.

Chair Rios:

We are going to move on to BDR 10 by Youth Legislator Chang. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Chang:

Good afternoon. Dual enrollment classes are a valuable resource for students to learn advanced courses and gain college credit at discounted prices. In Nevada, this is primarily accomplished through partnerships between high schools and regional universities like the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) and California schools. However, access to these opportunities is uneven, with Douglas, Lyon, and Storey Counties having fewer graduating students with dual enrollment credits. The statewide average for dual enrollment class participation is 25.8 percent per graduating class. However, Pershing County has zero students graduating with dual enrollment credits. Douglas County has nearly 10 percent. I do not believe these students are any less driven or any less desirable of learning. Instead, they are limited by geographical factors.

Expanding access to dual enrollment courses would address educational inequalities in Nevada while also helping students within Nevada learn. Dual enrollment has many benefits for students, allowing them to begin earning college credits while still in high school and at a discounted rate. Though there are existing avenues for dual enrollment, these opportunities are not equal. The solution would be to allow students to enroll directly in NSHE institutions to gain access to online classes. Though there are existing avenues for high school students to enroll in NSHE institutions, namely through Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) and the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), these avenues can be difficult and are geographically limited. Expanding access would bring the benefits of dual enrollment to more high school students.

The bill would do three things: (1) require agreements between high schools in Nevada and NSHE schools to establish a path for dual enrollment in NSHE schools; (2) require that these courses provide both college and high school credit; and (3) require these courses cost no more than \$100 per class.

There are numerous NSHE institutions throughout Nevada, many of which offer online instruction. These classes can be utilized to offer classes to students even if they do not live close to an in-person campus. Offered through various community colleges and universities, these online courses could provide students with valuable college credits and challenge them with university-level coursework. There exists legislative precedent for such a proposal. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 389.310 provides for high school students to enroll in dual credit programs. This proposal would simply broaden the scope of this statute and ensure that access is not limited by geography or financial constraints.

Such a program would have many benefits. Dual enrollment courses would allow students to graduate college earlier and at less financial burden—opening doors for the future. Dual enrollment courses would challenge students with college-level classes, expanding their horizons, and dual enrollment courses could offer fields of education that high schools might not offer.

The future of Nevada lies in its youth through their education, growth, and development. Limiting their access, intentionally or unintentionally, through financial and geographic barriers does us no good and only creates an unequal playing field. These are issues we ought to address, and these issues will be addressed in BDR 10.

Chair Rios:

Do any Youth Legislators have any questions?

Youth Legislator Cain:

In rural areas, to enroll in dual enrollment classes, would they take them online if they are not close to a university? If so, what if a student does not have access to the Internet or a computer? Would that be another barrier to dual enrollment?

Youth Legislator Chang:

As clarification, is this in the status quo or after the bill has passed?

Youth Legislator Cain:

After the bill has passed.

Youth Legislator Chang:

Yes. They would be enrolled in online courses with these NSHE institutions. For example, TMCC and Great Basin Community College both offer entirely online classes. Unfortunately, Internet access is not universally available throughout Nevada. However, that is entirely outside of the scope of the bill.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

You mentioned that this is already happening, but you are talking about academic inequalities. You mentioned that some schools will be able to take their dual enrollment courses through UNR and others would be taking [them] through community colleges. The two institutions have different levels of academic rigor. How would you address those inequalities within that, if a student is taking a course through a community college versus through a more universally accepted four-year university?

Youth Legislator Chang:

Well, a community college still offers the college credit, and the curriculum still fundamentally remains the same. If a student is taking English 101 at TMCC or at UNR, they are still taking English 101. Does that answer your question?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Yes, but I was wondering if—for academic mobility—a student wishes to take their dual enrollment courses to get college credit outside of the State of Nevada, some colleges accept UNR over community college. I am wondering how you would address that specifically.

Youth Legislator Chang:

Unfortunately, UNR does not offer online courses for all of their classes. For certain math and English classes they do so, I am not sure about others. However, the community

colleges do offer entirely online classes, and that remains the best solution without adding unnecessary costs or financial burdens to students.

Chair Rios:

Any questions in the north?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I was looking at your summary, and it says on the third part, "The cap total registration fees for each such course charged to pupil at \$100." Since we are reducing the cost for high schoolers, would there be a fiscal impact? Who would be covering the additional money?

Ms. Dimmitt:

Time is up. Can you finish quick?

Youth Legislator Chang:

Yes. In essence, these online courses can be expanded nearly indefinitely. There are course caps obviously for standard reasons, but a lot of these online courses are at a quarter or half capacity. These students are simply participating in classes without taking out the slot of an actual university or college student. There should not be any financial burden, since we are not replacing a tuition; we are simply adding one.

Ms. Dimmitt:

We will have to leave it there. Thank you.

Chair Rios:

Up next is Youth Legislator Coughlin with BDR 11. You may start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Coughlin:

My idea for a bill proposal is to mandate regular awareness campaigns or assemblies at least once per year on the topic of mental health in high schools.

While many schools have mandatory anti-bullying campaigns and occasionally a mental health campaign, the campaigns I would like to mandate would incorporate the usage of resources, such as mental health apps, encouraging students to download a designated app such as Soluna, which is a no-cost mental health app for youth between the ages of 13 and 25-years-old. This mandate would focus on lowering the high rates of mental health issues among Nevada's youth, primarily at the high school level, by optimizing mental health care access. This would not only benefit youth mental health, but also improve Nevada's low ranking among states for its limited access to mental health services.

According to an article from *The Nevada Independent*, Nevada's youth have the ninth highest prevalence of mental illness and the lowest rates of access to care in the nation. Additionally, 72 percent of those ages 12 to 17 with depression say they did not receive any form of mental health care in the last year, with Nevada ranking last in the country for youth access to mental health services. While students have access to school counselors or psychologists, Nevada schools have only 1 school psychologist for every 1,866 students on

average. It would require a large fiscal amount to hire the appropriate number of psychologists, especially with a shortage of mental health professionals across the nation.

My legislative response has been modeled on the recent actions of California's Legislature to tackle the youth mental health crisis. As a part of California's initiative, they introduced two apps with free mental health services. I previously mentioned one of these apps, Soluna, which provides resources and live coaching with no income or insurance requirements. By raising awareness and encouraging all students to download the same or similar mental health app where they can receive live assistance from a coach or even browse through and utilize the free tools, Nevada's youth will have simplified access to mental health resources, which will allow them to receive the confidential and necessary attention many of them need. Through this proposal, I also hope to alleviate the urgency in finding and hiring more mental healthcare professionals in schools. While my proposal may not be a long-term solution, it can give the youth a readily available resource to address their mental and emotional needs for the short term.

Furthermore, the possible fiscal impact of my proposal should be very minimal to nonexistent. The awareness campaigns or assemblies that my proposal would mandate are only required to take place at least once per year at each high school. The schools could organize awareness campaigns as they see fit using their already existing health and wellness curriculum materials if they so choose. Additionally, the mental health apps that schools would advocate for and encourage the students to use are already free of [charge] so, there should be no expenses for the local or State government, schools, or students. All students should have access to the resources they need for their mental and emotional well-being, as having a healthy state of mind can have a direct impact on an individual's physical [and] social health and nearly every other aspect of their daily life.

With my proposal, I hope to improve the access to mental health services in Nevada and thus improve the lives of the students I go to school with every day. Thank you for your time.

Chair Rios:

Are there any questions from Youth Legislators?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

You said you are going to mandate assemblies on mental health awareness. How large are these assemblies going to be? [Will it be] grade by grade, the whole school, or a single class? Because sometimes the larger the assembly gets, the harder it is to get people to pay attention—for lack of better phrasing.

Youth Legislator Coughlin:

As previously mentioned, it would be entirely up to the school, as some schools do an assembly for the entire school at one time, whereas others will divide it by grade, program, or some other determiner. The reason for that was because some schools will have an easier ability to reallocate their time throughout a single day, whereas others do not. I would hope they would do it in a way that promotes student attention. But at the same time, I do recognize it would be difficult to address the attention spans of each student.

Youth Legislator Chen:

I was wondering what the edge was that students gain from having an assembly or a campaign rather than a mandate or a newsletter? Because a campaign or assembly still does not ensure the students use the resource. What do you think the edge of having the assembly or campaign would be?

Youth Legislator Coughlin:

With the assembly or campaign, since it would be at most schools, my reasoning is that when you are among other students your age, if you see other students who are paying attention and downloading the app, it will encourage you to do the same. But at the same time, not every student needs the resources provided by free mental health apps. The students who need these campaigns will be the ones who are most likely paying attention and are more open to downloading or using the resources that are available.

Youth Legislator Allen:

Maybe I missed it in your presentation, and because it is not outlined in the briefs, will you summarize who would be organizing and putting on these assemblies and health campaigns?

Youth Legislator Coughlin:

For the health campaigns, again, it would mostly be up to the schools and what their abilities are, whether it is through their own funding or through the resources they already have. For example, most schools have a health curriculum that all students are required to take. Whether it is one semester [or] one year—it varies. But using either the mental health curriculum they have included in that, or if they were to partner with a nonprofit organization would be up to them. Depending on whether they have that mental health curriculum, they could use their health teachers or their own staff, or if they had a nonprofit organization they are partnering with, they would use the staff of that organization.

Chair Rios:

We are going to go ahead and move on to BDR 12, which is Youth Legislator Cain. You can begin when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Cain:

Hello, I want to thank you for the opportunity to present my bill to you today. My bill is about a pilot program that would be designed to put metal detectors in schools. Before I start talking about my bill, I want to explain my motivation.

In his junior year of high school, my brother, who was a student at West Tech, went into school on his birthday with the intention of taking an Advanced Placement (AP) exam, as I am sure many of us have done before. As he was taking his AP exam, he closed his booklet after completing his last question, and it was announced that his school was going to go under lockdown. They were unsure of whether there was a weapon or bomb on campus, but there was some threat perceived by the administration on campus. My brother was not only scared and frightened, but those around him were scared, frightened, and stressed, which caused him to become scared, frightened, and stressed. He was trying to calm down those people around him, but it is hard when you are in that situation. It puts

stress on everyone, and that is not an experience anyone should have to go through on their birthday or any other day of the year.

While the incident that happened at West Tech turned out to be a false alarm, there are plenty of schools where that is not a false alarm, and parents never see their child again. Students never see their favorite teacher again, teachers never see their students again, and peers cannot interact the same way in their classrooms anymore because of what happened. I do not want to live in a world where students are scared to go to school now. At Liberty High School in Nevada, there were nine weapons found on campus in the month of August. Keep in mind that August was not a full month of being in school. Some of us started on the 8th, and some of us started [August] 12th. Not even a month of being in school and nine weapons were found on campus.

The school district has already invested money in putting metal detectors in schools for football games. They are aware that gun violence in schools is an issue, and they are putting metal detectors in for football games, so students feel more safe. I think we should feel safe every day, and we should have metal detectors every day. Constituents from my town hall meeting and people I have talked to from my school have told me they are scared—scared of gun violence and scared of things that could happen to them at schools when there are not metal detectors and no protections in place to help them. This is an issue that is affecting all Nevada youth and something that has been brought to me. As a Nevada Youth Legislator, it is our responsibility to represent our constituents in the bill we bring forth.

The school district has a quote that says it only takes three seconds to walk through a metal detector. Three seconds. Is three seconds going to delay any of us from getting to school? No. As we came into this building today, we went through a metal detector. Did that cause a delay in this meeting? No. Time is not an issue; student safety is an issue. Metal detectors have been in use since the 1980s in schools in Detroit. Metal detectors can be a proven deterrent for bringing weapons on campus.

In 2021, 2022, and 2023, there was the highest increase in school shootings since 2008, according to *CNN*. There were at least 82 incidents in 2023, but 2022 was one of the deadliest years with 46 fatalities. Forty-six fatalities. Can you imagine if that was someone you knew from school—a student, a peer, or a friend? I do not want to live in a world where that is a student, a peer, or a friend.

Chair Rios:

Any questions from Youth Legislators?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

You mentioned in your presentation that it would not delay kids entering the school, but when you are dealing with thousands of kids going into a school and some of them [are] wearing belts or metal earrings, or they have metal zippers on their backpack; how would this help? How would this flow [and] not cause a delay?

Youth Legislator Cain:

When we walked in here, some of us were wearing belts or other things, and that did not cause an issue with the metal detectors. As I said, people who work with CCSD have said that it only takes three seconds to walk through a metal detector, which would not

theoretically cause a delay in school starts. Plenty of students show up early for school, so that would not cause an issue. I think it is more about student safety and less about school start times, if that was even an issue, which I do not believe it would be.

Chair Rios:

Anyone in the north with questions?

Youth Legislator Chang:

One part of this question is a follow-up to Youth Legislator Obstgarten, [and] another is entirely unrelated. First of all, would bags also be searched or put through a metal detector? Because I do not think anyone brings a knife to school on their person. And secondly, what would happen to a hypothetically detected weapon?

Youth Legislator Cain:

If a weapon was detected on campus, obviously it would be confiscated. But the bill is designed in a way that if we find ten weapons on a campus in a 30-day period, that is when a metal detector would be placed in a school. It is more about how many weapons you find on campus in a certain time period and less about— The metal detectors will not even be on campus if they are not necessary if that makes sense.

And secondly, to address your issue about start times [and] backpacks, the backpacks would go through a separate system, and they could be searched if there was reasonable suspicion.

Youth Legislator Conyers:

What is the potential fiscal impact of these metal detectors, and who will provide the funding for this?

Youth Legislator Cain:

The CCSD has already purchased \$3.7 million worth of metal detectors, which is 43 metal detectors for football games, which could be moved to different schools when they were not necessary at those football games for the pilot program. Since it is a pilot program, the physical impact would be smaller. Essentially, you would need to pay a security guard an hour or so more wages for the morning work they would do in operating the metal detectors, which would not [have] a significant fiscal impact, especially when you consider that we are protecting the lives of Nevada's youth.

Chair Rios:

We are going to go ahead and move on to BDR 13 presented by Youth Legislator Villatoro.

Youth Legislator Villatoro:

I would like to start off by saying thank you to my fellow Youth Legislators, Ms. Ashdown, and Senator Wiener for an amazing first half of our term.

My proposal is the enhanced support for ELLs Act. It is designed to provide targeted support for ELLs and empower our educators. A few key points that have stood out to me are to start off professional development. We will mandate regular training for teachers on best

practices for ELL students. This would include strategies for differentiated instruction, cultural competency training, language acquisition techniques, [and] culturally relevant curriculum. We aim to ensure our curriculum reflects the diverse backgrounds of our students, making learning more relatable and effective.

Now, I am not saying to change our curriculum as a whole, just to simply use inclusive content like diverse perspectives. The curriculum should include text, resources, and materials from various cultures and communities. This could mean featuring authors, historians, and scientists from diverse backgrounds or incorporating traditions and customs that reflect students' heritage as well as culturally responsive teaching practices. This includes differentiated instruction by tailoring lessons to meet the varied learning styles and cultural context of students. This could involve using visual aids, group work, [and] hands-on activities that draw on students' experiences. Language inclusivity is also a big thing, so offering bilingual materials or using students home languages to support comprehension and engagement. This not only aides learning but also honors their linguistic backgrounds.

Community and parental involvement are extremely important because we will foster stronger connections with families through outreach programs and workshops to support ELLs. The issues we face in schools are not only with ELLs but also with families, and what [they] go through to support their children at school when both the parents and students do not know English.

Accountability, we will implement assessment strategies to evaluate program effectiveness and continuously improve our approaches based on data. Lastly, resource allocation, we propose increased funding for emergent bilingual programs, ensuring resources are readily available to support our teachers as well as our students. While initial investments are necessary, the long-term benefits far outweigh these costs. By improving educational outcomes for ELLs, we not only enhance their individual futures but also foster a stronger, more equitable society.

Many great educators have been in education for many years but still struggle with strategies to support our emergent bilingual students. One particular school has provided an emergent bilingual strategist who not only helps the students but also the educators with strategies to support them as they navigate adapting to a new culture; that particular funding is provided [at] the principal's discretion, not necessarily the government. The education system does not have money allocated for this extra support for all of our schools. Therefore, I propose we ask our district to provide extra funding for the much-needed influx of newcomers.

Let us ensure that every student has the opportunity to succeed, paving the way for a brighter future for all. The expected outcome [of] passing this bill would be enhanced academic performance for ELLs, skilled and confident educators, targeted resource utilization, and stronger family and community engagement. Ultimately, we will create a more equitable and supportive educational environment that addresses the needs of all students.

Chair Rios:

Youth Legislator Breeden has the first question.

Youth Legislator Breeden:

How would implementing this look different from schools where minorities are a majority, in comparison to schools where minorities may make up less than 10 percent of the student body?

Youth Legislator Villatoro:

Correct me if I am wrong, but if I am understanding this, if there are more multilingual students at a school, this would help them rather than a school that does not have many multilingual students. Is that what you mean?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

I am more looking for how we can deal with schools where minorities and multilingual students are larger in comparison to schools where it may only be a few students, and it may be difficult to reach them.

Youth Legislator Villatoro:

No matter the percentage or ratio of the students, I believe all students should have the right [and] ability to learn and the accessibility. So using the resources needed to support the students who do not speak English, do not understand English, and are newly learning. I think it does not matter how many students who do not speak English go to a school. I think it mainly matters how we can support them, no matter the numbers at the school.

Chair Rios:

Any other Youth Legislators at this time?

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

I heard you mention that you believe all students deserve the opportunity to learn. How would non-district schools be included? Specifically, charter schools that are considered Title I and host the majority of minority students.

Youth Legislator Villatoro:

That is a great question. That is something I would like to look into now that you brought it up. I would love to touch base on that, and I can get back to you.

Chair Rios:

Do we have any idea on the cost of the program as of yet?

Youth Legislator Villatoro:

No, not at the moment. It is going to cost money. But ideally, I think our main focus is being able to get students to have the same opportunities as students who speak English. But as of right now we do not have—

Chair Rios:

Thank you. Any other questions at this time? Seeing none in the north, we are good to continue on to Youth Legislator Conyers with BDR 14.

Youth Legislator Conyers:

One of the biggest issues facing Nevada currently is our quality of education. Out of the 50 states, we rank 44th in educational quality. While there are many factors that go into how quality education is, I believe we can all agree that one of [our] most important factors [are] our teachers and educators. Therefore, one of our first solutions to this would be making sure teachers can be at their absolute best and also encouraging more people to become teachers. I believe the two parts [of] my BDR can put that into light.

The first part requires all teachers to participate in Continuing Education (CE) courses to receive at least 18 credits every 2 years. Continuing Education would allow these teachers to improve their skills as educators, and it would also improve the overall level of education. This would not be too much additional work for our teachers, because they have a great amount of time to take these courses, and it has the potential to increase their salaries.

Now that we figured out how to improve the quality of the teachers we have, how can we encourage more people to become teachers? I believe we can do this [by] offering student loan forgiveness. The second part of this BDR requires that all future educators, or for every— That \$50,000 worth of student loan forgiveness should be offered to any future educator who partakes in a dual credit program and gets their bachelor's degree with at least a grade point average of 3.0. This would encourage more people to become teachers, because student loans [are] one of the biggest and most well-known concerns in the United States, with many people not willing to go to college because they are worried about being in crippling student debt. Many people would jump at the opportunity to become educators if it meant they could access the student loan forgiveness.

Overall, this bill has the potential to increase educator skills through CE while also encouraging more people to become educators through the potential to increase salaries and potential student loan forgiveness. Let us think about— I project that with this decision alone, we can bring Nevada from 44th in our educational rank to at least the top 20. Think about what we can do to improve education from there and think about what we can improve with improvements in education. A good amount of people who suffer from mental health issues can claim that part of it comes from education. We would have better health care as the students have been better educated, and people can be more ready for a career. Matter of fact, more people would be interested in the Nevada Youth Legislature if they were better educated. All that starts with this here.

Chair Rios:

We are going to jump right into questions.

Vice Chair Cohen:

I had two questions to ask you. The first one was about the loan. You were talking about forgiveness, so does that mean that upon receiving the \$50,000 they will be excused from having to pay it back?

The second question I had was [about] the qualification teachers needed to receive those loan payments. Does the dual enrollment have to come from an in-State college? And how long do they have to be a teacher in order to qualify for that loan?

Youth Legislator Conyers:

For your first question, yes, for \$50,000 they borrow, they would not have to pay. I am sorry, can you repeat the second part of your question?

Vice Chair Cohen:

It was about the qualifications needed for a teacher to receive the \$50,000 in payments, such as where they had the dual enrollment, and how long they have been a teacher.

Youth Legislator Conyers:

Yes, that would require having attended an in-State college. I am not 100 percent sure on how many years we would require, but based on my current recommendation, I believe at least four years as an educator should be enough to qualify for this loan forgiveness.

Chair Rios:

I believe Youth Legislator Walsh had her hand up.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Yes, thank you. You said this would require every two years a teacher would need to complete a certain amount of credits. I am wondering—because you want more people to be in the profession—how this is going to help the veteran teachers, those who are ten plus years, who are already overworked and underpaid, and now you are adding more work to their load? I am wondering how that would help them want to stay in the profession instead of suffering from burnout and early retirement.

Youth Legislator Conyers:

Well, the priority of the CE courses would be their convenience, and this would not be too much additional work. We can make them virtual classes. They can attend a couple lectures to receive their credits. If we do this through something such as a virtual meeting, then they can be educated on the basics of child psychology along with going more in depth into their topic. But overall, I do not believe it would be too much work, as we have a great amount of time to complete these credits.

Youth Legislator Chang:

Eighteen credits are a lot. Would the teachers have to pay for these 18 credits out-of-pocket, or would they simply be compensated by the State?

Ms. Ashdown:

That was time. If you can answer it quickly, then please do.

Youth Legislator Conyers:

My plan is for the State to pay for these courses as they would be the ones requiring teachers to take the courses.

Chair Rios:

Next up, we have BDR 15 from Youth Legislator Nguyen. You can go ahead and start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Nguyen:

Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to first start off by thanking everyone for the opportunity to present my BDR.

Nevada faces significant educational challenges, including a severe teacher shortage that has led to higher student-to-teacher ratios and overcrowded classrooms, particularly in the largest school districts of Nevada—Clark County and Washoe County. This leaves students at a disadvantage, especially those without access to additional academic support. There are currently about 3,000 vacant teaching positions statewide, which negatively impacts many students, particularly those who require additional academic support from tutors or engaged parents. This is where adults from diverse backgrounds and professions can come into play. By stepping in as volunteers, they can help fill these gaps in education, offering students unique perspectives and skills that complement the traditional classroom experience. Engaging more volunteers with varied expertise will help bridge knowledge gaps and provide students with the additional support they need to succeed academically.

To address these issues, my proposal aims to engage more adults from diverse backgrounds and professions as volunteers in schools. In 2017, Senate Bill 287 was passed. This bill requires that volunteers at a public school and employees and volunteers at a private school undergo background checks, and a background check to be performed on each unlicensed employee and volunteer at least once every five years. While this policy is crucial for ensuring the safety of students, the process is lengthy.

In order to become a volunteer, you must go through a lengthy process of background checks and fingerprinting that cost you money. For example, in CCSD, the fee for fingerprinting and background checks is \$55. Additionally, since these background checks are managed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, processing times can range from four weeks to even longer, deterring potential volunteers due to these extended wait times.

My proposal seeks to streamline the fingerprinting and background check processes to reduce delays and make it easier for qualified individuals to contribute their time and talents. By expediting the process and reducing unnecessary steps, we can engage a broader range of volunteers who can bring valuable experiences and perspectives to enrich the educational environment.

To expedite the fingerprinting and background check process for school volunteers, I propose several key changes. First, removing fees for fingerprinting would eliminate a financial barrier and encourage more individuals to volunteer. Second, authorizing local law enforcement agencies, such as the metro police, to perform background checks would help reduce the backlog and speed up the approval process. Finally, allowing volunteers to begin working under supervision while their background checks are being processed would ensure that qualified individuals can start contributing their time and skills without unnecessary delay. These changes would streamline the process and make it easier for schools to engage a diverse range of volunteers.

Overall, the bill seeks to increase volunteer participation by streamlining the fingerprinting and background check process, making it easier and faster for adults to start volunteering.

Volunteers can play a crucial role in offering personalized assistance to students, which is essential given the current shortage of full-time teachers.

Additionally, allowing volunteers from various backgrounds, including parents with professional expertise and college students in preprofessional programs, can bring diverse perspectives into the classroom, enriching the educational environment and addressing gaps in student learning. The proposal also aims to waive background check fees, allowing law enforcement agencies to conduct fingerprinting and enabling volunteers to assist under direct supervision while their full background check is processed. This legislative response is designed to improve educational outcomes by expanding the pool of available support, enhancing the quality of education, and ensuring that more community members can effectively contribute to supporting Nevada students.

Chair Rios:

Any questions from Youth Legislators at this time?

Youth Legislator Chen:

I wanted clarity on where these volunteers would be placed. Would they be volunteer teachers and act as a substitute due to the vacancy?

Youth Legislator Nguyen:

The proposal aims to have these volunteers come in after school for mentorship programs to mentor these students to help bridge the knowledge gaps these students may be missing.

Youth Legislator Breeden:

If they are coming in after school, that would mean they would have to use a preexisting room with a teacher, so would that teacher have to stay with that volunteer as well? Thus needing to get paid more to monitor the space?

Youth Legislator Nguyen:

Yes. To address the financial part of that, this would require State funding to cover for the after-school hours the teachers are—

Youth Legislator Cain:

Do you know how you would pay for fingerprinting and background checks? Additionally, do you think there is a safety concern with allowing volunteers whose background checks have not been completed on campus, even under supervision?

Youth Legislator Nguyen:

I am sorry, could you repeat the second question?

Youth Legislator Cain:

Do you think there would be a safety concern allowing volunteers on campus who have not completed background checks even with supervision?

Youth Legislator Nguyen:

Yes. To address the second question, in terms of safety, the proposal would require a teacher or school staff in the room in order for the volunteer to be interacting with these students. For the first question, as I mentioned before, the proposal would aim to have State funds allocated to cover these costs.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time? Anyone who has not asked a question yet? I think we are good.

We are going to move on to BDR 16 presented by Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores. You can start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

Hello, everyone. Thank you for allowing me to share my proposal today.

My proposal addresses the critical issue of equitable funding in Title I low-income charter schools in Nevada. The current situation is that SB 231 allocated \$250 million to raise pay for public school educators. But unfortunately, it left out educators working in Title I low-income public charter schools. This has created inequity, not only to educators but more significantly to the students attending these schools. The lack of equitable funding has led to various challenges for Title I low-income charter schools, including difficulties in retaining qualified educators, providing student transportation, maintaining buildings, and offering better academic programs.

I have attended a Title I, low-income public charter school in East Las Vegas, Nevada, since 2017. This school, Equipo Academy, is a college prep school for sixth through twelfth grade geared towards empowering future first-generation college students to excel to and through college while becoming transformational leaders within their communities. Teachers I have grown to admire for their dedication to their students' education have recently left their school. Although their passion for their work has not changed, the inflation in our City has. The work of our teachers is equivalent to the commitment of surrounding public schools. However, the pay they receive is not, because funding was not allocated towards schools like ours, devoted teachers have been forced to make the decision to work at a publicly funded district school, even if [it is] down the street, in order to maintain their living expenses as educators.

This is not unique just to our school but to other Title I low-income public charter schools. Hiring highly-qualified educators has become just as difficult within the competitive salaries of neighboring district-funded schools. This raises issues for the youth in Nevada attending these schools, because if educators are not hired, schools lose their curriculum, which limits students learning opportunities.

My proposal seeks to rectify the situation by advocating funding for Title I charter schools. This funding would enable these schools to provide transportation services, match pay raises for educators, and enhance academic programs. I believe that by addressing the funding disparities, we can create a level playing field for Title I low-income public charter schools and ensure that all students, especially those from minority communities, have access to quality education.

Thank you for considering my bill proposal, and I hope to have your support in addressing the funding inequities Title I low-income schools in Nevada face.

To add on, this was not in my original plan, but I want to mention that a lot of these programs you have mentioned— I am going to use BDR 13 and BDR 7 as an example, because my school has a good amount of Spanish-speaking students who do not speak English. I do not know how these programs would work for low-income public charter schools if equitable funding is not addressed first.

Chair Rios:

We are going to go ahead right to questions.

Vice Chair Cohen:

I had a question about the teacher pay increase. Would this be consistent across different districts, or would it vary? And if not, would it be a statewide increase? If so, would that mean negotiations with teachers, or would it be a set price dictated by NDE?

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

Could you clarify who you are addressing in this? Because I think you are addressing CCSD educators, I am talking specifically [about] Title I educators in Nevada.

Vice Chair Cohen:

I was asking, how would you determine the increase in pay for those teachers?

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

I do not think that would be my decision. I think that would be more of a State decision on how they want to address the funding and make it equitable for schools that are considered Title I low-income public charter schools.

Youth Legislator Breeden:

Would this include support staff at Title I schools?

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

I want to know if I understood your question correctly. Would support staff mean hiring more staff?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

No, like custodians, administrators, or special education assistants. People who are not educators but still support the educators daily.

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

I would say for special education educators specifically because our school is having a hard time because we do have special education students. I feel like they are not receiving a good education that they would if they had a specialized special education educator. And this could all be due to the funding, because maybe the salary that my school could give

special education educators could not be as competitive as a public school's salary in a district.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

Did you have any specific numbers on the amount of Title I charter schools in the State of Nevada that this bill would affect? Do you have a number for that?

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

Yes, I do have a list of names. First, it would be my school Equipo Academy, Mater [Academy] East, Futuro Academy, Nevada Prep, Nevada Rise, and Democracy Prep.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

So it is only six or seven schools, what is the number?

Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores:

Six that are currently in a similar situation as my school.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Ms. Ashdown:

That is time.

Chair Rios:

Right on schedule. We are going to move on to BDR 17, which is presented by Youth Legislator Reganti in the north. You can go ahead and start when you are ready.

Youth Legislator Reganti:

Hi, everyone. I want to start off by clarifying some definitions. First, *corrective room restrictions* are "confinement to a room as a disciplinary action." Corrective room restrictions and solitary confinement are the same thing. There is legal terminology there, but I will be using them interchangeably throughout my time. Second, *recidivism* is "the tendency of a criminal to reoffend."

My BDR aims to limit the use of corrective room restrictions in juvenile detention facilities. The proposal sets a maximum limit of 15 hours, ensuring the confinement does not extend beyond the timeframe, unless absolutely necessary. In cases where it must exceed 15 hours, the juvenile must be provided with educational mental stimulation, and the reason must be thoroughly documented. However, confinement may never pass 24 hours under any circumstances.

Additionally, if a juvenile is placed in solitary confinement more than seven times within a month, they have the right to request a review of the reports by an on-duty official who did

not originally place them in the solitary confinement. This review ensures the reasoning behind the confinement is fair and just. Additionally, it will teach juveniles to advocate for themselves. Obviously, there will be no punishment given for a juvenile requesting for the report to be reviewed considering that we are helping them with real life skills, which include advocating for yourself.

The goal of the juvenile detention system should be to rehabilitate. Yet, over the years, we have lost sight of this goal. The system often forgets many of these children come from environments that do not teach them right from wrong or ones that perpetuate cycles of violence. The goal of my BDR is to prevent these kids from recidivating. We need to help these kids learn and succeed in the future, not punish them in traumatizing ways.

Corrective room restrictions do not rehabilitate but traumatize. The Juvenile Law Center said, "Solitary confinement can cause permanent psychological damage and may lead to self-harm, psychosis, and suicide." Is this really how we want to rehabilitate the children of Nevada? Through means that can lead to horrific consequences. We need to make a change.

Now, moving on to a more technical standpoint. We all want to present a BDR that will help the youth in Nevada but also get passed. Governor Lombardo recently signed a bill limiting solitary confinement in the prison system, and we are talking about children here. Let us make a change.

Chair Rios:

Any questions?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Do you have any numbers on how many juveniles in the State of Nevada were placed in solitary confinement in the last year, month, or any other time period?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I do not have the exact number for how often they are placed, but I do have a number for how often they can be placed to. They can be placed in corrective room restrictions for up to 72 hours. Whether that is only a few kids in the system, or it is many, we still need to make a change there.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I enjoy your bill, but I am wondering how we cannot go further. Why 15 to 24? I know the 24 number has certain rules for that, but why can we not limit solitary confinement further down from 15, maybe closer to 12 or 10? Why was 15 the number considering that is still an extensive time for children to be placed in solitary confinement?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I agree with you. I think solitary confinement in general is a horrific punishment to give children. But we also have to be realistic here. Right now, the limit is 72 hours, so cutting it all the way down to 10 or 12 hours may not be feasible. I would be happy to look into altering the bill if it gets passed.

Chair Rios:

Any other Youth Legislators?

Youth Legislator Cain:

It says that if they are placed in solitary confinement for 24 hours, they should be provided educational materials. I am curious what the educational materials would be.

And secondly, do we have a lot of children in Nevada who are being put in solitary confinement under unfair circumstances, or dealing with mental health issues because of being put in solitary confinement?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I am sorry, could you repeat the first question?

Youth Legislator Cain:

What educational materials would be provided to children put in solitary confinement for 24 hours?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

If we want to not have too much fiscal impact, it could be something as simple as writing exercises writing down why what they did was wrong. If we want to have a minor fiscal impact, this could include meeting with a mental health professional, pre-recorded videos, educational books, or workbooks.

What was your second question? I am so sorry.

Youth Legislator Cain:

I was curious if there is any data on how many children in Nevada are placed in solitary confinement unfairly or who are affected negatively in their mental health because of being placed in solitary confinement.

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I do not have the exact number for how many are placed, but for how their mental health is affected, the Juvenile Law Center said that a lot of side effects to solitary confinement can include psychosis, mental health issues, or even suicide. And that is regarding adults and children, so we want to address that issue and that consequence that can come with solitary confinement.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Ms. Dimmitt:

That is time.

Chair Rios:

Bill Draft Request 18 is my BDR proposal. I will turn the meeting over to Vice Chair Cohen for this portion of the meeting.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Thank you, Chair Rios. When you are ready, please proceed.

Chair Rios:

Good afternoon, everyone. Today, I am hoping to touch on a few topics regarding BDR 18.

To begin, it is no secret that youth community service provides clear positives for any individual who participates in it—between building work ethic and the principled service-oriented mindset to connecting key members and organizations with youth. The horizons for youth grow exponentially when they complete community service. It is for the positive community service that 36 states and territories here in the United States have adopted legislation or programs for school-age students to complete community service. These range anywhere from hour requirements to elective credit, and students are growing in their abilities.

The State of Nevada also has created community service legislation, and this legislation was passed back in 1995. Currently, based on NRS 389.165, Nevada students in public schools can earn 0.5—or one semester worth—of elective credit for the completion of community service projects for a maximum of one credit or one school year. I want to highlight the word “projects” here. Certain districts offer this credit through the completion of certain community service at the amount of 60 hours for 0.5 credit, or 120 hours a school year. Current legislation and current practices throughout the State could be improved.

The primary objective of BDR 18 is to grow the participation of Nevada youth in community service. It completes this objective through providing incentives for completing community service, providing districts the ability to make community service regulations in a way that fits them, and creating an important legal consideration to protect our schools and districts while students complete community service outside of the classroom. From my perspective, there are some gaps and improvements that current policy could include to better accomplish the goal of providing youth with an incentive for completing community service.

In order to create these changes, BDR 18 would recommend student-oriented changes and school-oriented changes to accomplish a number of improvements for the current legislation.

In terms of student-oriented changes, these include the following:

1. The language of the current legislation would be revised from “service projects” to “general community service” and therefore broaden the service a high school student can complete to earn credit, as well as better align the legislation with what some districts are doing today;
2. It would expand the legislation to all schools, including charter schools, and give every Nevada high school student the opportunity to earn this credit;
3. It would expand the credit maximum from one credit to two credits to encourage students to complete service over a longer period of time;

4. It would allow districts the opportunity to lower the required number of credits to anywhere in between 35 and 60 hours to possibly encourage more students to complete the hours by setting a value that fits for each district; and
5. It would provide for NDE to create information and resources for schools to provide their students with that would encourage students to complete community service and make them aware of the excellent opportunity in front of them.

Those were the student-oriented changes. In terms of school-oriented changes, these include the following:

1. It would legally protect schools and school districts while a student completes community service for credit; and
2. It would provide schools and districts with a clear understanding of what can count for service hours, how to track and certify service hours, and what a student needs to complete to submit for service hours. Those decisions would all be made in consultation with districts and boards of education, so everyone would have a seat at the table and every perspective is considered.

With the revisions in mind, the legislation that would arise is something that would improve the current outlook of community service and service learning in general throughout the State. We need more youth completing community service, and it would prepare Nevada youth for a changing world, and ensure they have the skills, mindset, and ability they need to succeed as adults.

To conclude, this legislation will accomplish the ideas of incentive for youth community service, open the doors for districts to lower that number for a required number of hours, encourage students to complete the service, and ensure that schools and districts have the support they need to make a positive impact. This legislation would place community service in the educational spotlight and expand those horizons for students.

With all that being said, I ask for your consideration of BDR 18 today. Thank you for your attention and time.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Would anyone like to ask a question?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

How would we monitor that the community service is actually real, so the credit they are getting for it is something they actually worked for?

Chair Rios:

How it is set up—and I wrote it out as the legislation would be designed—the NDE would create a format or a requirement and, in consultation with the districts, would decide what counts for community service and what a student would need to submit. My personal opinion, I think a picture and a signature from an adult would work. But again, this is all going to be in consultation with the districts.

I will tell you there are current practices because this is an active item. This is a good point to touch on for fiscal reasons. Because it is active, we will not need to create anything new,

but the NDE would need to work with the districts to create those items. Not necessarily a question for me, but the point of the legislation would specifically instruct the NDE, in consultation with the different districts—to answer that question—to decide how we ensure our students are completing community service. That way, the entire State of Nevada is able to get a say on that question, so we are able to get a firm solution on that.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Does anyone else have a question?

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

This is not really a question, more of a clarification. You said each district would have the opportunity to set something between 35 to 60 hours. Correct?

Chair Rios:

Correct.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

Did you say the same thing for the increase of the maximum credits from one to two, or is that statewide?

Chair Rios:

The maximum would be increased too, and that would be statewide. The hour question I do want to address—35 to 60 hours for a district to decide. The reason that is the case is for a number of reasons.

Originally, the intention of the legislation was to make it so that a school would have a cap at 35. There were a couple of issues with that. Number one, there is this item throughout the State—some of you might be familiar with it—called the Carnegie Unit, and that requires 60 hours for 0.5 credit in general for any class—math, English, and science.

I would be happy to have a discussion, if this bill moves forward, to lower that and set a lower maximum than 60, because I know that is a big concern for many students I spoke [with]. If there is enough support for it [and] if we want to make that change, I would personally be 100 percent for it to make that change and bring that maximum from 60 down to a more reasonable number, if that is what we want to do. But I do not want that to be a stressor, because the State is moving towards a place with the NDE based on—I spoke to a Superintendent and the State is moving to a place where maybe that Carnegie Unit, that 60-hour requirement, might change.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Are there any questions in the north?

Ms. Dimmitt:

No.

Youth Legislator Chen:

I understand how making this eligible for credits would or can contribute to— How would this work in terms of scheduling, open periods, and early graduation? Because it does count towards that.

Chair Rios:

It would be very much in line with a work study program. There are work study programs where students earn the credit as they go along, and it is either a pass or fail credit. That is how it would be designed, so if a student completes it, then they would earn that 0.5 credit on that basis, depending on what the district decides for the hour. Does that answer your question?

Vice Chair Cohen:

Thank you for the presentation. I will now turn the meeting to you, Chair Rios.

Chair Rios:

Thank you, Vice Chair Cohen. Vice Chair Cohen has BDR 19. You can begin when you are ready.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Good afternoon, fellow Youth Legislators. It is no secret that Nevada lacks the necessary mental health resources to treat its students, often coming last in national rankings among statistics related to youth and mental health. Therefore, a substantial need must be addressed, especially since it targets such a vulnerable group of Nevada citizens. It does not show up in infrastructure or fiscal notes, but mental health is a problem that decimates Nevada teens every single year, and this bill seeks to address that problem. Past bills have sought to increase resources available to treat mental health disabilities and disorders after they have already been a problem. Those bills have often not solved the problem and have led to more criticism about mental health solutions; as these bills are often costly.

My bill, which seeks to study which forms of implementation will be best for K through 12 Nevada schools, solves both problems. By directing the Nevada Board of Education to study this issue more in depth, they can research what methods are most effective in raising awareness of and preventing the exacerbation of mental health problems, not just treating them. This is especially true as the bill seeks to include both elementary and middle schools, ensuring both prevention and destigmatization of mental health issues early on, in addition to the assurance that over time students will have a 12-year cumulative education by the time they graduate. In this regard, the information found will be used proactively, and better more practical, and cost-effective solutions can be found. This will reduce mental health issues in Nevada schools, and work towards a better future for all those who attend them.

I seek to direct the SBE to create a subcommittee to find innovative, practical, and cost-effective ways to implement mental health education and training for pupils and instructors. My intent is to find different ways to decrease the statistics of prevalence and stigmatization of mental health issues in schools, promote a cumulative education of 12 years of mental health education by graduation for students, mental health training for teachers, and ultimately support the next generation of Nevadans. By using this type of method—a research study conducted by professionals—it is possible to determine how to

best move forward in a manner that serves all parties, preventing youth from experiencing mental health issues, assisting youth already experiencing mental health issues, aiding teachers who interact with said individuals, and equipping school officials with resources to support all students and teachers.

By implementing education at such a young age and building upon that in the future, young Nevadans will be furnished with an arsenal of resources at their disposal and their mental health journeys. By implementing training for teachers, teachers can learn the best methods to ensure their students do not experience mental health disorders and support those who do. By providing schools with a direction on how to ensure these things happen, the study conducted by the subcommittee of the SBE will make a tremendous difference in the lives of all those in the educational environment. Precisely how that will be implemented is unknown, but that is the exact reason why this bill needs to exist—to find out ways that will solve the problem, are easy to implement, and do not cost a fortune.

The actual implementation of mental health education and training [for] students and teachers remains impossible to predict without a fully conducted research study. However, the outcomes of the study itself—not its findings—are easier to predict. For one, it is one of the cheapest BDRs presented today, as research costs do not include already present employees, infrastructure, and outreach that NDE already possesses. Since this bill is cost-effective and maximizes social impact, there will be no shortage of bipartisan support in the Nevada Legislature, letting this bill have an incredible chance of success.

Furthermore, I know this study will find crucial, innovative, practical, and cost-effective solutions that previously had not been discovered, allowing mental health education and training to be implemented throughout K through 12 schools in Nevada. By doing so, young Nevadans will be able to learn and thrive in schools and have the ability to grow up as strong, healthy individuals. This bill will definitively treat the issue and save both money and lives.

Thank you, and I look forward to your vote.

Chair Rios:

Any questions from Youth Legislators?

Youth Legislator Cain:

How can you ensure the efficiency of a subcommittee on mental health? Especially when so many of the bills today have to do with shortcomings of the school board that are not intentional but sometimes just happen because of flaws in the system.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Well, the whole point of the study is to find ways to reduce that government red tape that already exists. I understand the concern that maybe the subcommittee will not be as effective as idealized. But as it does seek to solve an issue in a way that ends up saving money for the State, there would not be an incentive for the subcommittee not to go ahead and do this research project as it will end up benefiting them more in the long run. I do not think that would be a major concern.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I want to thank Youth Legislator Cohen for his well-thought-out speech. I really enjoyed it.

I see where you are thinking, but I am wondering how much this will push because, at the end of the day, schools are academic institutions. I am wondering if adding the subcommittee and the NDE will not ruin the reputation of schools, but put more burden onto an institution that, at the end of the day, is academic and has had a lot of burden in the past with more programs to do with mental health of their students, which sometimes are not always warranted. The fact that, again, schools are academic institutions and not mental health facilities.

Vice Chair Cohen:

On the point about ensuring schools are not overburdened—part of the goal I seek to address in the research project conducted by NDE is to find ways to make schools less burdened while still achieving the goals that need to be achieved. The main part of the research project is to find ways to take that pressure off the schools as best it can in order to maximize whatever impact that subcommittee seeks to achieve.

I think with the research project, we are going to find innovative ways that previously had not been thought of because they had not been investigated or researched fully. That is one of the main incentives for doing this research project.

Youth Legislator Chong:

Who will be on the subcommittee? Second, what is the time frame for creating this research report? When should it be released?

Vice Chair Cohen:

For people made up on the subcommittee of the SBE, that would have to be created at discretion of the SBE. But it could be officials from the SBE, community leaders, or anyone who the SBE deems would be as responsible as possible to ensure the full implementation of the bill.

Regarding the timeline of the bill, that would also be left up to the discretion of the SBE. But as I said earlier, as it ends up improving the SBE's position over the long term, I think there would be no reason to delay or slow down this process.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Ms. Ashdown:

Time.

Chair Rios:

We are going to move on to BDR 20, which is Youth Legislator Rosas.

You can begin when ready.

Youth Legislator Rosas:

Hi, my BDR aims at lowering the minimum blood donation age from 16- to 14-years-old.

The Coronavirus Disease of 2019 had a disastrous effect on the healthcare system—I am sure we all know that. It especially crippled blood banks. Blood banks everywhere are out of blood; they are running out of it. There is a nationwide shortage of it. There is just no blood.

I was able to speak with two leaders in my community that work with Vitalant and many others, like Banner, and they highlighted the importance of donating blood. I learned that blood banks heavily rely on this, specifically from minors and youth. Twenty-five percent of their incoming blood—their blood received—came from high schoolers and college students. That is a lot when you compare it to the other groups they get from. This makes the youth very crucial when supplying blood.

Right now, the minimum age to donate blood in Nevada is 16 with parental consent, or 17 without it. That range prevents a lot of high schoolers from donating. I did a little poll in my high school, and I found that a lot of the underclassmen—freshmen and sophomores—would have donated blood if they could [but] they are not allowed to; they have that limit, unfortunately. If lowered, the amount of donors will increase, and ultimately, there will be more blood.

To donate blood, you currently need to meet two requirements: height and weight. I think keeping those requirements for the new lowered ages will still prevent bad things from happening. A lot of people cannot donate blood because it is unhealthy, and you should be able to keep those recommend— If you cannot donate blood, you should not. It is harmful for you, and you would not be able to, even if you aged up anyway. They should still keep those to prevent harm from being done.

I think that lowering the minimum donating age to 14 will greatly increase the number of youth donors. This will lead to a lot more blood in blood banks and, ultimately, less of a strain for healthcare workers who need that blood for people.

I am a cadet at my local fire station, and I ride along with the emergency medical technicians, and you really see the importance of that blood. It is really needed. I do not know if a lot of people think about it, but [it is] definitely needed. I help set up and run the blood banks too. It is nice when a lot of people go, and I would like to see more youth come in.

Chair Rios:

[Any] questions at this time?

Youth Legislator Breeden:

I donated blood at my school this Monday, where I was one pound over the limit, so I was able to, but my 17-year-old best friend was one pound over and could not. How many 14-year-olds could donate blood when there is a majority of high schoolers who are trying to donate who are at the minimum age but not at the minimum height or weight?

Youth Legislator Rosas:

You have to be over both of them, and a lot of people are not going to meet both of those requirements. They are unfortunately not going to be able to. I recognize that a lot of underclass younger people are not going to meet those standards, and that is sad. They will

not be able to donate, but I know that a couple of them will be able to, so I want to open up that door [and] possibility for the few who are able to.

If they want to donate while they are younger, they will hopefully want to donate as they age up. Lowering the age will not mean less donors. It will hopefully mean more, even if it is just a little bit.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time? [Any] questions in the north?

Youth Legislator Chong:

Do you know why existing law sets the blood donation age at 16? I was really interested in this bill. I think it has the potential for a lot of change, but I saw that [in] most states it is uniformly at 16. Is there any reason why this limit is in terms of maybe biology, and have you talked to blood banks or other health professionals about this?

Youth Legislator Rosas:

I have talked to Banner Health, a local clinic in my city, and Vitalant. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations are the reason it is at 16 and 17 right now. They do not know why it is like that. With the Vitalant workers I have spoken with, they said there is no reason why it has to be at 16. Now, I am sure that there is— I would have to come back at you with an answer for that, but it is because of FDA regulations. I do not know why it is specifically 16.

Chair Rios:

Any other questions at this time?

Youth Legislator Chang:

Two questions; one is a follow-up to Youth Legislator Chong, and one is my own. If there are FDA regulations that set the minimum age limit for 16, then how would changing State laws affect that if it is a federal regulation?

Youth Legislator Rosas:

If it is federal [and] if it is a national thing, it is going to be a lot harder to change. I am hoping that if it can gain traction, even locally at first and then State. If we do get State, maybe we could go and do more people's minds [inaudible] a good idea. But that is hard if it is going to be FDA to change.

Youth Legislator Chang:

The second question is, if we lower the age limit [to] 16 and under, [they] would then have to get parental permission. Correct?

Youth Legislator Rosas:

Yes, I believe 16 and under will have to get parental permission.

Ms. Dimmitt:

Time [is] up.

Chair Rios:

We are going to move on to BDR 21; Youth Legislator Perry, which I believe Senator Wiener—

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

Thank you, Mister Chair. Is Youth Legislator Perry present?

Chair Rios:

Not at this time.

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

We have checked that we do not have any pre-submitted remarks to be shared. We have done that in the past where Youth Legislators have submitted remarks for the Chair to read into the record. So at this time, for consideration and understanding of this measure, Mister Chair, if you would read the summary for BDR 21. This will have to suffice at this time.

Chair Rios:

Bill Draft Request 21 is submitted by Youth Legislator G'Yanna Perry. It states existing law requires each school adopt a plan to provide progressive discipline for pupils. This bill would require each campus to have at least one restorative justice facilitator to lead a restorative justice intervention, perform assessments, offer support during an intervention, and require schools adopt at least one of the best practices for restorative justice.

I believe we do not have a questions portion.

Thank you for the wonderful presentations and for your questions today and your involvement.

Now that we have heard all the BDR proposals, I would like to give Youth Legislators a quick three-minute recess to privately consider—not discuss with our colleagues—all the information that has been presented to us. This is the time for you to decide which one BDR proposal, if any, you would like to co-sponsor.

Youth Legislators, please take time to rank the top three BDR proposals you have heard today. After the recess, I will ask Ms. Jimenez to call roll to determine co-sponsorships. When your name is called, please provide the number of the BDR proposal you would like to co-sponsor. After that, we will do another roll call vote to state your vote on the BDR proposals. When your name is called, please provide the numbers for your top three BDR proposal preferences. At this time, we will take a three-minute recess.

The NYL will now come back to order. As I stated before the recess, we will begin with a roll call vote to determine co-sponsors. When your name is called, please provide the number of the one BDR proposal, if any, you would like to co-sponsor. Alternatively, if you do not wish to co-sponsor a BDR proposal, please say so.

Ms. Jimenez, will you please call the roll?

Ms. Jimenez:

Youth Legislator Allen—BDR 13
Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores—None
Youth Legislator Breeden—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Cain—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Chang—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Chen—BDR 1
Youth Legislator Chong—BDR 7
Vice Chair Cohen—None
Youth Legislator Conyers—BDR 2
Youth Legislator Coughlin—BDR 6
Youth Legislator McCarthy—BDR 15
Youth Legislator Nguyen—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Obstgarten—BDR 18
Youth Legislator Park—None
Youth Legislator Reganti—BDR 8
Chair Rios—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Rosas—None
Youth Legislator Villatoro—BDR 7
Youth Legislator Wolf—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Walsh—BDR 17

[Youth Legislator Perry was absent for the vote.]

Chair Rios:

Now that we have taken care of the co-sponsors, let us move on to the BDR vote. When your name is called, please state the numbers for the three BDR proposals you would most like to see move forward. The seven BDR proposals with the most votes will be addressed during the October 22, 2024, NYL meeting.

Ms. Jimenez, will you please call the roll?

Ms. Jimenez:

Youth Legislator Allen—BDRs 7, 12, and 17
Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores—BDRs 16, 12, and 17
Youth Legislator Breeden—BDRs 1, 6, and 3
Youth Legislator Cain—BDRs 12, 6, and 17
Youth Legislator Chang—BDRs 6, 10, and 2
Youth Legislator Chen—BDRs 12, 1, and 10
Youth Legislator Chong—BDRs 7, 8, and 17
Vice Chair Cohen—BDRs 2, 4, and 19
Youth Legislator Conyers—BDRs 2, 8, and 18
Youth Legislator Coughlin—BDRs 6, 17, and 3
Youth Legislator McCarthy—BDRs 15, 8, and 3
Youth Legislator Nguyen—BDRs 3, 6, and 17
Youth Legislator Obstgarten—BDRs 2, 18, and 20
Youth Legislator Park—BDRs 6, 7, and 21
Youth Legislator Reganti—BDRs 17, 7, and 8
Chair Rios—BDRs 17, 1, and 18

Youth Legislator Rosas—BDRs 6, 10, and 17
Youth Legislator Villatoro—BDRs 6, 7, and 20
Youth Legislator Wolf—BDRs 6, 8, and 18
Youth Legislator Walsh—BDRs 17, 6, and 8

[Youth Legislator Perry was absent for the vote.]

Chair Rios:

Thank you. Could we please tally up those votes to see which are the top seven?

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

Please, staff and Tina, I attempted to keep a tally. To me, it looks like you have four that—
It looks like 17, 6, 8, and 7. Are those the top four? May I have confirmation of that?

Ms. Jimenez:

Yes, that is correct, Senator Wiener. We do have a tie between—

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

Then you have 3, 2, 18, and 12 that all have three.

Ms. Jimenez:

That is correct.

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

—or four.

Ms. Jimenez:

Four, yes.

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

My suggestion would be that you do another vote on those four that are remaining to get the top three. Everybody would get one vote.

Chair Rios:

We are going to go ahead and move forward with that. We are going to be having the tiebreaker vote between BDRs 3, 18, 12, and 2. Is that correct? We will give it a couple of seconds for everybody to go and read those.

Ms. Jimenez, if you could please call the roll. We are only choosing one of those four.

Ms. Jimenez:

Youth Legislator Allen—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores—BDR 18
Youth Legislator Breeden—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Cain—BDR 12

Youth Legislator Chang—BDR 2
Youth Legislator Chen—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Chong—BDR 18
Vice Chair Cohen—BDR 2
Youth Legislator Conyers—BDR 18
Youth Legislator Coughlin—BDR 3
Youth Legislator McCarthy—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Nguyen—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Obstgarten—BDR 2
Youth Legislator Park—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Reganti—BDR 12
Chair Rios—BDR 18
Youth Legislator Rosas—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Villatoro—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Wolf—BDR 18
Youth Legislator Walsh—BDR 12

[Youth Legislator Perry was absent for the vote.]

Chair Rios:

Thank you. If we could please tally those up.

If I have it correct, BDRs 6, 8, 17, 3, 7, 18, and 12 will be moving forward. Is that correct?

Ms. Jimenez:

That is correct.

Chair Rios:

Thank you for providing us with these seven BDR proposals. Youth Legislators whose BDR proposals were chosen today will have the opportunity to give more in-depth presentations about them and their BDR proposals during our October 22nd NYL meeting. Each Youth Legislator will have five minutes for their presentations and four minutes for colleagues' questions and their thoughtful answers. After these presentations, Youth Legislators will vote to select the top two BDR proposals that will be heard at our meeting on November 20, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM VI—PREVIEW OF UPCOMING ACTIVITIES, MEETINGS, AND TRAININGS

Chair Rios:

The next order of business is Item VI, which is a preview of the upcoming activities, meetings, and trainings of the NYL. Our next meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2024. I look forward to seeing all of you again. We will further consider the seven BDR proposals we chose today and select two of them for our official hearing on November 20, 2024.

After our meeting on October 22nd, we will receive trainings regarding two outside assignments: providing testimony before a public decision-making body; and outreach recruitment. Our Public Testimony Plans are due on or before November 16th. Our Outreach Recruitment letters or videos are due on or before December 14th. As always, please submit the assignments before the due date, if possible. The assignment templates for these

activities are in our training binders, and Ms. Ashdown will also send PDF fillable forms. We must send our completed plans to Senator Wiener, our Legislators, and Ms. Ashdown. (Agenda Item VI)

There is a document in your reading folder that lists these upcoming events.

AGENDA ITEM VII—YOUTH LEGISLATORS' COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND/OR DISCUSSION

Chair Rios:

Agenda Item VII is time for Youth Legislators', comments, questions, and/or discussion. I will ask Senator Wiener to lead the portion of the meeting.

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

Thank you, Chair Rios. I am awed. I am overwhelmed with joy at the excellence of ideas, research, passion, and the delivery of all of this and making it concise and being complete and thorough in presenting and in answering questions. Me, a word person, I am speechless. You all did an exemplary job. Wow. I wish I could have been there with you.

What I encourage, and we have done this from the very beginning, and now the time has come, and it will come again next month. Fourteen proposals though well-presented and well vetted, the colleagues chose the seven. Now, there are 14 proposals that can have a different kind of life [and] a different path to take. I strongly encourage each of you to reach out to your Legislators and start that conversation, because now they are on timelines to get their bill proposals in for the next session. They are on deadlines. Contact them. Certainly, you can provide the summary. Ask for time to talk with them. You can provide your remarks if you want to send that, so they can see more about—the summaries do not capture what it is you presented in your remarks. We have already had some Legislators inquire about what next level of involvement they can have with you. Please take advantage of this opportunity. They still have a window of time to request BDRs in their allocation. Please consider—it is not mandated—reaching out and seeking their support for either Assembly or Senate side. Please take advantage of this opportunity to move your measure through a request to a legislator through an individual bill introduction.

The ideas you brought, I kept thinking I was sitting in the Senate listening to each of you with your passion, commitment, and the intention behind what you wanted to do today in attempting to get yours selected for the next round. You were professional. You were exemplary. You hit the mark. Each one of you was profound, and you brought your passion, intention, and purpose. All of it came to the table as you presented and as you answered questions. I am so grateful for each of you and the privilege of being here to witness what you did today.

Any questions that you might have at this point, any thoughts you want to share, any discussion points you want to bring to this conversation? I will not be able to call on anybody, Mister Chair, so if you would call on anybody who might want to share, that would be lovely.

Chair Rios:

Youth Legislator Walsh, go ahead.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I would like to share that I am also super-duper impressed by everybody. This is really exciting. It is super late for me, because I am four [or] three hours ahead of you, but you have definitely kept me awake. Thank you for that. I had a lot of fun.

Honestly, this has helped me so much to understand so many other issues in our State that I did not even realize because of my own perspective. I want to thank everybody. I hope you have a great weekend as well. Thank you, Senator Wiener, for coming here as well. I know you are still recovering from surgery, but you were able to carve out time for us, which is really awesome. So, thank you.

Chair Rios:

Anybody else want to provide any thoughts? I will go ahead.

I want to echo Youth Legislator Walsh's remarks for Senator Wiener. Thank you for joining us. I know you are busy recovering from surgery, which is an entire task on its own. The highest appreciation for my fellow Youth Legislators. The bill proposals, you know, we sit in classes all day where we hear proposals about different ideas or in government classes. These are really some of the most well-thought-out, and the passion is bouncing off the walls; it is definitely very present.

I would, again, like to echo Youth Legislator Walsh's remarks on the difference of perspectives that we encountered today. In our own lives, we have things that are important to us. Specifically with the State of Nevada, getting to hear the different concerns that especially our Northern Nevada and rural Youth Legislators had to bring forward is really important, because we are separate parts of the State, but at the end of the day, we are one Nevada. As long as you remember that I think we will be successful as a State and as people. Thank you. It has been a wonderful experience today.

If there are no other comments from Youth Legislators, I would like to once again thank Senator Wiener. I will now open the second period of public comment—

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

Mister Chair, before you do that, in the overview of upcoming trainings—and to review again, even if you just said it—so we can plant that seed really carefully about what we have coming up between now and January. Again, to [inaudible] that one more time.

Chair Rios:

For sure. I will review Item VI, which is the preview of the upcoming activities, meetings, and trainings of the NYL, so we are all prepared and ready to go.

Our next meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2024. We will further consider the seven BDR proposals we chose today and select two of them for our official hearing on November 20, 2024; two dates there: October 22nd and November 20th.

After our meeting on October 22nd, we will receive trainings regarding two outside assignments. One of those is the providing testimony before a public decision-making body and the outreach recruitment. Our Public Testimony Plans are due on or before November 16th. Our Outreach Recruitment letters or videos are due on or before December 14th. When possible, please submit the assignments before the due date.

The assignment templates for these activities are in our training binders, and Ms. Ashdown will also send PDF fillable forms. We must send our completed plans to Senator Wiener, our Legislators, and Ms. Ashdown. All three of those must be sure to get [them]. And of course, legislators being multiple, so making sure we are “cc’ing” everybody on the emails and no one is missing out on the awesome things we are doing here in the Youth Legislature.

There is a document in your meeting folder that lists these upcoming events. Senator Wiener, is there anything else you wanted to add about those items?

Senator Wiener (Ret.):

Why I wanted you to emphasize that [is] because it is very easy for us to pass through that on an agenda. It is very important that we secure, in our minds, what these deadlines are, and what we will be doing going forward in the processing of the measure. Sometimes you do not get it on the first pass, and it is very important to understand how it all fits together as we go forward into the final stages of the BDR process as well as the outside activity. Sometimes hearing things more than once makes a difference.

Chair Rios:

Thank you, Senator Wiener, for that reminder.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Rios:

I will now open the second period of public comment. The same rules mentioned during the first period of public comment apply. Please try to avoid repeating testimony. If someone has already made your point, each person will be asked to limit their testimony to two minutes.

[Chair Rios called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.]

Do any Youth Legislators have any final thoughts or comments before adjourning? Seeing none, this will conclude our business for today. This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you all. Have a great weekend.

AGENDA ITEM IX—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Nevada Youth Legislature, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Jimenez
Research Policy Assistant

Tina Ashdown
Constituent Services Analyst/Program
Facilitator

APPROVED BY:

Youth Legislator Sebastian Rios, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item V	Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)	Bill Draft Request Proposals for the Nevada Youth Legislature 2024
Agenda Item VI	Tina Ashdown, Constituent Services Analyst/Program Facilitator, Constituent Services Unit, Research Division, LCB	Preview of Upcoming Activities, Meetings, and Trainings

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>.