

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION - 56th ASSEMBLY SESSION  
FEBRUARY 15, 1971

PRESENT: Swallow, Frazzini, Wilson, Foote, Smalley, White

ABSENT: Hawkins

GUESTS: N. Edd Miller, President of University of Nevada, Reno  
Robert I. Rose, State Board of Education  
Lonnie F. Shields, Washoe County Teacher's Assoc.  
Chairman, Teachers in Politics  
Gene Morton, Washoe County Teacher's Association  
Len Robinson, Teachers Clark County, Nevada State Ed. Assoc.  
Neil D. Humphrey, Chancellor University of Nevada System  
John M. Vergul, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Edmund R. Barmettler, University of Nevada, Reno

Chairman Swallow convened the meeting at 12:15 P.M. dispensing with reading of the minutes of previous meeting and turned the meeting over to Chancellor Humphrey for pro discussion of AB 257.

AB 257

An act relating to leaves of absence of University of Nevada System personnel; removing certain restrictions on the granting of sabbatical leave with pay.

Mr. Humphrey said he appreciated the Committee reconvening through the lunch hour for this purpose and was happy that the bill had already been introduced. Mr. Swallow told them that was the way the Committee had agreed to do it, to introduce it and then have discussion.

Mr. Humphrey said he had three men with him, two from Reno and one from Las Vegas. He then introduced President of the University, N. Edd Miller. Dr. J. Vergul, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, Las Vegas and Dr. Edmund R. Barmettler, University of Nevada Senate, Reno.

Mr. Humphrey said by way of explanation of what this bill does that there now is a limitation of the number of sabbatical leaves granted at 2% of all teaching faculty. This number at present times provides for sixteen sabbatical leaves and at present there is a much greater amount eligible. This would leave it up to the Board of Regents to make either a greater or lesser amount eligible based upon the budget considerations. I will now turn this over to President Miller and let him give you his comments, he said.

President Miller stated that a sabbatical leave was a kind of self renewal and gives the faculty a chance to keep abreast of the rapid changes in their fields. The trouble with the 2% limitation, he said was that, typically on the Reno campus and he thought on the Las Vegas campus as well they had something over twice as many applications for sabbatical leaves as they were able to grant with the 2% limitation and these were worthy applications. He said that faculty members must submit a project which had relevance to this teaching in order to qualify for this leave and in any case they would not like to grant leaves for all who submitted projects but that he would like to have the freedom to either grant less or more and that was the whole heart of this matter.

Mr. Humphrey said that perhaps the two faculty representatives would like to explain why they were so interested.

Mr. Wilson asked at this point if there was any particular period of time required before they were eligible. Mr. Miller said that six years was required before the first sabbatical and six more years before second. In actual semantics it would start the seventh year.

Mrs. White asked if it was a whole year at half salary or a half year at whole salary. She was told it was a whole year at  $\frac{2}{3}$  salary.

Dr. Virgiel explained that this was particularly acute on the Las Vegas campus, the last fifteen years or so where they have three times the applications as they had allocations and they would like to be able to increase these allocations.

Mrs. White asked what their backlog was and he told her that they had eleven or twelve applications for four openings.

Mr. Barmettler said he would like to approach the problem slightly differently. There are two thoughts on the prevailing attitude; one of them is that it is an opportunity for faculty members to renew their professional requirements and literally to combine a more fresh and productive individual and that one must realize there are tremendous changes in the professional fields as well as the teaching categories and there tends to be a need to be more closely associated with these changes; the second factor that there is a faculty that can be extraordinarily more productive in the sense that they can write books that society can use and they can deviate from the normal activity that they have been programmed into. I would say this about numbers, he said that there certainly is a backlog, yet he didn't think all requests should be granted, that there should be a criteria and that this leave should be of benefit to the University as well. He said that it was an established part of a University curriculum but there should be restraints on the conditions on these leaves.

Mr. Humphrey said that in summary they were asking that this be a matter for the Board of Regents to determine. It is one of the ways that faculty can be compensated for their devotion. We ask that the bill be passed out "do pass" subject to the Board of Regents be allowed to set the number based upon the normal number of eligibility requirements, he stated.

Mrs. White added if the funds are available. Mr. Humphrey said it was always be based upon the funds available. They are getting less Mrs. White added.

Chairman then thanked the University officials for coming and we will consider it, he said.

The meeting was then given over to the gentlemen present representing the State Board of Education and Teacher's Association who then spoke on AB 1 & 2.

AB 1 & 2 Relates to eliminating restrictions on differences allowable in teachers' salaries because of differences in levels of training or in number of years teaching experience.

They said this is an extremely important bill to the educators of the state in building up the morale factor in every school in the state. They said that the morale factor of the teachers in the state affected every child.

Mrs. Foote moved that AB 1 & 2 be put on the agenda for the Committee in the next day or two.

Motion was seconded.

Discussion followed and Chairman said he would prefer not to do this. Mrs. Frazzini said that he had to act on the motion and he said that he wasn't sure but would check on it. He further stated that he wasn't against it, however. He said he did feel that he had this prerogative.

It was decided to check into the propriety involved in this matter.

Meeting was adjourned.