

## Assembly

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION - MINUTES OF HEARING - 56TH SESSION  
MARCH 3RD, 1971

91

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

ABSENT: Foote

GUESTS: N. Edd Miller - University of Nevada, Reno (President)  
J. T. Anderson - Vice President of University of Nevada, Reno  
Carmen Burkhart  
B. J. Berry - Reno, teacher  
Delia Martinez - Legislative Intern  
John R. Gamble - Department of Education  
R. Maples - 425 E 9th Street, Washoe County School District  
Richard Morgan - Executive Director, NICA  
Shirlee Wedow - PTA  
Richard Miller - State Board of Education  
Dean Roberta Barnes - Acting Vice President of Student Affairs UNR  
Frankie Sue Del Papa, ASUN President, UNR  
Lonnie Shields - Washoe County Teachers  
Robert Patroni - Clark County School District  
Press

In absence of Chairman Swallow who was detained temporarily acting Chairman White convened the meeting at 10:30 A.M. She asked that those who were in favor of these things as they are at the University of Nevada, speak first.

President Ed Miller of the University introduced Vice President of the University Mr. Anderson and Frankie Sue Del Papa, Student Body President of the University. President Miller said he was in opposition to AB 372 for a variety of reasons; one being that the authority for this matter should lie with the Board of Regents, another being that students shouldn't have their individual rights taken away from them just because they lived on the campus; and that it made dormitory life more attractive to those over twenty-one. He said they had a set of regulations which students were supposed to abide by and he asked that these be passed around to the Committee. He further stated that this was decided by a student vote, both those under twenty-one and over so that the younger students had a say whether it would bother them or not. He said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Anderson spoke next on the agenda. He said he had served at the University under both types of regulations and that he could say he had not noticed any increase in disturbances since liquor has been allowed. He said if things did get out of hand that they had safeguards that could be used. The Board of Regents could recind their decision, for one thing.

Frankie Sue Del Papa, the University student body president spoke next. She said that she came to answer any questions that she could. She explained that during her term this question had come up. She said that the Board of Regents after much study had made this decision and since they had to suffer the consequences of their decision they (the student body) had to stand by what they had decided. She said, after all there had been a double standard at the University, especially during the summer when the Judges, the U. S. Army and others drank when they wished on the campus and dorms. Therefore, the students over twenty-one had the same privelege she seemed to think.

Frankie Sue DeI Papa -----

The students felt that they were being denied their Civil Rights, she said. That all things considered she felt this is the best policy.

Chairman White asked if anyone wanted to speak on this particular item.

President Miller, said in summary, that they felt this was a matter to be handled by the Board of Regents as part of the administration of the University. He said that the students who lived in dormitories over twenty-one years of age was somewhat less than 10% of the percent of the total residents in dormitories. Finally, he said, with over three hundred trial judges participating in alcoholic beverages in the summer time it did present a problem of discrimination.

Chairman asked what about the narcotics, no one has mentioned that.

President Miller said that at present narcotics are prohibited by state law and were under a different category than alcoholic beverages.

Mrs. White asked how do you enforce it now?

President Miller asked you mean alcoholic beverages?

Chairman White answered yes.

Not very well, he answered, but they would be able to do so as they would have people committed to seeing there were not violations.

Chairman White asked if there were any other questions. She asked if anyone wanted to speak for AB 372.

Chairman Swallow arrived at this point and took over the meeting.

He said that he would like to make one statement before the guests departed he wanted to issue a statement to correct a rumour before it became a monster. He said some people in the educational circles have heard that the Chairman of Education had received a threat to have his business bombed, he said he would like all parties concerned to know that he had never received a threat and hoped he never would. He added that in no way had he been pressured to this extent nor to the extent he would care to complain about. So if you have ever heard this you can put a stop to it, he stated.

Discussion was now to be devoted to AB 414 a bill which would create office of ombudsman in state department of education Chairman said.

He asked if anyone wished to speak on AB 414 before they left.

The University officials answered Mary Frazzini's question if they had tried the policy of an ombudsman on the campus for awhile.

There was a brief discussion on this and they said they had tried it for a period of three months. The idea was, it was brought out, to cut the volume of red tape, and the ombudsman thought it was highly satisfactory and that one of the problems that was solved without involving the President was a highly sensitive personnel problem, and that if they ever got over complications in the budget they would like to reinstate.

That it was one of the ways to deal with student unrest.

Mrs. White said that she remembered they had done it but she had never heard how it worked out.

It was brought out that the person to fill this position would have to be a person who was well established and new the University quite well and would require a high salary.

Miss Hawkins said may be that this would eliminate some other positions or would save money somewhere else.

Richard Morgan, Executive Director, NICA came to the front to speak and said that this concept was something that was needed but that it should not have a higher priority than some of the more immediate things that are being talked about at this time, this would be an expenditure of about \$35,000.00, that in the budget squeeze at this time there were more important place to put this money. He said that each school district had people that could accomplish this sort of thing right now as they are, if this were focused upon. Also that the way the bill reads the ombudsman would not have too complete authority and would overlap into other areas, also that there had been some talk of creating a State ombudsman and this might overlap.

Chairman asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Richard Miller, State Board of Education, came to the fore and said, in effect, that he was in favor of this bill. He said that this generation had a responsibility to bridge the gap between parents and others. He said that the salary should be in keeping with the current salary structure and shouldn't be as large as mentioned.

Chairman Swallow asked the question what would they consider the proper salary for this position. No one answered this question.

Mr. Morgan said the bill called for the appointment of ombudsman to be made by The State Board of Education but that he felt the appointed should be made by the Governor as he was elected by the people and the job was to serve the people and should be made in that way. It would be more logical for it to be an appointee of an elected official of the people. He might have greater freedom.

Dr White asked if he hadn't mentioned that he thought this position should be at the level of the County. Mr. Morgan said that what he was thinking about was that this was a terribly large state with lots of problems and one man couldn't possibly do it and we were kidding ourselves to think he could and that the way to start it was at local levels of county. He said that he thought that many of the teacher associations might be willing to share the cost of this by building their own better relations with the community. He mentioned that he talked to many of the people over the entire state.

Mr. Wilson said that was the point he wanted to bring out and that this was ridiculous that this person would have to have a supportive staff.

Chairman said they would like to be able to do this and they would take into consideration what would be feasible along these lines and that if there were no further comments they would move along to AB 446, a bill which would require a longer probationary period to become a public school teacher.

Mr. Gamble said that the bill was incorrectly worded.

Mr. Morgan said that he felt it was a good bill, that there were thirty-six that either had a two year or three year probabionary period and that he would make two suggestions one, that there is another bill that they might have introduced that morning but at any rate would be introduced which would give comprehensive treatment of all the problems everyone was having and that he would respectfully defer action on this bill until they saw this one coming out and that there might be two relatively on the same subject. He said they were still not treating the real problem that came up with the professional practices act. of 1967. The real problem is that any public employee, either by judicial decision and I am talking about probably fifty judicial decisions say that a public employee can only be discharged if he knows the reasons for his termination and has an opportunity to defend himself and that the purpose of the professional practices act was to end fifty years of school prejudice where people were just terminated at the end of the year and never given a reason why they were terminated. He said that they had taken the position that a law of this nature ought to be one that helps people correct their weaknesses and that knowing their weaknesses they would want to do something about them and that what they needed to get at was correct evaluation and quality of evaluation. He said that they needed job descriptions and they exist in many states now, so that there is some standard to work back against. The most hurt by inadequate teachers are other teachers and the two teachers sitting here know that is true, and that they are most anxious to clean house but that their hands were tied and would the committee please wait until these other bills were out.

Dr. White said that had complaints had come that some teachers had lost track of what was realistic for their teaching and that these complaints come from parents and do we have any concept in public education which jerks these people up and says you are not doing what needs to be done at this particular level and you need to go and get refresher courses

Mr. Morgan said that the answer to her question was no. He said that some people were politically protected in the job they had.

Mr. Miller said he had reworded AB 571 to that effect. He thought that was the number of the bill.

Miss Hawkins said it was wrong to evaluate the teacher and no one else.

Chairman asked Bob Maples if he had a question. He rose to speak on AB 446. He said Washoe County School District favored the philosophy in AB 446. In other words that teachers should have a probationary period of two years before a decision as to whether they should be granted tenure and that they have found the same problems referred to as the first year can be a poor year for a teacher and that later they improve.

Chairman said that they were grateful for their comments and they certainly were helpful and would help on their decisions.

Mrs. Frazzini said it was so frustrating to hear all these things, evaluate them and to make the proper decisions and give each one proper care in the small amount of time they had to do it. If they only had time to listen, to hear and to formulate and do the right job.

Chairman said she had voiced the opinion of every one of them.

Chairman said the move was on to adjourn and move towards reapportionment as soon as possible. He said he would like to discuss two or three bills as to possible hearings or what they would like to do.

Discussion centered on AB 31 & SB 5.

Motion was made to hold AB 31 for definitive action.

Motion seconded and motion carried.

It was mentioned that hearings were scheduled for AB 224 & AB 225.

AB 393 which would modify provisions relating to teacher's leave. It was decided to hold this until the new bill came out and would be heard at the scheduled hearing on March 8th.

SB 225 and SB 224 were discussed next.

Motion was made to do pass SB 224.

Motion seconded.

Motion carried.

Motion mad to do pass SB 225.

Motion seconded.

Motion carried

changes in  
Mr. Morgan said there were three bills dealing with professional practices act coming before them.

It was brought out that 570 would provide penalties for assaults on teachers and students. Also 571 would could come out.

Chairman said they try to get these together somehow.

Motion made by Mrs. Frazzini to indefinitely postpone 372.

Discussion followed with some of committee feeling it was up to the Board of Regents and others feeling it wrong to have liquor on the campus for twenty-one year olds.

Assembly

Committee on Education - Hearing

March 3, 1976

Someone suggested that they establish a pub off the campus.

Chairman said they did have problems at the University and they did have problems with students intermixing etc. It needs to be resolved and if the University doesn't do it. Someone has to do it. He read a newspaper article by a judge reporting on the activities that go on at Nye Hall. He said they did feel that they needed to be urged and reminded.

Mr Wilson brought out that if they were going to get high they were going to do it.

Miss Hawkins brought out that this covered school districts period. She said if this covered school districts why didn't it apply to the University. If a law is there they will obey it.

Motion seconded.

Motion carried.

Motion was made to indefinitely postpone for possible amendments, AB 414.

Motion seconded.

Motion carried.

It was decided to hold AB 446 for other bills.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 A.M.

#####

gs

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Recess

Date March 3, Wed. Time 10:00 A.M. Room 328

Bills or Resolutions to be considered

Subject

Counsel requested\*

AB 372

~~Provides for parental bond as condition of probation of juvenile offender.~~

*Drug & liquor in educational premises*

AB 414

Creates office of educational ombudsman in State Department of Education

AB 446

Requires longer probationary period to become public school teacher.

\*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.

HEARINGS PENDING

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_ Room \_\_\_\_\_  
Subject \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_ Room \_\_\_\_\_  
Subject \_\_\_\_\_