

JOINT HEARING  
SENATE AND ASSEMBLY EDUCATION COMMITTEES

187

FEBRUARY 13, 1975

SENATORS: Bryan, Blakemore, Monroe, Sheerin, Young  
ASSEMBLYMEN: Wittenberg, Chaney, Coulter, Polish, Vergiels,  
Getto, Lowman, and Weise

An informal joint meeting of the Senate and Assembly Education Committees was called to order to hear the Comprehensive Plan of the University of Nevada for 1975-1979.

Chancellor Humphrey began by introducing some of his people who were in attendance, including Dr. Max Milam, President, University of Nevada Reno, Dr. Don Baepfler, President, University of Nevada Las Vegas, Dr. Donnelly, President, Community College System, Mr. Donald Jessup, Dr. Owen Knorr, and several others.

Chancellor Humphrey stated that this presentation was a result of legislation passed in 1967 requiring the University of Nevada to present a 10 year comprehensive plan and update it every two years. In 1973 this was amended requiring a 4 year plan updated every two years. Chancellor Humphrey then turned over the program to Dr. Owen Knorr.

Dr. Knorr gave a brief explanation of the document they had distributed to all members of the Legislature on February 3. They feel that this document is very comprehensive and should be quite self explanatory. He stated "you have to know where you are now, where you are going, and how you are going to get there". This is what they have attempted to do in this plan.

He then went through each section of the plan and gave a brief explanation on each.

Section I, Introduction - self explanatory.

Section II, Goals and Objectives of State Supported Higher Education in Nevada.

Goals - overall general purpose and the end to which effort is directed.

Objectives - measurable outcome to be achieved in a period of time.

Program - a comprehensive activity engaged in to meet certain institutional objectives.

Section III, Organization of the System and Its Major Divisions

Section IV, Higher Education Issues and Problems in Nevada in the 1970's. Dr. Knorr presented the following list of anticipated issues and their implications.

1. Interinstitutional Competition
2. Interinstitutional Cooperation
3. Student Persistence and Attrition
4. Length of Time Required for a Degree
5. Grading Standards
6. The Management and Use of Student Funds
7. Articulation
8. Admissions Standards
9. Tuition and Fees
10. Issues Relating to Faculty

Section V, Comparative Analysis with Other State Systems. Dr. Knorr stated that they presented as many comparative analyses with 11 western states as they were able to find. He presented a number of measures because a single measure is not very useful. They have in the document a total of 16 different measures.

Section VI, A Descriptive Analysis of the University of Nevada System, July 1, 1968 to December, 1974 with Projections to 1979. Dr. Knorr included the various amounts of growth within the system which is projected and discussed current programs that carry out the goals and objectives of the university.

Section VII, Nonpublic Postsecondary Education in Nevada. Dr. Knorr stated that this was added since the Governor appointed the Commission on Higher Education. With the application for federal grants it became necessary for this document to cover federal requirements. It includes inventory of nonpublic institutions in Nevada of which there are 38 legitimate post-secondary institutions. This part of the document meets the federal criteria in order to compete for federal funds.

This completed the general discussion for the document and Dr. Knorr opened the session to questions and answers.

Mr. Vergiels asked if there was an increase in faculty tied directly to the projected increase in student and was this connected in any way to the present student load. Dr. Knorr stated they had arrived at the number of faculty needed by using the same percentage as exists now.

Mr. Weise asked if the cost for each student reflected the new policy of payment by each full-time equivalent student for each credit. Mr. Jessup stated that it did and that they projected an increase of student cost of 20% the first year.

Senator Young stated that he had often questioned the method of measuring many things and specifically cited the measure of percentage of capita burden. He asked if this was computed on personal income, corporate income or what and further stated that he felt it rather misleading in that in one measure Nevada can look so good and in the next measure look so bad. Dr. Knorr stated that this measure was arrived at by total population divided by personal income. He also stated that they had taken this measure from a recently published book and they were not aware of the method whereby the figure was reached but the same application was used for all the states.

Chancellor Humphrey stated that they tried to use as many measures as they could find in order to make it a more accurate study. The University system feels that this state has the physical capacity to do anything on the behalf of the student.

Senator Young asked if any of the money projections included federal funds. Dr. Knorr stated that the only money considered was tax money, student costs, etc.

Mr. Vergiels asked if these projections included any new programs or were just keeping current programs maintained. Dr. Knorr stated that they did feel that they could implement new programs under these projections.

Mr. Weise stated that the Community College System was suppose to draw some of the student away from the University yet the projection for the University was continual growth. He asked where all these projected students were coming from. Chancellor Humphrey stated that the Community College was absorbing some of the student load especially in the part time student and adult education fields thus letting the University better serve the full time student. The University is not growing as much as it was and Nevada still is one of the top states in population growth.

Senator Sheerin asked if they felt that they may have to turn students away because of money shortage. Dr. Baepfler stated that would not anticipate turning away students but would have to economize in some way. It would be difficult but they would have to manage somehow. Dr. Milam agreed with Dr. Baepfler that it would have to be handled somehow. Dr. Donnelly stated that they were especially having this problem at the community colleges and they felt that it would become acute at Western Nevada Community College and they would hope that they would not have to turn students away.

Dr. Milam stated that there were some fields that were already limited but not necessarily because of the cost factor. Some

were limited as determined for accrediting purposes. These standards are set and are beyond control of the University.

Mr. Getto asked if the University did anything to direct students toward the current job market. He cited the situation a few years ago when so many teachers were graduating and they became a drug on the market. Did the University do anything to try to relate to the job market? Dr. Milam stated that they have asked for more counselors for this very reason. They do recognize the need for this but you can not regulate the student, you can only counsel. Chancellor Humphrey stated that the students seem to adjust themselves but this takes a little while. ✓ 190

Dr. Knorr stated that they have try to adjust curriculum to manpower but by the time it takes to do this the manpower need has changed.

Chairman Wittenberg officially closed the meeting at this time but stated that the questions and answers would continue as long as they wanted to stay.