

MINUTES OF MEETING - COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION - 54TH NEVADA ASSEMBLY SESSION

March 14, 1967

Meeting convened in Room 32 at the morning recess, Tuesday, March 14, 1967.

PRESENT: Garfinkle, Prince, Getto, Webb & Wilson

ABSENT: Foote & Espinosa

SPEAKERS: Mel Close, Speaker of the Assembly and James Wood, Assemblyman

Action was taken on the following business:

SB 136 Increases number of members of board of regents of University of Nevada.

Mel Close was the first speaker and he stated that he was in favor of SB 136 which would give Clark County two additional Regents on the Board of Regents. He said there was justification for doing so. Clark County would not in any way control the Regency. It would be a 6-5 Board. 6 from the other counties and 5 from Clark County. He believes that the present Board of Regents works for the State as a whole and not for any particular county. It would be a step forward to give Clark County two additional Regents. Clark County would be well satisfied and would undoubtedly elect qualified Regents to serve on the Board.

Mr. Webb: Asked Mr. Close if he knew the feeling of the Senate in respect to Clark County's attitude regarding the Medical School.

Mr. Close: Said he didn't really know. He had talked to several of the Senate but hadn't actually asked for a definite opinion from any of them. His opinion is still the same.

Mr. Garfinkle: If the Regents were apportioned on a population basis what would happen if Clark County would get 65 percent of the total population? What would stop the Regents from eventually becoming domineering?

Mr. Close: I don't know. It would be on the 1-1 ratio. If this would happen and Clark County would, sometime in the future, get a majority the feeling here among the legislators from Washoe and Clark County is that sometimes they watch out more for the small counties than they have in the past with the reapportionment of the legislature. Believe this would possibly be true with the Regents too. He felt something like this would be to speculative.

Mr. Garfinkle: Two things he doesn't like are (1) being issued a summons, and (2) questioning the integrity of the present Board. This hasn't been fair.

Mr. Close: Anybody can file a suit. We here in the legislature are not compelled to do anything. I don't think the present Board is prejudice to a point they would want to do any damage to the University or deliberately sabotage the Southern campus but most of them are graduates of the Northern campus, live here, have their ties here and are therefore closer to this campus.

Mr. Getto: Then if the Regents are reapportioned the trend will be to the other way.

Mr. Close: The Regents now and in the next few years will not be as closely associated with the Campus.

Mr. Getto: How do you feel about the Board of Regents?

Mr. Close: As the school system is one, it should be operating as such. However, budgeting for the schools should be separate with the Regents having the power to apportion the monies given them for both schools.

Mr. Prince: One thing that is quite startling to me is that if we go on a reapportionment basis Southern Nevada could have the majority of Regents and this could certainly be a great hindrance...Hate the thought of reapportionment of the regents.

Mr. Close: You feel that the present Regents are prejudice?

Mr. Prince: Not now but it could happen.

Mr. Garfinkle asked Mr. James Wood for his remarks.

Mr. Wood stated that he thinks the words already spoken were healthy, wise and had wisdom. However, there is a difference in concept of this particular piece of legislation. The Board of Regents at present are properly constituted and functioning under the Constitution of the State of Nevada. Court action has been filed to reapportion the Board of Regents. If there is to be a reapportionment it seems that this is certainly worthy of consideration. He believes the legislature is putting the "cart before the horse". What is really the urgency of reapportionment of the Board of Regents. It seems that the courts, in the future will order the reapportionment. The facts that have to be considered are the facilities at both campuses, consider the functions that are going on at present, and most important the enrollment of the two campuses. (He didn't have the figures with him) but the enrollment at Southern is not as much as it is at the Northern campus. 60 percent of the enrollment is at the Northern Campus. I don't see under the present structure of the Board of Regents any discrimination at all. What is the urgency that we should reach out ahead of the constitution and courts and reapportion the Board of Regents, if something were wrong...yes, something you could criticize them for...yes. They are going to become separate sooner or later and we will have two separate campuses operating entirely independent of one another. I am not advocating it today, but it will eventually happen. When this is done, then the Board of Regents should be separated. I certainly respect the remarks of the speaker we just have a slight difference of opinion but both agree on the same objectives.

Mr. Getto: I am trying to look at it from all sides. About the enrollment at the USN in respect to reapportionment do you think that if the facilities were there it would not be a larger school than the Northern Campus?

Mr. Wood: I read in the newspaper that they would soon have to turn down admission to Southern campus. They are reaching a point where more facilities are needed. The Nevada campus is much larger structurally. We must not lose sight of the fact that because the Northern campus is located in Reno it serves only Reno...it serves Western Nevada and some of California. It is a small percentage of students that are local, most of them are from outlying areas. There is going to be a need for more facilities in Clark County.

Mr. Wilson: At this point do you feel you would rather see the Board of Regents reapportioned by court order than by mandate of the legislative body?

Mr. Wood: Procedures in the court which none of us here know the answer to. We as legislators are acting in the face of a court order and the action is premature. There will come very shortly a period when the two campuses will be separated,

Assembly Committee on Education

separate Board of Regents, and separate requests from the legislature.

Mr. Prince: This bill doesn't actually ask for reapportionment...just that two more regents from Clark County be added.

Mr. Frank Young: The Constitution establishes the University but does not determine the Board of Regents. Legislation establishes the make up of the Board of Regents.

Mr. Garfinkle: Statute changed it from 5 to 9 in 1958.

Mr. Wood: Asked for the Committees support in introducing legislation for a 2 year medical school. He stated that his primary interest in this particular issue is one of long range planning. Any medical school planning that is to be undertaken must be done on a long range plan. Dr. Hugh Follmer, advocates that any planning should take and require a space from 8 to 10 years. Washoe Medical Center will shortly be undertaking construction of additional facilities and these would be designed along the lines giving consideration to the two year medical school. In clarifying a statement in a Clark County newspaper making reference to the cost running from 25 to 30 million dollars. For the most part, that mount of money is foundation or gift money over a period of time. The big cost is the maintenance cost after the school becomes functional in the year approximately 1972. We would be required to come up with \$215,000.00. It is the feeling that the medical association together with some of the business firms could come up with that amount of money as a gift for the entire program to facilitate a two year medical school. The medical men of the State have the vision..not me. I believe as they believe that the State of Nevada must encourage some of their own medical talent. Would like to see the committee support a Resolution of intent on the Assembly floor by vote.

Mr. Wilson: The amount of money involved in this type of thing is the point that is vague to everybody concerned. This factor will have to be taken in to consideration because of the position with which we find ourselves in in trying to raise the revenue to keep the present programs going. What are we going to do about the basic elementary curriculum that is lacking and needs strengthening. I don't believe you can finance something on suppositions.

Mr. Wood: Your words are well founded. However, one responsibility of the legislature to the State of Nevada is development and enhancement of education in the State.. Primary concern has been the need for more money for the schools of Nevada. We may have to increase the sales tax in order to just take care of basic education. Now comes an opportunity to take into education a multi-million dollar program gifted by the Kellogg and Commonwealth Foundation (You can read in the Prospectus on your desks the amount of money they will have available)All they ask in return is for the legislature to show legislative intent to maintain the medical school at a later date. No doctors will come out of the program until 1978 or 79.

Mr. Close: I am opposed to a medical school at all based on a matter of logic and not emotion. the WICHE program is sponsoring 17 students in medical schools, at present. In 1972 there will be 34 students. Putting something into the State of Nevada that we don't really need with a total population of about 600,000. The doctors will go where the market is regardless of whether Nevada is their home or not. Granted, the need for doctors at the present time in the State is high because of the rapid growth...this growth will level off and one of these

days we will probably have more doctors than we need or at least be as well off as the other States. We have to limit our programs somewhere. 70 percent of the revenue now goes to education. Our primary responsibility is not to 17 or 34 students but to thousands who will be attending the University. The University should be given an opportunity for a good basic undergraduate program. In the long run our goals should not be set so high. We should be able to afford it. Nevada, at the present time, cannot afford it. I oppose it being a committee measure.

Mr. Webb: The undergraduate program is important and should be developed...the WICHE program is good.

SB 194 Clarifies residence status of university student who marries.

Mr. Kean: Took exception with just half of the bill...that is when a woman marries a man then she should have the privilege of being a resident. Women always take the mans name, etc. therefore she should also be allowed to take his residency and not be required to pay out of State tuition. Would like to have the committee consider this.

Mr. Garfinkle asked Mr. Jerry Dondero of the Governor's office to present his proposal.

Mr. Dondero stated he was here from Governor Laxalt's staff to get an expression from the committee as to support of a resolution that would call for a creation of a Nevada Advisory Committee for Higher Education. They came up with something that they feel would be workable in establishing better communications between the legislature, Governor and the board of regents. This committee would be titled "Nevada Advisory Committee for Higher Education", call for a Board consisting of 15 members, 3 Board of Regents, 4 Legislators, 1 member of the Board of Trustees from Carson College, and 7 members from the public at large appointed by the Governor. The Chairman would be appointed by the Governor from this group. The Board would function in an advisory capacity and also as a vehicle of communications between the Regents, Governor and the Legislature. The Board of Regents has approved the proposal.

Mr. Garfinkle asked him to have it drawn up as an AJR Resolution.

Mr. Webb moved that the resolution be made

Mr. Wilson seconded

Motion passed unanimously

Mr. Garfinkle will introduce it once it is like it should be.

AB 423 Changes appraisal method in sale or lease of school property.
(Wait until Thursday)

SB 136 and SB 194 Action will be taken at the next meeting.

BDR 34-1414 "Teacher aides"

This proposal states that certified personnel must be in the classroom with a teacheraide. A teacheraide can be on the playground or in the lunchroom without a certified person.

Mr. Wilson moved that the proposal be introduced.

March 14, 1967

Assembly Committee on Education

-5-

Mr. Webb seconded
Motion passed unanimously
Mr. Garfinkle will introduce on the floor.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.