

Assembly

134

MINUTES

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE - NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE - 58th SESSION

FEBRUARY 11, 1975

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mello at 8:00 A.M. in the Ways and Means Committee Room.

PRESENT: Chairman Mello, Mr. Bremner, Mrs. Brookman, Mr. Dreyer, Mr. Glover, Mr. Howard, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Weise and Mr. Wittenberg.

ALSO PRESENT: John Dolan, Bill Bible, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Gamble, Mr. Liston, Mr. Picollo, Ed Pisaltis, Richard Morgan, Ken Guinn and Fr. Dunphy.

Because of the meeting being held at the same time as the Governor's Prayer Breakfast, Father Dunphy and Mr. Robinson each said a prayer for the Committee.

Motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 7, 1975 was made by Mr. Howard and Seconded by Mr. Bremner. Motion passed.

Mr. Hansen explained the Distributive School Fund and stated that it is a very complex plan.

Mr. Liston stated that it is the sense of the Legislature to provide to every child in Nevada a reasonably equal educational opportunity. In order for that to take place, the State must provide a system of education. The Board of School Trustees exists in 17 created School Districts and have particular responsibilities and authorities. The responsibilities are to make an annual budget and to operate and maintain schools for children from 7-17 and they must provide this free schooling 180 days of each year. They must recognize what happens in local School Districts that cause expenses to be incurred and expenditures to be made. Most of the expenditures that School Districts make must come from operating an organizational unit designed to serve a group of children. The effectiveness of serving children in a classroom is minimized when there are too many children on one room with only one teacher. He also stated that the State must provide a school where there are five or more children.

Mr. Liston explained the pupil/teacher extremes for elementary pupils and secondary pupils. If there is a High School at all, there must be at least five teachers. He then explained the Special Education allotments. He stated that when a child first enters the door of a school, he is placed in either kindergarten, elementary or secondary. But after he has reached the other side, the abilities are determined. A child in such circumstances that do not enable him to make progress, is then given special provisions. Value assignments are very important and are made by both pupil and staff. More than 80% of the expenses incurred are in value assignments.

Over

Mr. Liston then explained the Enrollment and Determinations of Teacher and Other Certified Employee Allotments Selected Relationships chart.

He stated that 22% of the support comes from major resources and 78% is guaranteed support.

Dr. Picollo, Superintendent in Washoe County, stated that in Washoe County local revenues have increased about 13.8%, motor vehicle taxes are up, but the sales taxes are down and this would mean only about a 5.5% salary increase. He also stated that only \$2.65 per hour is paid to their bus drivers because they are locked into an \$18 per child for transportation. He then explained the cost of education in Washoe County as compared to the National level.

Richard Morgan, Executive Director of the Nevada State Education Association, stated that per pupil, the basic support indicates an increase of 16.98% and that the salary increase is slightly over one-half of the basic support factor. He stated they wanted fair and equitable treatment as they are the heart and soul of Nevada, both today and tomorrow. They are asking for a salary increase considerably more than 10%. Mr. Morgan added that he does not want to be understood as saying the Governor's recommendation for state workers is unjust in view of the economic circumstances that have prevailed in our country in the last two years.

Ken Guinn stated that he is present as the President of the Superintendent's Association throughout the State. He clarified a few items Mr. Liston said about the formula. He stated that it wasn't important that the committee understand the elements of the formula presented as there are very few superintendents who understand the intricacies of this formula. He stated the important thing to remember is that this formula is developed through a systematic approach for handing out money and putting it into the local School Districts.

He felt that the proposal made by the School Board of Education to the Governor's original budgeting process was for an 18% increase in the first year. He was not saying that this was agreeable to everyone or every particular Association, but in developing the program, they tried to look at what would be a minimum salary someone could get with an 18% increase. He felt that an 18% increase would allow even some of those districts either with transportation, vast growth or decreasing student enrollment problems to give somewhere in the neighborhood of 10%. He stated that in Clark County the figure computed was 16.1%. The Superintendents were to meet with their Association members and present to them the 18% for the first year of the Biennium, and 14% the second year. The economic stability of the country has certainly declined since the figure was determined and they understand that the second year is something that will have to be worked with in terms of a trigger mechanism or whatever can take place to allow an increase if the money is available. He did imply, however, that as a group they recommended 18%. The only analysis he could come up with in terms of what the Governor has in his budget right now that would be different from the first year of the Biennium is that he has now included a 17% increase which is 1% less than originally requested and if another 1% is to go to the retirement system that is employer paid, this would leave only 16%. He stated that he could not give detailed information right now as to the amount because they are in negotiations.

He stated he wanted to give the committee an example without using teachers and stated that he wanted to make a point in favor of the state employees. He said, "Generally, this is not my nature, but I think it is a point that needs to be made." A lot of people have asked him how he could support publicly an increase of 15% for state employees and not openly support a 15% pay raise for Clark County School District employees. With the analyzed data available he used for an example, custodians:

	+ \$101	City of Las Vegas
	+ 56	Clark County
factor	0	Clark County School District (\$689 salary)
	- \$ 33	State of Nevada
	- 64	Private Industry

OVER

He used the custodians as they have a complete parity rate. He stated that regardless of whether this Legislative body decides to give State employees of 15% or not is immaterial to him because whether they do or not will not stop the public employees from increasing at a rate acceptable either via binding arbitration, advisory arbitration or some form of agreement between the County Commissioners and the employee groups; the City Commissioners and the employee groups; or the local School Boards. He stated that the figures in the other categories have about the same parity rate also. He also mentioned that the 15% for state employed custodians will not move them up to the level of other employees. He felt that as a management person and as a taxpayer, he felt he had the right to say this.

He also mentioned that the \$101 figure is for a 7 hour day as opposed to the School District, Clark County, State and the private sector. He also stated that the fringe benefit factor has a great deal of variety. For instance, the employees of Clark County get one-half of 1% of their salary as longevity pay. And that if the City changed their custodian's hours from 7 to 8, they would be paid the differential which would be \$201.

Mr. Guinn also explained that teachers, custodians, state workers or anyone else cannot be compared.

Dick Morgan then stated that they did not support the 18% or the 14% and Ed Pisaltis, Washoe County Teachers Association, stated that they did not support the 18-14%. Mr. Guinn stated that the 18-14% proposal would be a minimum proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 A.M.