

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Eighty-second Session
May 5, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Vice Chair Edgar Flores at 1:06 p.m. on Friday, May 5, 2023, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Roberta Lange, Chair
Senator Edgar Flores, Vice Chair
Senator Dina Neal
Senator Fabian Doñate
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Carrie A. Buck
Senator Robin L. Titus

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen, Assembly District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jen Sturm-Gahner, Policy Analyst
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Patricia Haddad, Clark County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Jack Giese, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Andrew LePeilbet, Chair, United Veterans Legislative Council
Hana Fahmi, ACE High School
Jonathan Norman, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers

Senate Committee on Education
May 5, 2023
Page 2

Kris Schneider
Trevor Parrish, Vegas Chamber
Gil Lopez, Charter School Association of Nevada
Gia Moore, Director, College and Career Readiness and School Choice,
Clark County School District
Ashley Cruz, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance

VICE CHAIR FLORES:

I will open the meeting of the Senate Committee on Education. Chair Lange is absent, excused for the first part of this meeting. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 207.

ASSEMBLY BILL 207 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing work-based learning programs. (BDR 34-835)

ASSEMBLYMAN DUY NGUYEN (Assembly District No. 8):

It is an honor for me to be here in front of the Senate Committee on Education. Work-based learning offers students the opportunity to connect learning in the classroom with experiences in business and industry. These programs can be beneficial for students to aid them in preparing for both post-secondary education and future careers. Work-based learning can help students acquire skills they may not be exposed to in a traditional classroom setting. It is important for us to ensure that opportunities are available for our students.

There are some barriers to work-based learning, one of which involves liability insurance. For example, there are several organizations and employers in Nevada that, due to liability concerns, reportedly do not allow Career and Technical Education (CTE) students to engage in their workplace programs unless they are over the age of 18. The problem this bill is trying to solve is to remove that barrier and increase the work-based learning opportunities for students.

According to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE), work-based learning is defined as an educational strategy that offers students the opportunity to connect classroom learning to authentic business and industry experiences. Work-based learning in Nevada is described as a continuum of experiences that help prepare students for post-secondary education and careers.

The goal of work-based learning is to assist students to be college- and career-ready through authentic connections to business and industry in a field

related to the student's career interests. This can be experienced in a variety of ways, including career-aspiration activities, career-preparation activities, career-training activities and apprenticeship-ready programs that align directly to a registered apprenticeship. While still in high school, a student may begin the program with classes at school and job training off campus.

There are about 320,000 students in the Clark County School District (CCSD) in Las Vegas, with 66 percent or 211,000 of those students, enrolled in a CTE program of study. Students who complete a CTE program in Nevada have an average 94 percent graduation rate. Students enrolled in a CTE program learn industry-specific technical skills and professional skills including communication, problem-solving, teamwork, professionalism, attendance, positive attitude and more. These CTE students learn about hundreds of industry-recognized credentials prior to graduation while also earning dual credits.

However, only 49,356 students are enrolled in this high-wage, high-demand program in high school, which is less than 25 percent of the 211,000 CTE students. That means 75 percent of students enrolling in a CTE program of study do not have access to work-based learning opportunities. Our goal is to improve the school district's ability to engage employers in work-based learning opportunities by removing barriers.

There are several strategies needed to address these challenges. Assembly Bill 207 starts by addressing the liability insurance for employers to engage in that process. Basically, if you look at the bill in the first reprint, it is simple. Section 1, subsection 1, allows a school district to purchase and maintain insurance liability. Section 1, subsection 2 ensures that the school district cannot charge the pupil or parent the costs of obtaining that insurance coverage. That is the gist of the bill.

SENATOR BUCK:

Is this going to increase opportunities or put a barrier on our rural communities and other communities that do not have the means to get liability insurance?

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

The bill uses permissive language, so it does not mandate a school district to do anything. However, if they choose to participate in a work-based learning program to create that opportunity for their students, the liability insurance can

be purchased by the school district. That way, this would not be the financial responsibility of the parents or the student.

I want to stress that the intent of A.B. 207 is not to mandate; it is to provide permissive language as is already addressed in the Guide to Work-Based Learning that NDE has established. In that section of the Guide, it recommends that the school districts establish policies around liability insurance. This bill is just codifying that in statute to be consistent with the NDE Guide.

SENATOR TITUS:

Is there anything that prohibits schools from doing this now?

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

No. There is no prohibition. There are some rules in some school districts in our State that are already doing this by best practice as indicated in the Guide from NDE. This bill is only to encourage them to be more consistent with what is going on in the guidebook and what is reflected in statute.

SENATOR TITUS:

Do you have a concrete number of businesses or job entities that would accept work-based students if the school had liability insurance? I would assume that all schools already have some sort of liability insurance.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

I do not have a concrete number of businesses so I would have to get that to you. I can speak from my own personal experience as an employer. At my workplace, we have had many requests to offer workplace learning because it is so fun to work with us. Many high school students are interested in working with my organization. But as the chief compliance person, I did not want to accept anyone under the age of 18 unless they have a sponsored program by another entity that has some sort of memorandum of understanding (MOU) with us to cover that liability cost. To small nonprofits and businesses like ours, those insurance liability premiums added to our bottom line could be detrimental, even though we really want to help those students.

SENATOR TITUS:

I also wanted to know if most schools already have liability insurance.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

Some school districts do it by best practices. Some school districts may or may not see the guidelines here and maybe they are waiting for something in statute to correlate with the guidelines so they can take that next step.

SENATOR TITUS:

My concern is when you add this language and then people get liability insurance, in my mind, it just opens the floodgates for lawsuits. The only people who really do well in those legal situations are the trial attorneys and insurance companies and not necessarily the students. I am just somewhat hesitant on opening up another way to have lawyers make money.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

This is something I have been doing for the last 3 1/2 years. We are talking about how to get more students into internships. Time and time again, we see an employer or a potential company that says they would love to have somebody come work with them.

To Senator Titus's question about how many employers would like to have high school kids come work with them, we know there will be a lot of interest. The employers' concern is generally with students from the ages of 15 to 17 who want to get into the workforce. I do not think the school district has the type of insurance that covers a student when they leave the school campus. Schools have insurance for when they have a sporting event or an event on campus, but they do not have the other liability insurance.

I have done some research on this that goes back 20 years. Lately, employers feel like you have to be 18 or else you cannot touch a shovel or manipulate anything. I looked up the federal laws and there is nothing to prohibit a student from going to a construction site or a factory or any workplace short of working in a nitroglycerin factory.

There are companies right now that are working with schools. They insure the kids and then the companies go find internships or positions for students and they carry liability insurance with them. That works, but in most of these cases, it is a small group of students that they can work with—kids who fit certain categories and check certain boxes.

What we are trying to do is provide more and more opportunities for a variety of kids who want to get into a career before getting out of school. They want to get into something that fits them. That is why the permissive language is good in this bill. It is to help those companies feel like they have coverage. I would imagine once they have that, you are going to see a whole lot of people wanting to get involved in this.

SENATOR NEAL:

Will the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) cover the insurance if it is a work-based learning program?

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I have worked with Workforce Connections, and I believe there are programs where WIOA has covered some of the students. However, it depends on the student and who is part of that program. If we want to talk about expanding and offering this opportunity to more students, you are going to have to have something like this bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

I think expanding the availability is this bill's intent. As I said earlier, there are existing programs throughout the State, whether it is CTE programs or work-based learning programs, whether with Workforce Connections or other entities that exist for select types of students. But there is not necessarily a general availability.

If I do not belong to any of those programs and I am in a school district that may not have a connection with those programs, I may be out of luck. If I want to learn how to make a cake and I want to go to the local pastry shop across the street from my house, that business owner may or may not be participating in any of the existing programs for the school district. I can then go to my teacher and say, "Hey, can I go and get some work experience out of this bakery?" If the employer says no, because I am only 16 and the employer does not want me touching any equipment because I might break it or get injured, with this bill, the liability insurance can be purchased by the school district so I can participate.

The other part of the bill is that we want to ensure that the responsibility of the insurance does not fall back to the students or parents, because those insurance

premiums would be lower when purchased with a large group discount from a school district than it would be for an individual participant.

SENATOR NEAL:

You want the school district or charter school to maintain the insurance, and I know it is permissive, but there is no fiscal note on this bill. Clearly, it is going to cost money, where is that coming from? We just had CCSD oppose summer school. How will CCSD pass this and bring this to fruition and then make it a potential trigger or non-trigger for the students?

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

I do not have the answer to that question. There are programs that exist and this is just to expand it so other folks can participate. I could find that answer for you and send it to the Committee as well.

SENATOR NEAL:

This your first Session. If you pass this bill, which I am sure you will, this is one of the ones that you are going to have to work on after you leave the building so your intent is actually implemented. Understand that because you put in permissive language, which is the "may," you might run into some encounters where somebody says, "Well, you did not mandate that we do it; this is permissive, and we are telling you now that we do not have the money."

Just so you know, real life is when we leave this building, and the agencies or entities that we place these laws upon read these sentences verbatim. So good luck on implementing it in real life.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I agree with Senator Neal. You are putting permissive language in there, hoping that maybe a school district will want to try it. There might be a small school district that tries it, so it can be a pilot district. Maybe you could add that the school can accept gifts or grants. I do not know if there is anything that stops them from doing that. Maybe there are several businesses in the community that want to contribute to offset the cost and pay for this liability insurance; then the students can come in and start participating. That might be something for you to look into.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

I am learning a lot about this process and I am really blessed to have the guidance from all of you on this Committee as well as the entire Club 63. I want to make sure that this gets implemented, especially for immigrant populations since I am an immigrant myself. This will facilitate an opportunity for us to be able to participate where there is a partnership between the school and the business world, or the "real world," as we call it.

I want to give students every opportunity to be successful through these types of programs. I love the idea of having community participation as well as other support for financial responsibility. As far as limited resources, I know this is not a money committee, but I just want to make sure that the intent is for us to create access and reduce the barriers. That is why A.B. 207 is here.

PATRICIA HADDAD (Clark County School District):

In its initial intent, A.B. 207 aimed to make work-based learning more appealing to businesses. Due to an amendment from the original language, it will actually have the opposite effect. The original language of the bill provided immunity from civil liability for failure to obtain coverage or obtain a specific amount of coverage at sites outside of the jurisdiction of school districts. Without the original provisions, the amended bill will likely result in school districts reducing or eliminating work-based learning opportunities in most of the State. Therefore, CCSD is in opposition to the bill.

Students engaged in work-based learning may or may not be considered employees by the company's workers' compensation policy because they are not being paid by the company. As a result, there may not be coverage for injuries if that occurs to the students who participate. Adding these students to the company's workers' compensation policy is too expensive for many small employers. This prevents those companies from participating in work-based learning programs.

The liability associated with a student's action usually falls on the employer supervising the work, not the school district. This places another financial burden on the business. To address liability and coverage for students participating in work-based learning programs, CCSD enters into individualized agreements with participating businesses. We self-insure any potential liability associated with a student's participation and utilize the protections under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 41 in case of a claim against CCSD.

While this bill provides the enabling language for school districts to purchase additional coverage to make the program more appealing to businesses, removing that initial provision that provides immunity from civil liability leaves school districts vulnerable if an incident does occur and adequate limits are not purchased.

If the bill is passed, businesses will continue to bear the entire financial burden of the liability, which is especially difficult for these smaller businesses. Without protection, school districts will be discouraged from purchasing this additional coverage because there is no protection for them if the wrong level of coverage is purchased.

In closing, should this bill become law without adding back section 3 from the initial drafting, it will force school districts to make decisions to protect their limited funding and prevent litigation by not participating in these programs. Students will suffer because of reduced learning opportunities and the business community will suffer because we will not have students who are skilled and entering into those professions. I have submitted my letter ([Exhibit C](#)) in opposition to A.B. 207.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

It is always hard to get up and oppose a bill when you know the sponsor is trying to help kids, and that is the case here. As my colleague just pointed out, this bill will have the opposite effect.

There was a lot of confusion about the bill. We talked about it yesterday at a Nevada Association of School Superintendents meeting. Superintendents wanted to report what they are doing in their districts, but they did not know how to address the issue. When the bill first came out, it was a good bill. It had a section 3 that read:

The board of trustees of a school district and the governing body of a charter school are immune from civil liability for actions based upon the failure of the board of trustees or governing body to obtain insurance coverage as authorized by this section or to obtain a particular amount of insurance coverage.

When that was in the bill, it made good sense. If you want to buy insurance, you had some assurance that you were not going to get sued if you did not get

what attorneys call “appropriate coverage.” The amendment took that section out and that is what caused a problem. As Senator Titus pointed out, you can buy the insurance now and take your chances, with or without the bill.

The original bill afforded some cover, especially for smaller school districts. That is no longer in there. Keep in mind, we have over 2,100 Nevada students involved in work-based learning programs. So this is a big deal for school districts and it is a big deal to keep these programs going. Senator Hammond pointed out how important these programs have been to school districts and what an opportunity it is for the students.

The original bill would have helped the issue, but the amendment has really put a damper on things. School districts do not want to buy insurance and then take the chance of having inappropriate coverage.

JACK GIESEA (Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):
We are testifying in support, and I will submit my full comments ([Exhibit D](#)) to the Committee staff. Apologies for the confusion on the phone testimony, but I did want to register our support of A.B. 207 on the record.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

I was just taking notes diligently trying to make sure I register every comment that was made in opposition. One thing I want to make clear is that this has already been done in practice throughout the State. I am just adding the language to be consistent in NRS with best practices as already indicated in the NDE Guide to Work-Based Learning.

Some of these same opposition issues were raised when we were in the Assembly. The Assembly passed the bill unanimously because the concern was that having this immunity clause removed would be a detriment to the program. I think that would be a stretch, because research shows many programs within NRS right now in our school districts do not have the same language. We do not have immunity for civil liability on anything else currently in NRS.

By putting this particular language back into this bill, we will create a whole new situation with every program that a school district does. We will come back and say, “Hey, you give work-based learning a civil liability immunity blanket. So because you give that to them, please give that to us, too.”

That is a concern for me because, in current practice, MOUs and individualized agreements can already be done at a school district level through the *Nevada Administrative Code* to execute some of these programs.

There are liability discussions that could be done in those MOUs with the employers and school districts. We have a responsibility to create access and that is what this bill is doing. It is codifying something that is already being done in practice and making it accessible to every student, not just certain students, of our great State.

I look forward to working further with the opposition on this bill, but they have not brought anything new to the table since the discussion in the Assembly. I want to make sure I am proactive with this, and we will work together just like Senator Neal suggested, to ensure that this gets implemented afterwards. That is my intention. We are not going to create a bill here and just let it sit in a desk somewhere, not getting used. My intention is to create opportunities for all of the students out there, including the immigrant community, which I am a part of and am also serving. We want to make sure we give every opportunity we can to those that need them.

SENATOR BUCK:

Are you not willing to remove the amendment? Because I am trying to grasp why a school district would even implement work-based learning if it opens them up to a larger liability.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN:

The current programs, even before this language, already exist. I am not creating anything new or resetting the rules that are already in place. Basically, this has already been done in practice. This is just to remove the financial responsibility, if there is any, from the parents or students. The opposition right now from the State is on the liability piece. Currently, there is no language in NRS that states any programs have liability immunity in NRS.

SENATOR BUCK:

To me, it seems like it puts a big burden on school districts and taxpayers.

VICE CHAIR FLORES:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 207 and give the gavel back to Chair Lange.

Senate Committee on Education
May 5, 2023
Page 12

CHAIR LANGE:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 185.

ASSEMBLY BILL 185 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the education of pupils who are children of military personnel. (BDR 34-524)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ERICA MOSCA (Assembly District No. 14):

Nevada is one of the only states that does not have advanced enrollment policies for military dependents. That means when a dependent gets a permanent change of station (PCS), they cannot automatically enroll in school.

I am a proud active-duty, enlisted military spouse. My husband has had orders to Texas, Alaska, Nevada, Japan and back to Nevada while also deploying to Afghanistan and Qatar, all before his thirty-fifth birthday. We do not have children, but a large majority of the active-duty military families in our Country do. Typically, they say that housing and education are the hardest things to deal with when they relocate, especially if they have children.

To solve this problem, we could adopt advanced enrollment policies. What that means is that a young person could use the military base address, also called the installation address, to enroll in school ahead of their PCS. They could use that address in Infinite Campus, too, and then by the next school year, they would have to show that they do live in that school's attendance zone.

We are not trying to say military families can have open enrollment anywhere. We are saying that because of the issues with housing right now, young people could move here and not be able to enroll in school for many weeks because they do not have an actual address. This would also apply to charter school lottery applications and enrollment processes. The CCSD in southern Nevada already does this for magnet and CTE programs, but they do not do it for all the schools.

Finally, the bill also asks to codify that school districts will make reasonable efforts to allow students to finish school when they move. This idea came from Superintendent Dr. Summer Stevens of Churchill County School District, the school district connected to Naval Air Station Fallon. She shared with me that when students move away from her school district, she has helped them utilize online classes so they could finish their studies and graduate.

During the Assembly hearing, we heard some examples of how advanced enrollment could help military families. One testifier told of a family who had a PCS order to move from the East Coast to Las Vegas. They could not get lodging at the Nellis Air Force Base because it was so overcrowded, so they instead rented a room in a temporary hotel. When they went to enroll in a school, they were not allowed to use the hotel address because under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, they did not qualify because they were not unhoused.

That family had to work directly with the CCSD legal department to get their student enrolled in school. A month later, they finally got their house and their child had to transfer to yet another school. That is exactly what we are trying to prevent for families. Just let them go to the school they plan to go to. That way, by the next school year, if they are going to continue going to that school, they can show that they live in the attendance zone for the school.

I submitted a bill summary ([Exhibit E](#)) and will point out the important points in the bill. In section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), there are definitions; paragraph (b) gives the practical matter of using the military base as the address; and paragraph (d) references the example of allowing students to finish if practicable. Subsection 4 requires the family to show proof of residency.

Finally, I will share that in creating this bill, I was trying to find something practical that could work for everybody. I talked to many stakeholders including all 17 school districts, the State Public Charter School Authority and Coral Academy, which is the public charter school operator at Nellis Air Force Base. I also spoke to the leadership of the Nevada National Guard and the leadership at Nellis Air Force Base. Other stakeholders were contacted, including Dr. Brian Wiseman, the principal of K-12 schools at Creech Air Force Base in Indian Springs, as well as the NDE and the CCSD central office staff because they are the ones who would actually have to implement the bill. They confirmed this could be implemented on Infinite Campus.

I have spoken with many military spouses and families. One woman, Sharene Brown, the spouse of General Charles Q. Brown, the 22nd Chief of Staff of the Air Force, agreed that advanced enrollment is one of the biggest things U.S. military families advocate for.

SENATOR TITUS:

Reaching out to all 17 counties is important with the different demographics we have in our State. Several sessions ago, I put in a bill proposing that a charter school could hold aside several spots for military families. This was specifically relating to Fallon because of the Naval Air Station there, but it could have applied to any military base. You mentioned the charter school lottery, so I am wondering how this bill would affect that process. Would families be able to apply for the lottery program using the base as their address?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

Currently, if someone wants to apply to Coral Academy, the charter school at Nellis, and they are coming from a different state, they cannot apply because they do not have a local address. If you could use the base address that is on your PCS orders, they would allow that to be submitted for both the lottery and the enrollment process. According to Coral Academy, it is the enrollment process that is the bigger issue.

SENATOR TITUS:

At least that would put them on even ground with all the other kids trying to get into the lottery program. My bill was for the charter school to hold a couple of slots for military kids because they did not know when they were going to be showing up and they would not have an address to solve this problem. The way you have it in your bill, it gives them equity in the application process.

SENATOR BUCK:

The same thing happened to my son, a Green Beret Army Ranger who was serving in Washington State at Joint Base Lewis–McChord and had to move to Fort Bragg in North Carolina with his two German shepherds and two kids, and they could not get housing. They had to live in a hotel for about seven months until housing was available, and schooling was definitely an issue.

I know this is a national issue and I really like the bill. Is there any way to add an amendment to give priority to these military personnel in lotteries, particularly for charter schools and maybe magnet schools? Many charter schools have sibling priority, but could we have a military personnel priority?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

The Clark County School District does do this for magnet and CTE schools because, if you think about it, you could be in Florida and you could be working

on advanced manufacturing, and you do not know which school does advanced manufacturing when you come to CCSD. They actually do a direct connect to help that student continue on that track. I am open to talking to you and see if that makes sense after talking to the State Public Charter School Authority and the other groups.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I think we did a military priority a couple years ago, but it may only be for Coral Academy on Nellis Air Force Base. If I recall, we limited it to military personnel and contractors who worked at the facility. I do not know if we did something other than that, but I know that exists and we are checking right now.

SENATOR BUCK:

Not all military personnel live on base. A lot of them live off site and commute. So, if we could look into all charter schools ensuring that they prioritize military students somewhere in the hierarchy, I would support that.

SENATOR TITUS:

I think what you are mentioning was included in my bill that did not pass.

CHAIR LANGE:

We are having our legal counsel check that out.

JEN STURM-GAHNER (Policy Analyst):

I have been in contact with our Committee counsel and per NRS 388A.456, subsection 1, paragraph (c), subparagraph (4), it gives priority enrollment for pupils who reside on a military base if the charter school is at the military base.

CHAIR LANGE:

I will take testimony in support of A.B. 185.

ANDREW LEPEILBET (Chair, United Veterans Legislative Council):

We represent 279,000 veterans in our State, our National Guard and our active military. We are in support of this bill and have been for a long time. We wish Senator Titus's bill had gone through a long time ago.

To give you some perspective, when you get a PCS order, it is a traumatic thing for families. I have personally gone through it quite a few times. It is difficult on

the families because the communication is lacking on where to go, who to talk to and more. Some of these families move and are without permanent housing for as long as three months. As Senator Buck pointed out, it was seven months in her son's case. It can be a very difficult situation.

Allowing the use of the address of the military base the family has been transferred to is an enormous improvement and simplifies the lives of these families of our veterans and our active military. We are in high support of A.B. 185.

HANA FAHMI (ACE High School):

I am speaking on behalf of ACE High School, the Reno public charter school focused on construction, engineering, transportation, mining and manufacturing. ACE actively works with military families and we support A.B. 185.

MS. PIERCZYNSKI:

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents is in strong support of this bill and think it should be passed.

MS. HADDAD:

This is something that CCSD already implemented to ensure that our students from military families are prioritized. We are in support of this legislation and I have submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit F](#)).

JONATHAN NORMAN (Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers):

I do not think we supported this on the Assembly side because the line was so long to support that we got tired of waiting. We support it now.

KRIS SCHNEIDER:

I am speaking in support of A.B. 185. I represent Mountain View Lutheran School, the first private school in Nevada to be recognized as a Purple Star School, which designates schools that are focused on helping military-connected children and their families. This bill is right up the alley of any of our Purple Star Schools. It allows our State to be in better compliance with and allows better implementation of the Military Interstate Children's Compact.

From the perspective of athletics, which is a good way for a child to feel included at a new school, this would allow those PCS children to be able to get into athletics right away. My only concern is ensuring that once the student has

moved from the base address to their new permanent address, they should not lose their eligibility for 180 school days, as is required in the current National Institutes of Health guidelines. I could be wrong, but I would encourage that to be looked into so those students are not losing yet another connection to feel more attached in their new location.

TREVOR PARRISH (Vegas Chamber):

The Vegas Chamber is in support of A.B. 185 because assisting children of military families with enrollment into schools is common sense. Moving to different states as often as military families do is extremely difficult on their children already. So giving these families every resource they need to help their children get back into the classroom as soon as possible is something our State can help with.

GIL LOPEZ (Charter School Association of Nevada):

The Charter School Association of Nevada is in strong support of A.B. 185. We have a couple of schools that service military families and this will have a great impact on them. I have submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR LANGE:

I will submit four letters of support that we received ([Exhibit H](#)) and close the hearing on A.B. 185 and open the hearing on A.B. 256.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 256 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to work-based learning programs. (BDR 34-534)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ERICA MOSCA (Assembly District No. 14):

This bill goes well with the first bill we heard today. Assembly Bill 256 is trying to solve the problem of how the background check law is being interpreted when it comes to work-based learning. I submitted a bill summary ([Exhibit I](#)).

In 2019, S.B. No. 185 of the 80th Session was passed, requiring businesses, organizations or agencies that want to participate with schools in work-based learning or to be internship hosts, to have their entire company background checked. This means it is very difficult for students in CTE and magnet programs to actually intern or do work-based learning during the school day.

Here is an example of why this is an issue. If you are in the culinary track program at CCSD and you are learning to be a baker and you want to go to a

casino to work in their big shop, the current law says that every single employee at that casino must be background checked because, in theory, anyone could do something inappropriate with a student.

What A.B. 256 is trying to say is that we must make sure young people are safe, but we also want them to be able to have these work-based learning experiences. The change this bill is making is to say that the person who is the manager or the supervisor of the student must be background checked so they are liable if anything happens. It excludes the company from having their entire staff background checked.

I talked to all the school districts and found that the bill is being interpreted differently on the ground. I wanted to make sure it was clear that somebody must be background checked and that we are using the NDE work-based learning policies. However, there is local control when it comes to school boards, so you will see more of that later in the bill. Gia Moore in Las Vegas with CCSD will talk about how this actually works in our largest school district.

GIA MOORE (Director, College and Career Readiness and School Choice, Clark County School District):

I oversee a number of programs in CCSD, including our magnet schools, CTE academies and our CTE department. Assemblywoman Mosca outlined the challenges surrounding this background check law. Within the CCSD, our goal over the past several years has been to increase offerings and enrollment in high-skill, high-demand and high-wage CTE programs of study to align with our State workforce needs. While we hear that there is a constant need from employers to have skilled professionals, our ability for students to engage in work-based learning opportunities is often hindered by the current background check process.

As mentioned earlier, 66 percent of all CCSD high school students are enrolled in a CTE program of study. Each year, our students graduate having earned industry-recognized credentials in high-need areas including manufacturing, health care and technology. We want our students to make these connections with potential employers prior to graduation and build those relationships so their hard work does not evolve into a missed opportunity to keep our graduates in Nevada.

While the background check law was well-intentioned, we have missed out on countless opportunities with employers unable to have every employee screened, particularly with larger industry areas. For example, in partnership with the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, we were asked to be part of a portal with a one-stop internship. It was matchmaking essentially, through an online portal. This opportunity was formed out of our common goal of strengthening southern Nevada's workforce by dramatically enhancing internship placements.

Unfortunately, this opportunity did not come to fruition as each employer and employee of the partnering businesses featured in this portal would have had to have completed background checks for our students to be able to participate. This is just one of many examples. I appreciate your consideration in helping us remove obstacles for keeping our talent here in Nevada.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

I can quickly go over the bill, starting in section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b), where it would exempt employees from background checks other than the person who is overseeing the student. In section 1.5, subsection 4, paragraph (d), subparagraph (1), we want students to be trained in "identifying and reporting harassment in the workplace," and subparagraph (2) directs the training to include "developing and maintaining healthy relationships in the workplace." This way, there would be pretraining for young people to know if they are seeing something that may be inappropriate or unhealthy in a workplace.

Section 2 includes information about local control. The existing work-based learning guidelines through the NDE are important because we want standards, but there can be some local control when it comes to one-off cases of work-based learning and internships.

Finally, some businesses have ten employees, and some have thousands of employees. Currently, those larger ones do not take our students for internships because they are not willing to do background checks of every employee. On a much smaller scale, at my nonprofit that I started and ran for a decade, internships were pretty integral to what we did. Young people could actually experience what they were learning on the ground, whether it was how to write a professional email or how to not be on your phone at work.

We had a young person intern at NV Energy as a tenth grader. He is now in college at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas with a paid internship with his same internship host, NV Energy. It is important that young people from our most marginalized communities can have social capital access to gain whatever skills and opportunities they want. From an equity standpoint, private schools like Cristo Rey St. Viator in Las Vegas already do this, and Colorado and Michigan are states with robust work-based learning programs that allow this.

SENATOR NEAL:

In section 1.5, subsection 4, paragraph (d), subparagraph (2) of the bill, it talks about training so students can understand healthy relationships. What would be included in that? The first thing that came to my mind was grooming. It could potentially be multiple people who are overseeing the student, so can we add some more plurality to that? Could we include anyone who comes in direct contact with the student versus just the supervisor or manager?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

That is definitely the intent. We want to make sure that anybody who has contact with the student is background checked, because that is the way it is at schools. Even a parent who wants to come onto a school campus has to get background checked because they will have interactions with students. I appreciate the idea of making sure things like grooming are included. I was thinking that training would be not only identifying inappropriate behaviors, but also tone and respect for the young person. We do not want them to just be used as free labor.

SENATOR NEAL:

In grooming, typically the groomer becomes your friend and makes you believe that, then it is like this slow scaling that leads to other, inappropriate behaviors. That is why I think it is important to include grooming.

SENATOR TITUS:

I share Senator Neal's concerns regarding who will and who will not have the background checks. I believe in removing barriers and getting these young folks out there, but if we are just doing background checks on their supervisors, I worry that anyone who has unsupervised contact with our youth would also need a background check. I agree that when you go into a big company with, say, 200 employees, maybe only 4 or 5 of them will be interacting with the student. If a student is prepping in a restaurant and he or she is in a room with

ten people all prepping, I am fine with not all of them being background checked. On the other hand, if there is going to be a one-on-one contact with someone other than a supervisor, like going out on a delivery with one employee, I feel that person needs to have had a background check.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

That is helpful. Both you and Senator Neal mentioned the idea of direct contact, so it is not just the supervisor. I can work on that amendment.

CHAIR LANGE:

I will take testimony in support of A.B. 256.

ASHLEY CRUZ (Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):

We support A.B. 256. When working with partners to bring diverse industries and careers to our communities, agencies are asked two things: is there available and developable lands, and the second question is about the talent pipeline. The ability to provide opportunities for students to develop job-specific skills while earning a formal education not only enhances the student experience, it also affords them the opportunity to be an immediately desirable candidate for their industry.

Additionally, it increases workforce productivity, encourages talent retention, promotes career advancement, and works to address the skills gaps. The Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance sees work-based learning as an effective way to support workforce development.

MR. NORMAN:

At the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, we have students from Cristo Rey St. Viator school at our office. This work-based learning exposes them to attorneys in a professional environment that they would not otherwise have the opportunity to experience. For a lot of kids from marginal economic backgrounds, the opportunity to be exposed to professional environments is going to come from opportunities through their schools. For students from parts of Las Vegas like Summerlin, their parents are going to make sure those kids have these opportunities. But for kids that I work with in foster care and in the communities in the downtown area where I live, those kids are going to rely on the schools to create these opportunities for them.

Assembly Bill 256 goes a long way toward providing that important exposure to all kinds of workplaces. I would also point out that you can get a job in this State when you are a minor, so we do not think of the same screening because we rely on the human resources department of each business to have some responsibility for ensuring that all employees are safe in that workplace. This bill has a lot of great things in it to create opportunities for Nevada students. We support it.

MR. GIESEA:

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) supports A.B. 256. We currently partner with some Nevada System of Higher Education institutions in southern Nevada and the Clark County Summer Business Institute to recruit high school and college-age students for flexible and paid internships that provide insight into many of the RTC's numerous responsibilities. This bill represents a great opportunity to provide additional chances for students looking to enhance their leadership skills and obtain valuable experience as they explore careers that may be best suited for them. Work-based learning is a key component of a successful workforce development pipeline. We urge your support of the bill.

MR. LOPEZ:

The Charter School Association of Nevada strongly supports A.B. 256. Work-based learning programs offer students valuable opportunities to gain practical skills, experience and connections in their desired fields. We thank you for bringing this bill forward and urge your support.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

I look forward to working on the suggestions that were given. I will make sure I follow up with you.

Senate Committee on Education
May 5, 2023
Page 23

CHAIR LANGE:

I am submitting two letters of support ([Exhibit J](#)) for this bill and will close the hearing on A.B. 256 and open public comment. Seeing none, I will adjourn the meeting of the Senate Committee on Education at 2:19 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Roberta Lange, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 207	C	9	Patricia Haddad / CCSD	Opposition Letter
A.B. 207	D	10	Jack Giese / RTC of Southern Nevada	Support Testimony
A.B. 185	E	13	Assemblywoman Erica Mosca	Bill Summary
A.B. 185	F	16	Patricia Haddad / CCSD	Letter of Support
A.B. 185	G	17	Gil Lopez / CSAN	Letter of Support
A.B. 185	H	17	Chair Roberta Lange	Four Letters of Support
A.B. 256	I	17	Assemblywoman Erica Mosca	Bill Summary
A.B. 256	J	23	Chair Roberta Lange	Two Letters of Support