

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

108

Minutes of Meeting - April 28, 1975

The fourteenth meeting of the Senate Education Committee was held on April 28, 1975 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 323.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Richard H. Bryan
Senator Neal
Senator Schofield
Senator Blakemore
Senator Sheerin
Senator Young

OTHERS PRESENT: See Exhibit A

S.B. 564 - Creates school attendance review boards for public health schools and junior high schools for purpose of solving attendance and behavioral problems of pupils.

Mr. Robert Cox, Washoe County School District, advised that their position is that a bill of this nature is not necessary and that it would not perform a serviceable function as it relates to the way the school district now operates. They would have 17 boards that would have to be created. They feel they can handle the situation in the way they are attacking it at present. Mr. Cox further stated that Judge Foreman does not feel there is a need for this bill. This is not necessary in Washoe County and they feel it would create a burden. Mr. Cox stated that if the legislature wants to go with this type of a bill, they should create one board for the entire county. They deal with the probation department and the truant children and try to solve the problem before it gets to the courts. They use guidance and counseling and as a final resort, go to the probation department. They have a psychologist that meets with the parents and children to see what the problem really is. Mr. Cox feels that this bill is trying to further the very things they are doing and feels it might create more problems than it would solve. Mr. Cox also feels that they should have the flexibility to meet the problems as they arise and the creation of this board would take the flexibility out of the procedure. Mr. Cox advised that this can be handled on an in-house basis.

Mr. Bob Petroni advised the committee that he has spoken to Judge Mendoza and was advised that he would rather wait two years to see if the California legislation works. Mr. Petroni advised that they feel it should be handled on an in-house basis also. This would place an administrative burden on Clark County; it should be worked out with parent counseling unless the parent doesn't cooperate. Senator Neal asked how this was handled in Clark County and if it is true that a truant usually ends up in an opportunity school. Mr. Petroni said no, it depends upon how many times the individual has been a truant. Three times would make him a habitual truant. They work with them on the alternative rather than juvenile court.

Mr. Bob Best, Nevada State School Board Assn., advised that they are not in favor of the bill. This would create an extra burden on them and they feel it is unnecessary since they do have programs to carry on truancy and behavioral problems.

Senator Young moved that this bill be indefinitely postponed; seconded by Senator Blakemore; motion carried. Committee members absent: Senators Neal and Foote.

S.B. 494 - Provides for evaluation, dismissal, demotion and non-renewal of professional employees of community colleges.

Mr. David Emerson, NNCC, advised that this bill has received the support of the faculty. Mr. Emerson stated that they do have one out, which is the court system and feels that is a horrendous thing for everyone concerned. This bill also has the total support of NSEA. Senator Young asked if he felt there was anything wrong with the bill; Mr. Emerson stated that, according to the faculty and administration, the two year probationary period is probably too short. They need time to evaluate and the teachers need time to improve. Mr. Emerson would recommend this be changed to three years.

Mary Wardlaw, WNCC, spoke in favor of the bill (see Exhibit A-1 for copy of testimony). Ms. Wardlaw also provided the committee with copies of a section of their code dealing with economic security (Exhibit B), section of the code dealing with tenure (Exhibit C), personnel evaluation report (Exhibit D), and the student form for appraisal of instructor (Exhibit E).

Mr. Bob Rose, WNCC, advised that he has been requested by Mr. William Bonaudi (faculty member of WNCC) to present to the committee a copy of his letter in support of this bill (see Exhibit F).

Mr. Joseph Doser, Faculty Senate Chairman of WNCC, spoke in favor of the bill and provided the committee with a written consensus from the WNCC (see Exhibit G). Mr. Doser provided the committee with a copy of his testimony (see Exhibit H).

Mary Williams, CCCC, stated that they support the passage of this bill and they support the testimony of the other community colleges in Nevada.

Neil D. Humphrey, Chancellor of UNS, read a statement from James Buchanan who is unable to be present today to speak in opposition of the bill (see Exhibit I for copy of Mr. Buchanan's statement). Chancellor Humphrey feels that Section 2 of the bill is not needed, and with reference to Section 3, Chancellor Humphrey advised that the community colleges are given substantial economic security; he is given ample notice and written reasons for such action. After

four years of probationary period, they are given a three-year contract. The Board of Regents support this in 1971 and since that time no individual or collective complaints have been sent to the Board; therefore, they assume it is functioning well. They see no need for this bill. The Board would be pleased to consider the community college request for a change in procedure if they are dissatisfied with the present procedure. Chancellor Humphrey advised that for any community college faculty member who is dismissed during the period of his contract, cause would have to be shown.

Senator Neal stated that non-renewal of contract seems to be what is sometimes called "catch-22" -- if you cannot get a person for cause, then this is a way to get rid of them. Chancellor Humphrey advised that the universities and colleges that have probationary faculty members need not show cause if they are not to be renewed. With the probationary status, you need not show cause to not renew him. Chancellor Humphrey further stated that this is almost uniformly the way it works throughout the U.S.. The probation period for the university faculty can be up to seven years; at the community college they are eligible for a three-year contract after four years.

Senator Sheerin asked if there is a difference between NRS 391 and tenure. Chancellor Humphrey stated that the essence is the same - you need to have a provision that provides that you must show cause for non-renewal or dismissal -- that is the essence of tenure. If you have a provision that you must show cause, that is tenure. Senator Young asked if it is true that no one from the University has been discharged with tenure except one case that is still pending; Chancellor Humphrey answered in the affirmative.

Senator Neal asked what the foundation is behind the probationary period. Chancellor Humphrey advised that the University code follows word for word the statement by the American Assn. of Professors, and it is most frequently found in universities as to probationary period. For the community colleges, it was believed to be desirable to attempt a different method for these faculty members because of the assumption that their curriculum changes fairly rapidly. To accommodate the needs of the community for different courses that would be required and the changing of programs and courses, it was believed that in many cases the tenure would not be applicable.

Senator Young referred to the possibility of a teacher being fearful of contacting the Board of Regents and asked if there is a policy that says a teacher cannot contact them. Chancellor Humphrey stated that there is no policy that a faculty member cannot talk to a Regent. The code provides that a faculty senate may propose amendments to the code and guarantees that this may be done.

Charles Donnelly, President of Community College Division, spoke in opposition of the bill and presented the committee with copies of Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty (Exhibit J), Procedures for Evaluation (Exhibit K), and UNS Economic Security Provisions (Exhibit L). Dr. Donnelly feels that under this bill they would be put under the public school act - they should remain under the UNS. Dr. Donnelly feels that the two-year probationary period would make it difficult to evaluate within this short time.

Senator Bryan commented that we provide some kind of fair dismissal for K-12 and tenure for the University and asked what the justification is for providing nothing that is akin to K-12 or tenure for the community colleges. Dr. Donnelly advised that the method of economic security in dismissal is substitute for tenure. Dr. Donnelly further commented that a person would be notified in writing by March 1. As recourse, they can ask for the reasons in writing. Dr. Donnelly advised that he is not opposed to a hearing and feels they would set up a hearing if asked to do so. He is willing to discuss this with them.

Senator Neal asked how they administer the salaried increases at the community college. Dr. Donnelly advised that the percentage increase is mandated by the Legislature. Senator Neal asked how many faculty members they have and from those, how many do they normally not renew contracts on. Dr. Donnelly advised that they have over 150 full-time professional members, and probably a total of 500 faculty members (part-time and full-time). Out of the 150, they have 6 that they would not renew.

Senator Young asked what percentage of teachers will have the three-year rolling contract. Dr. Donnelly advised that it would be about the same as they have had so far - 5 out of 150. After such time as the teachers are eligible for the three-year contract, they will probably have about 145 out of the 150 that will have the three-year contract. Senator Young asked what system other colleges use. Dr. Donnelly replied that very few operate under the same system as they have. When most community colleges were initiated, they were part of the school districts and an adjunct of the secondary schools -- the 13th and 14th grades. Many of them are now no longer part of the school districts. Senator Young asked if this would impede their ability to get good staff; Dr. Donnelly feels that it would because the two year period is too short. Dr. Donnelly advised that he would prefer a four-year period.

Senator Sheerin asked that if the committee were the Board of Regents and the community colleges were asking for hearing procedures, would he (Dr. Donnelly) appear before the Board of Regents in opposition to such a K-12 hearing. Dr. Donnelly advised that he would oppose that. Dr. Donnelly does not feel that the community colleges need to be told by the Legislature that evaluation is important.

Dr. Nicholson, Clark County Community College, advised that he is concerned with Section 3 of the bill and feels it would be to their advantage to have at least four years.

Senator Sheerin asked if the committee were the Board of Regents and this were a request for fair hearing on dismissal, would he (Dr. Nicholson) be in favor of it or would he oppose it. Dr. Nicholson stated that he would oppose that request - they are not K-12. He favors a clear set of policies regarding open hearings. Upon questioning from Senator Young, Dr. Nicholson advised that he is not in favor of tenure.

Dr. Jack Davis, Executive Vice President of WNCC, spoke in opposition of the bill because the two-year probationary period is not long enough to make critical and fair appraisals -- four years would be better. Concerning the matter of a hearing, Dr. Davis feels that a person should have the right to a hearing and at the present time, a person can request such hearing. This should be established through policy and not Legislative procedure. Relative to the matter of evaluations, Dr. Davis advised that the WNCC has been putting together an evaluation package. This started with the student evaluation of staff members. A committee was formed to put together an instrument which was field tested with the students. They are now in the second year of this. Each semester the students can evaluate staff members. A copy of the data is returned to each faculty member. Dr. Davis referred to Ms. Wardlaw's statement that no one has discussed her contract with her, and advised that the reason for this is because she has been doing a very good job -- they would talk to them if they weren't doing a good job. They are presently working on an instrument whereby the staff would evaluate the administrators. Dr. Davis feels that if the matter of a hearing is settled, they can get the job done. Dr. Davis further stated that there is power with the Regents and if they have more time, they can get the job done.

Senator Bryan asked if Dr. Davis feels there are philosophical inconsistencies in that we do provide for dismissal in K-12 and the University provides tenure and there seems to be a gap in providing something for the community colleges. Dr. Davis advised that he would like to stay away from the K-12. He does feel there are inconsistencies in what the community college faculty has vs. the University division. He feels it should be made known that there should be a way that is going to be just and right for the community colleges. Dr. Davis further commented that policies and procedures need to be established so that the rights are the same. Dr. Davis advised that a hearing is one provision that he would take a stand on now. Senator Bryan asked Dr. Davis if he had a point of view that he wanted the Board of Regents to adopt, would he have free access to the Regents to advance this point of view or would he have to reach a consensus point of view before approaching them. Dr. Davis

advised that he would pursue it with the President. Senator Young asked that, if the Legislature opted not to do anything, would they proceed to develop standards. Dr. Davis responded in the affirmative.

Senator Sheerin asked if there would be problems if this bill mandated hearing officer procedures and delegated the Board of Regents to prescribe the course for dismissal. Dr. Davis responded in the affirmative. Dr. Davis further stated that if it were to say "shall" be a hearing, he would have no objection.

William Berg, Executive Vice President of NNCC, advised that over a period of the last two years they have been trying to work out an evaluation system that would be fair. Their procedural goals are that the evaluation form be developed; the faculty member would evaluate himself; it would be Dr. Berg's responsibility to complete a similar form for that individual; they will meet and compare the evaluations. If they cannot come to an agreement, it would then call for an evaluation by peers. Dr. Berg advised that he would agree with the other vice presidents in that two years is not long enough. Dr. Berg recommends that the Board of Regents act on the problem before the Legislature tells them how.

Senator Sheerin moved "Do Pass" and amend; seconded by Senator Young; motion carried. Absent: Senators Neal and Foote. Senator Bryan is to compose language that would increase the probationary period.

A.B. 54 - Prohibits issuance of degrees except by certain qualified degree-granting institutions.

Dr. Merlin Anderson, State Department of Education, provided the committee with an article from the Las Vegas Review-Journal entitled "Diploma mill bill could cure blackeye" (see Exhibit M) and a written statement from Mr. John Gamble (see Exhibit N). Dr. Anderson advised that they are in support of this bill because it would take care of a situation that has been quite disruptive and a bad influence on the State.

Senator Blakemore expressed concern with a situation whereby a flying school would be issuing an instrument rating and asked if this would be included in the term "degree" in subsection 2, page 1. Dr. Anderson advised that Section 1 and subsection 2 are lead-in's to Section 3 and that the definition of "degree-granting institution" in this section would clarify this.

Senator Bryan asked why the language "one year or more" is necessary in Section 5, page 2. Assemblyman Sue Wagner replied that this is strictly bill drafting language.

Senator Young suggested that this language, referring to doing business for one year or more, be taken out. Senator Young questioned the language "outstanding public service" which is contained in Section 4, page 2.

Joe Lawlor, Department of Consumer Affairs, spoke in favor of the bill and felt that there should be some amendment or separate legislation where articles of incorporation of accredited university should be registered with the Secretary of State. Many of the "diploma mills", such as Jackson State, are using the State of Nevada to further their business.

Dr. Anderson referred to A.B. 24 which is still in the Assembly, and advised that Mr. Wittenberg sent this bill out so that something could be done in this session. Dr. Anderson further advised that he has contacted the Federal Trades Commission in San Francisco and they are interested but do not have the manpower or time to devote themselves to this problem. Most of these businesses operate out of California but use Nevada as a drop box or a place where inquiries are sent.

Shirley Coats, Consumer Protection, advised the committee of a particular case they have investigated involving a Dr. Ozaki who had established a degree-granting program called "The Society for Education Recognition". During the 12-14 months that Dr. Ozaki was in Colorado, he grossed a total of \$100,000 from this program. He then came to Reno and was in operation for three months before they got an injunction against him. He mailed out 5,000 brochures, out of which 80 people responded. A copy of this brochure is attached hereto and marked as Exhibit O). Dr. Ozaki made a total of \$7,350 while in Reno. Ms. Coats presented the committee with a copy of proposed amendments to this bill (see Exhibit P).

Senator Bryan referred to "honorary degree" and felt that a person had to pay for this type of degree. Assemblyman Wagner advised that she would check on this and advise the committee. Senator Sheerin questioned if this should be under the deceptive trades practice rather than NRS 207; Assemblyman Wagner advised that she will also check on this matter.

Senator Young moved "Do Pass" and amend to strike the one-year provision and to include a civil penalty; seconded by Senator Schofield, motion carried.

Upon presentation of BDR 34-1737, the committee agreed on a committee introduction and re-referral to the Finance Committee.

Senate Education Committee
Minutes of Meeting
April 28, 1975
Page Eight

115

Being no further business at this time, the meeting was
adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Sharon W. Maher, Secretary

ROOM # 323

DAY Monday

DATE 4-28-75

NAME ORGANIZATION ADDRESS

Robert Cox (SB 56A) Washoe County School District 151st Street, Reno

Mary Wardlaw NSP W.N.C.C. wish to testify 494 support

Mary William NSP CCCC wish to testify 494 support

Daniel Emerson NSP-WNCC WNCC Faculty Senate Testify for SB 494

JOSEPH G. DOWER FACULTY SENATE CHM W.N.C.C. TESTIFY IN SUPPORT OF SB 494

Robert Ross W.N.C.C. For 494

DON CRALLE BBB FOR AB54

Mary D. Humphrey Univ. of Nevada System SB 494 - Negative

John Tom Ross U.N.S. Observer

Charles Donnelly CCO W of N System SB 494 - Negative

William Berg Northern Nevada CC SB 494 - Negative

JACK DAVIS WESTERN NEVADA C.C. SB 494 - Negative

Bob Best Nev. State School Boards Assn SB 564 Negative

John Bumpk Nev Dept of Educ AB 54 favor SB 564 negative

Richard Morgan NSEA

~~Richard Morgan~~ ~~W.N.C.C.~~

Ed Howard W.N.C.C. 1420 N. Virginia - 494

Jo Anne Dain W.N.C.C. speaks - For 494

Richard Morgan W.N.C.C. Reno for 494

Edna Saunders W.N.C.C. Personal to 494/behavior

*Testimony in support of SB. 494
Mary Wardlaw
President WNCC Chapt NSP*

Faculty of the Community College, like faculty of the UNR and the UNLV, are governed under a Code adopted by the Board of Regents. Certain provisions of the Code apply to the Universities; other provisions apply to the Community Colleges. Let's look at what the Code offers Community College faculty. The Chancellor, Dr. Humphrey, the Division President, Dr. Donnelly, and the Executive Vice President of WNCC, Dr. Davis, have each stated publicly that they are in favor of fair dismissal, that Community College faculty now have fair dismissal. Section 3.6 of the Code provides two types of contracts for Community College faculty. The first type of contract is a one-year probationary contract. Dr. Humphrey testified April 14, 1975 before this Committee that under this contract there is no provision for a hearing before dismissal; cause is not required for dismissal. At the end of the four year probationary period, a faculty member who is reappointed is given a three-year contract. Under this contract, again Dr. Humphrey testified, there is no provision for a hearing before dismissal; cause is not required for dismissal. Thus the only difference between the probationary contract and the non-probationary contract is that under the probationary contract, a faculty member is given several months' notice before dismissal, whereas under the non-probationary contract, he is given two years' notice. (Lame Duck Personnel Policy)

117

The Board of Regents has not demonstrated leadership in personnel policy. The Board of Regents, which claims autonomy in personnel matters, has delegated its own authority to hire and fire to its Division Presidents. In fact, the Division President is the only individual who can authorize a contract. Moreover, the Board of

Regents relinquished some of its autonomy over personnel matters 118
when the restriction was made that classified staff be drawn from
the pool of state employees.

As Community College faculty our channel of communication to
the Board of Regents is through our Executive Vice President, the
Division President, and the Chancellor. Faculty concern can be
effectively transmitted via this channel. When the WNCC Chapter
of NSP sought to introduce legislation to improve UNS health
insurance coverage (S.B.560), the Board of Regents endorsed the
concept, March 21, 1975, even before the bill was out of the Bill
Drafting Office! At other times faculty concern is blocked via
this channel. Despite numerous attempts on the part of faculty
members to discuss fair dismissal as set forth in S.B.494 with our
Executive Vice President, the Division President, and the Chancellor,
Dr. Humphrey confessed before this Committee on April 14, 1975 that
he was unaware Community College faculty are dissatisfied with the
present one and three-year contracts. We have tried to work through
existing channels to the Board of Regents. Our efforts have failed.
Now we seek legislation.

Our present instruments of evaluation are inadequate. Furthermore
they are not used to assist those teachers whose classroom performance
is less than excellent, to improve.

Faculty of the Community College commend legislators for the
introduction of S.B.494 and for recognition of the vast differences
between the provisions and probable results of S.B.494 and the
provisions and all-too-frequent results of the UNR-UNLV tenure system.
Under the UNR-UNLV system, tenure (Section 3.4.1 and 3.4.3.c of the

Code) is the granting of a life-time appointment to an individual by the Board of Regents through regular personnel procedures. This appointment expires at the end of the contract year during which a UNR-UNLV faculty member reaches the age of sixty-five. Faculty of the Community College support S.B.494. S.B.494, unlike the UNR-UNLV tenure system, requires that each professional employee be evaluated at least annually. S.B.494, unlike the UNR-UNLV tenure system, requires that the evaluation shall, if necessary, include recommendations for improvement in performance and that a reasonable effort shall be made to assist the faculty member to correct any deficiencies noted in the evaluation. S.B.494 guarantees--not a life-time appointment--but notification of cause and a hearing prior to dismissal. Thus it grants Community College faculty--not tenure-- but the due process rights presently enjoyed by public school teachers, by government employees, and by students, due process rights increasingly recognized by the courts.

Students of the Community College are corrections officers, employees of government, of local businesses and industries; they are full time students pursuing business, law enforcement, health occupations or liberal arts programs. It is in the best interests of students, the best interests of the community, and the best interests of taxpayers that the Community College provide quality instruction; that is instruction tied to a rigorous system of evaluation such that a highly competent teacher is re-employed because of his/her competence, a rigorous system of evaluation such that a less than competent teacher is helped to improve the quality of his/her instruction, a rigorous system of evaluation such that an incompetent teacher who cannot improve the quality of his/her

instruction even with help is dismissed under a fair procedure, one which would minimize the chance that the dismissed teacher would contest dismissal in court, a procedure costly to the institution as well as to the individual.

WNCC faculty support S.B.494. Chancellor Humphrey stated before this Committee that the first two-thirds of the bill is "just good personnel management practice." The remaining third asks only that the administration justify the firing of a professional employee. As a teacher I have to be able to justify the grade I give a student. Is it so much to ask that an administrator justify the firing of a professional employee?

SECTION 3.5 - Economic Security Provisions for Desert Research
Institute Faculty

- 3.5.1 DRI faculty are not eligible for appointment to tenure; however, it is the policy of the University that these faculty members shall enjoy the maximum economic security which can be provided consistent with the method of financing the center or laboratory involved.
- 3.5.2 The center or laboratory director, in consultation with the DRI president, shall decide whether a professional contract shall be discontinued. The faculty member shall be given notification in writing by the director and the president at least seven months before the expiration of his term of employment, except as provided in Section 3.5.3.
- 3.5.3 In cases of demonstrably bona fide financial exigency, employment may be terminated in two months by notification in writing from the director and president. In such cases, the faculty member shall have the right, upon receipt of such notice, to appeal pursuant to the provisions of this Code.

SECTION 3.6 - Economic Security Provisions for Community College
Division Faculty

- 3.6.1 CCD faculty are not eligible for appointment to tenure; however, it is the policy of the University that these faculty members shall enjoy the maximum economic security which can be provided consistent with the method of financing the program and with the changing needs for personnel as program emphasis changes.
- 3.6.2 Unless otherwise stated by the president in writing, all full-time faculty appointments will be probationary until notification is sent in writing by the president to the appointee. This includes transfers from other divisions of the System. Contracts for probationary faculty will be issued for a maximum length of one year.
- 3.6.3 The probationary period cannot exceed five years plus any part of an academic year in which an appointee was employed later than the fifth day of the fall semester.

121

- 3.6.4 If a probationary appointee is offered a contract for the fifth year of employment, that contract shall be either for a one year period at the end of which time the employment will be terminated, or a three year contract will be offered. By June 30 of each contract year thereafter, the appointee shall either be offered a new three-year contract, or notified in writing by the president that his current contract will be allowed to terminate in two years.
- 3.6.5 Notice of non-reappointment for the coming academic year of probationary faculty shall be given in writing by March 1.

3.4.2 Notice of Tenure. The Board of Regents, through its official action, has the sole and exclusive authority to grant tenure. When a faculty member has been granted tenure he shall be informed immediately in writing by the president. Any defect in the notice or misstatement of Board actions shall not create against the University any enforceable legal obligations.

3.4.3 Termination, Expiration or Relinquishment of Tenure. After a faculty member has been appointed with tenure, his service may be terminated only through established University procedures for adequate cause or because of demonstrably bona fide financial exigencies, or curricular reasons.

(a) Cause. Causes for which a faculty member with tenure may be dismissed include those defined in Chapter 5 and the following:

1. Incompetence to perform the duties for which the faculty member is employed;
2. Failure to perform the duties for which the faculty member is employed;
3. Conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude;
4. Repeated acts of insubordination;
5. Unprofessional conduct;
6. Habitual drunkenness or habitual use of narcotics or dangerous drugs as defined in the Nevada Revised Statutes;
7. Commission of any of the acts specified in Section 2.1.4 of this Code, which have been declared in said section to be the antithesis of academic freedom and responsibility;
8. Falsification of employment application or documents submitted thereto or other false or fraudulent representations made in securing employment.

(b) Financial or Curricular Reasons for Termination. A tenured faculty member may be terminated for financial exigency only if the Board of Regents has declared that a financial emergency exists in the division, college or department involved. The employment of a tenured faculty member may be terminated because a special subject has been dropped or the curriculum or course reorganized, if such reorganization results in the termination of a position held by the faculty member. If the position of a tenured faculty member is threatened because of financial exigency or because a curricular

program or department has been reorganized or dropped, the faculty member shall be continued, if possible, in an appropriate capacity. If he is terminated for one of these reasons, his position will not be filled by a new appointee within a period of two years, unless the terminated faculty member has been offered, in writing, and has failed to accept, the reappointment at his previous rank and salary step.

124

- (c) Expiration of Tenure. Tenure expires at the end of the contract year during which a faculty member reaches the age of sixty-five. A faculty member relinquishes or waives his right to tenure upon resignation from the University of Nevada System or any division thereof, or if he voluntarily relinquishes his tenure in writing.
- (d) Tenure for Faculty in Administrative Positions. An administrator, as defined in Section 1.5, who holds faculty status qualifies for appointment to tenure, its rights, privileges and obligations; however, his administrative appointment is separate and distinct from his faculty status. He may be removed from his administrative post without substantiation of cause, but he shall be reassigned within the University division in which he was granted tenure. If an administrator is removed the reasons shall be given to him in writing if he so requests.
- (e) Relinquishment of Tenure on Transfer. Tenure shall be awarded within a specific division or service or special unit of the University and is not transferable between divisions or units. Persons awarded tenure prior to the establishment of the University of Nevada System (February 10, 1968) shall have tenure within the division in which they were serving when awarded tenure. In the event a faculty member transfers from one division to another he shall be deemed to have relinquished his tenure rights in the division from which he transferred and shall not have tenure in the new division unless specifically recommended for tenure by that division and granted such by the Board of Regents.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM
PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION REPORT

NAME _____ POSITION NO. _____

COLLEGE _____ POSITION _____

1974-75 Salary: Rank _____ Step _____ A or B Contract _____ % of Full Time or FTE _____

Approved Recommended A or B % of Full Time
1975-76 Salary: Rank _____ Step _____ Contract _____ or FTE _____

1975-76 Salary Recommendation determined as follows:

1974-75 Salary _____
Satisfactory Step Increase _____
Merit or Inequity Adjustment _____
1975-76 Salary _____

The evidence which justifies the above recommendation, based on the criteria in the University Code, is as follows:

EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT _____
(Signature) (Date)

RECOMMENDED () NOT RECOMMENDED ()

PRESIDENT _____
(Signature) (Date)

Three (3) copies of this report should be completed by the staff member's immediate superior and reviewed by each higher administrative officer. One (1) copy should be retained by the Executive Vice-President and two (2) filed with the President. It is the obligation of the evaluator to advise the individual being evaluated whether or not he is being recommended for a salary increase, and, in general, the reasons therefore. See University Code, especially Section Four of Chapter 11 for detailed instructions regarding evaluation policy and procedure.

~~00410~~

WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

~~127~~

Student Form
For Appraisal of Instruction

127a

Name of Instructor: _____

Name and Number of Course: _____

Are you Male ___ or Female ___?

126

Reasons for taking course:

Required for my college program _____

General interest (elective) _____

Upgrading in present job _____

Planning to change job _____

Promotion to higher job level _____

Other (please specify) _____

The instructors of Western Nevada Community College require conscientious, positive and systematic feedback regarding their teaching techniques in order to initiate self-improvement when needed. It is for this reason that the College solicits your opinions concerning instruction. In order that the opinions expressed may be free and open, you are requested not to sign your name to this evaluation.

1. In your opinion, how do you rate your instructor's interest in and enthusiasm for teaching this course?

Excellent ___ Above Average ___ Average ___ Below Average ___

2. Do you feel that the instructor's preparation for class is:

Excellent ___ Above Average ___ Average ___ Below Average ___

3. In your opinion, how do you rate the instructor in terms of stimulating interest in the subject taught?

Excellent ___ Above Average ___ Average ___ Below Average ___

4. Do you feel that the instructor is meeting the objectives of the course as you understand them?

Yes ___ Almost ___ Partially ___ No ___

5. Do you feel that the instructor is successful in creating a good learning situation?

Very Successful ___ Moderately Successful ___ Not Successful ___ Not Applicable ___

6. Do you feel that the outside assignments given by the instructor are relevant to the course objectives?

Always ___ Usually ___ Rarely ___ Not Applicable ___

7. Do you feel that the instructor is fair and objective in his grading practices?

Always ___ Usually ___ Rarely ___ Not Applicable ___

8. Are the instructor's methods of evaluation consistent with the objectives of the course?

Always ___ Usually ___ Rarely ___ Not Applicable ___

9. Do you find that the instructor is willing to take time outside of class to give assistance to students who need help?

Very Willing ___ Willing ___ Reluctant ___ Not Applicable ___

10. Taking into account the size of the class, is your instructor concerned about you as an individual?

Definitely ___ Sometimes ___ Seldom ___ No ___

11. Is your instructor's personal appearance appropriate?

Always ___ Usually ___ Rarely ___ Not Applicable ___

12. Does your instructor conduct himself/herself in a professional manner?

Always ___ Usually ___ Rarely ___

13. Is your instructor flexible and open to student suggestions?

Always ___ Usually ___ Rarely ___

14. Is the instructor successful in relating the content of the course to your needs? This question applies to occupational courses only.

Very Successful ___ Moderately Successful ___ Not Successful ___

15. Please comment specifically on the ways you feel the instructor is effective and ineffective in conveying the content of the course:

April 28, 1975

128

My name is William C. Bonaudi, and I am a faculty member of Western Nevada Community College. I am submitting this statement in support of SB 494.

From August, 1973 through February, 1975, I was chairman of the Western Nevada Community College Faculty Senate. On January 17, 1974, a meeting of faculty senate officers from the three community colleges in the division was held in Las Vegas. The purpose of such a meeting was to identify common areas of faculty concern so that remedy in these areas could be affected at a meeting between this group and the president of the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System, Dr. Charles Donnelley. That meeting was scheduled for the next day, January 18, 1974.

The meeting on January 18, adjourned with agreement on some issues, and in those areas where there was disagreement, a commitment to schedule another meeting with the senate representatives, the three executive vice-presidents, and the president of the Community College Division. The areas of probation and evaluation of instructors were items to be included in these discussions, and it was requested by the senates that a meeting be held no later than May, 1974 to continue the interaction.

Dr. Donnelley, after receiving two letters from me, dated January 21, 1974, and May 13, 1974, finally honored his commitment to schedule the requested meeting, this one to be held May 31, 1974. However, during the week of May 26, 1974, his office called to cancel the meeting, with the promise that it would be rescheduled. That next meeting was not held until April 1, 1975, almost 15 months after the first meeting in Las Vegas.

The concept of fair dismissal has always been a concern with CCD faculty. The combined CCD senates attempted to work with the problem of lacking such a procedure by establishing a dialogue with the President of the CCD on this and other issues. This is standard procedure within the University of Nevada System to place an item on the Board of Regents' agenda.

I suggest that the faculty did in good faith attempt to resolve this problem within the Community College Division, but met indifference and inattention from the President of the CCD. It is interesting that he in turn waited until the current legislative session to finally schedule the first meeting ever with all of the above mentioned people in attendance. I suggest we could hardly allow the opportunity for legislative review of this problem to pass in light of our previous attempts to work within the University of Nevada System.

William C. Bonaudi



WESTERN NEVADA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FACULTY SENATE

130

5005 ECHO AVENUE

RENO, NEVADA 89506

(702) 972-0701

April 24, 1975

Senator Richard Bryan, Chairman
Committee on Education
Nevada State Legislature
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dear Senator Bryan:

At the April 23, 1975, meeting of the Western Nevada Community College the following motion concerning S. B. 494, providing for fair dismissal for professional employees of community colleges, was passed unanimously:

That the sense of the Western Nevada Community College Faculty Senate is that they support passage of S. B. 494 by the Nevada State Legislature during its 1975 session.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Joseph G. Doser'.

Joseph G. Doser
Faculty Senate Chairman

JGD:jd

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, MY NAME IS JOSEPH DOSER, CHAIRMAN OF THE WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE. I AM HERE TODAY ON BEHALF OF OUR SENATE TO TESTIFY IN FAVOR OF SB 494, WHICH WOULD GUARANTEE FAIR DISMISSAL FOR THE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION. FIRST, I WOULD LIKE TO ENTER INTO THE RECORD A COPY OF THE RESOLUTION THAT WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY OUR FACULTY SENATE ON APRIL 23. 131

MR. CHAIRMAN, I DID TESTIFY IN FAVOR OF THIS BILL ON MONDAY, APRIL 14 AND IN LIGHT OF THAT I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP MY TESTIMONY BRIEF AND MAKE ONLY THE FOLLOWING FOUR POINTS:

1. (THE ADMINISTRATION SAYS THAT WE HAVE FAIR DISMISSAL. CLEARLY, THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE INDICATES THAT THE CONTRARY IS TRUE) THE TESTIMONY BY THE CHANCELLOR AT THE LAST HEARING WAS TO THE EFFECT THAT AN INSTRUCTOR OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION CAN BE TERMINATED WITHOUT CAUSE. (THE CODE IS SILENT WITH REGARD TO FAIR DISMISSAL FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL.)

2. IT IS TRUE THAT THE MOST LIBERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE CODE MIGHT PERMIT A HEARING BUT ONLY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION. THIS IS AN OBVIOUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST BECAUSE THE INDIVIDUAL WHO MUST APPROVE THE HEARING IS THE ONE WHO COULD HAVE INITIATED THE DISMISSAL.

3. WHY IS IT THAT UNDER THE UNS CODE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES ARE THE ONLY TEACHERS DENIED FAIR DISMISSAL AND DUE PROCESS? AS SENATOR BRYAN POINTED OUT AT THE LAST HEARING, K-12 HAS FAIR DISMISSAL, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA PROFESSORS HAVE TENURE WHILE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES HAVE NOTHING.

4. THE CHANCELLOR SUGGESTED AT THE LAST MEETING THAT WE HAVE NOT GONE THROUGH CHANNELS. THE APPROPRIATE CHANNEL IS THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION PRESIDENT WITH WHOM WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE INSTEAD OF GOING OVER HIS HEAD DIRECTLY TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS.

IN CONCLUSION, IT IS CLEAR THAT WE DO NOT HAVE FAIR DISMISSAL AND THAT WE HAVE ATTEMPTED TO GO THROUGH CHANNELS. WE ARE THE ONLY TEACHING UNIT IN THE STATE OF NEVADA THAT DOES NOT HAVE SOME FORM OF FAIR DISMISSAL. ISN'T THIS AN OBVIOUS INEQUITY? IF OUR ADMINISTRATION BELIEVES THAT WE NOW HAVE FAIR DISMISSAL AND WANT US TO HAVE FAIR DISMISSAL WHY IS IT THAT THEY ARE HERE NOW OPPOSING THIS BILL? THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO MY TESTIMONY AND FOR YOUR SUPPORT ON SB 494.

Senate Bill 494 addresses itself to evaluation, dismissal, demotion, and nonrenewal of contracts of professional employees of the Community College Division.

The University of Nevada System Code already provides for an evaluation procedure for professional employees of the Community College Division as well as all other professional employees. The policy reads as follows: "An evaluation report shall be made annually regarding each professional staff member by his department chairman. Evaluation of department chairmen shall be made by the dean. The policies and procedures for evaluation shall be set forth in the division bylaws."

The Community College faculty handbook contains the guidelines for such evaluation. Since we have such policies, President Donnelly will comment on this in a moment. This should negate any need for Section 2 in the Senate Bill 494.

Section 3 in the bill provides tenure for professional employees within the Community College Division. Currently community college faculty are not provided tenure but are given substantial economic security. If a faculty member's contract is not renewed or if he is demoted, he is given ample notice and also may request written reasons for such action. He also would be accorded all the elements of due process.

This bill provides for tenure after a very short probationary period of two years. The trend nationwide in colleges offering tenure is to longer probationary periods. The universities in Nevada are not required by Code to give tenure until seven years.

The community college faculty after a four-year probationary period are given a three-year contract. The Board of Regents unanimously supported this policy when it was adopted in 1971 and no individual or collective complaints have been sent to the Board regarding this policy so we have assumed that it is functioning effectively.

Therefore, we do not see the necessity for Senate Bill 494 since evaluation is already being provided and reasonable economic security is likewise being provided after a four-year probationary period in the form of three-year contracts renewable each year.

Chairman Buchanan has further authorized me to state that the Board will be pleased to consider a community college faculty request for a change in procedure if the faculty are dissatisfied with the present procedure.

Neil D. Humphrey
Chancellor
University of Nevada System

I FACULTY

H. Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty

Evaluation of faculty should serve as a device to insure the most effective instruction in the classroom and the best educational services for students at the college. Evaluation should be conducted in a positive, constructive manner so that instructors may profit from helpful criticism of others.

Evaluation should be structured so as to provide for administrative, student, and self input. It should also provide for administrative classroom visitation so that faculty are evaluated primarily upon their teaching performance in the classroom.

Evaluation should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Mastery of subject matter.
2. Ability to communicate with students.
3. Performance of assigned duties.
4. Relationship with colleagues.
5. Organization of course.
6. Performance of students.
7. Use of learning resources material.

I FACULTY

I. Procedures for Evaluation

Each college shall develop procedures for evaluation of faculty by the administration, by students, and by the individual faculty member.

An evaluation report shall be submitted annually for each faculty member to the President by February 1.

This report should be a brief summary of the administrative, student and self evaluations.

The Executive Vice-President or his designee shall discuss the evaluation with each faculty member in a confidential manner.

SECTION 3.6 - Economic Security Provisions for
Community College Division Faculty

- 3.6.1 CCD faculty are not eligible for appointment to tenure; however, it is the policy of the University that these faculty members shall enjoy the maximum economic security which can be provided consistent with the method of financing the program and with the changing needs for personnel as program emphasis changes.
- 3.6.2 Unless otherwise stated by the president in writing, all full-time faculty appointments will be probationary until notification is sent in writing by the president to the appointee. This includes transfers from other divisions of the System. Contracts for probationary faculty will be issued for a maximum length of one year.
- 3.6.3 The probabonary period cannot exceed five years plus any part of an academic year in which an appointee was employed later than the fifth day of the fall semester.
- 3.6.4 If a probationary appointee is offered a contract for the fifth year of employment, that contract shall be either for a one year period at the end of which time the employment will be terminated, or a three year contract will be offered. By June 30 of each contract year thereafter, the appointee shall either be offered a new three-year contract, or notified in writing by the president that his current contract will be allowed to terminate in two years.
- 3.6.5 Notice of non-reappointment for the coming academic year of probationary faculty shall be given in writing by March 1.

R-J Viewpoint

138

'Diploma mill' bill could cure blackeye

A bill to prohibit the operation of "diploma mills" in Nevada has passed the Assembly and is up for consideration in the Senate.

We urge its swift passage to bring an end to the type of degree selling operations which are giving Nevada a black eye throughout the nation.

Several mail order schools, which operate out of postal boxes with no campuses or visible student bodies, have existed in Nevada for some time.

The "institutions of higher learning" have advertised far and wide the variety of degrees available for a price much to the dismay of State Department of Education licensing officials who have been unable to touch such schools, often because of their religious affiliations.

The measure up for consideration, Assembly Bill 54, would force degree-granting institutions to be accredited on the federal level and to offer courses which are transferable to accredited universities or colleges.

No longer could would-be scholars send in money and receive a degree without formal preparation or training. There is evidence that in the past many persons have earned doctorate degrees overnight from questionable sources merely by paying the required fee.

The proposed legislation would outlaw the advertising, granting or selling of degrees by any person, firm, association, partnership or corporation other than a degree-granting institution.

AB54 is such a positive piece of legislation, which will serve well to enhance the reputation of schools with integrity, that we cannot imagine it being opposed by anyone representing a reputable school with nothing to fear.

The bill is a step toward bringing long-needed control over private school education in Nevada. There are many fine private schools serving the citizens of our state, providing valid instruction in career areas which help those without a vocation become wage-earners.

Such institutions with their consumer oriented practices can be proud of their past records and their contribution to the state.

Unfortunately there are other less scrupulous schools which have taken advantage of the uneducated who are looking for an opportunity to advance themselves.

Several of these schools have been forced out of business in the past by the State Board of Education, but many of them continue to get around loopholes in the laws and make a mockery out of the whole system of private school licensing.

We agree with State Board members that there are some schools they are not really qualified to pass judgment on, including those who train bartenders, dealers or dog groomers. While AB54 does not deal with such problems it is a step in the right direction toward correcting the difficulties surrounding private school licensing.

A. B. 54

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 54—ASSEMBLYMEN WAGNER,
CHANEY, WEISE AND HAYES

JANUARY 27, 1975

Referred to Committee on Education

SUMMARY—Prohibits issuance of degrees except by certain qualified degree-granting institutions. Fiscal Note: No. (BDR 16-475)

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to academic degrees; defining degree-granting institutions and requiring that such institutions meet certain conditions; prohibiting issuance of degrees except by degree-granting institutions; providing penalties; providing injunctive relief; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Chapter 207 of NRS is hereby amended by adding
2 thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2 to 8, inclusive, of this act.

3 SEC. 2. "*Degree*" means any statement, diploma, certificate or other
4 writing in any language which indicates or represents, or which is
5 intended to indicate or represent, that the person named thereon is
6 learned in or has satisfactorily completed the requirements of an acad-
7 emic or professional program of study in a particular field of endeavor
8 beyond the secondary school level as a result of formal preparation or
9 training.

10 SEC. 3. "*Degree-granting institution*" means a school, academy, insti-
11 tute, junior college, college, university or other educational organization
12 or entity located in the State of Nevada or operating from a place of busi-
13 ness in this state which offers courses of instruction or study wherein
14 credits may be earned toward an academic or professional degree in any
15 field of endeavor beyond the secondary school level, and:

16 1. *Is accredited by an accrediting association recognized by the Office*
17 *of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education and*
18 *Welfare; or*

19 2. *Has filed and kept current with appropriate amendments, in the*
20 *office of the superintendent of public instruction pursuant to regulations*
21 *adopted by the state board of education, an affidavit by the president of*
22 *the institution stating that the majority of the course credits offered by the*
23 *institution are generally acceptable or transferable to at least one college*
24 *or university accredited by an accrediting association recognized by the*

— 2 —

1 Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Educa-
2 tion and Welfare.

3 SEC. 4. "Honorary degree" means any statement, diploma, certificate
4 or other writing in any language which indicates or represents, or which
5 is intended to indicate or represent, that the person named thereon is
6 learned in any field of public service or has performed outstanding public
7 service or that the person named therein has demonstrated proficiency in
8 a field of endeavor without having completed formal courses of instruc-
9 tion or study or formal preparation or training.

10 SEC. 5. No person, firm, association, partnership or corporation,
11 other than a degree-granting institution which has been doing business in
12 the State of Nevada for a period of 1 year or more, may award, bestow,
13 confer, give, grant, convey or sell to any other person a degree or hon-
14 orary degree upon which is inscribed, in any language, the word "asso-
15 ciate," "bachelor," "baccalaureate," "master," "doctor" or "fellow," or
16 any abbreviation thereof.

17 SEC. 6. No person, firm, association, partnership or corporation,
18 other than a degree-granting institution, may:

19 1. Advertise or otherwise represent that it awards, bestows, confers,
20 gives, grants, conveys or sells degrees or honorary degrees; or

21 2. Solicit enrollment in courses of instruction or study by making any
22 such representation.

23 SEC. 7. The attorney general or any district attorney may bring an
24 action in any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin any violation of the
25 provisions of sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act.

26 SEC. 8. Every person, firm, partnership or officer or managing agent
27 of any corporation or association who violates any of the provisions of
28 sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Senator Bryan:

The department of education feels
this is a positive step towards control
of unscrupulous practices of so-called
"diploma mills" etc. Another bill that
will be coming to you (A.B. 27) will
further ~~be~~ restrict and/or control
such schools and protect the potential
student.

We favor passage of this bill and
urge support of A.B. 27 in this committee
and in the Senate Finance Comm.

EXHIBIT N

— *John R. Smith*

You have been nominated...

The Society for Academic Recognition is the result of a comment made by Dr. William J. McGill, President of Columbia University. Dr. McGill said:

"If we consider just the bare formalities, an educated person should begin by earning a bachelor's degree from a good four-year college. He should also possess a graduate or professional degree as well as a certificate attesting to at least a year or two of post-graduate study.

"These are the essentials. A student who has managed to endure this extended regimen and who has performed well can be expected to be able to read the literature in his scholarly field and he even might be able to contribute to it. But it is not clear that a student so trained can write readable English sentences, nor is it obvious that he knows anything at all outside his own academic specialty.

"Higher education today is very narrow and very deep. It is also highly ritualized, so that bright students tend to become frustrated by what they see as the increasing rigidities of a narrow-track system....."

There is considerable food for thought in what Dr. McGill said, for many students have thrown up their hands in disgust at the archaic requirements of some school systems, thousands abandon formal educational systems because of unreasonable financial costs, and many additional thousands forsake a college degree because they are intelligent enough to realize that it is mainly a status symbol... and is in no way proof of special mental prowess or a guarantee that they'll be able to earn a living.

ROLE OF THE SOCIETY

We are convinced that there are many persons of real accomplishment who have greater knowledge, greater abilities, and who are greater assets to society than the run-of-the-mill student who has

acquiring "credits" of dubious value, and lately being awarded a degree with the title of Doctor.

We believe that the doctoral degree should be a true honor, and that it should be awarded for accomplishment, specialized labors, praise-worthy achievement in the fields of Art, Science, Literature and Industry. Such people are worthy of recognition, and, surely, they deserve to be addressed with special respect.

Some months ago, for example, the Society received the nomination of a man who lacked formal education. But, starting with one small store, he had built a business which now consists of five very successful department stores! We sent the record of his achievement to an affiliated college, which readily granted him an honorary doctorate in Business Administration. It was quite obvious that his experience entitled him to such a degree.

Recently the Society received the nomination of a man who is a chemical engineer. His formal education ended with a B.S. degree. But he continued to devote a large part of his time to research, he authored many monographs on various phases of his work, and now he heads a laboratory which is engaged in advanced research. We prepared a resume of his work and submitted it with our recommendation to a southern University, which conferred an honorary doctorate in Science upon him. He reports that the degree has been a valuable asset to him. But the fact is that his practical experience and achievement in the field of Science qualified him for the degree.

The Society is pleased to receive nominations from many fields. Inventors, educators, writers, musicians, artists, scientists, businessmen, social workers...all are valuable to our society, and all should be recognized for achievement in their work.

It is the function of the Society to screen such persons, and, when adjudged worthy, to recommend them to an affiliated college or university for an honorary degree. The degree always is conferred by the trustees of a specific college or university, not by the society, which simply is a trusted intermediary.

THE AFFILIATED COLLEGES

After evaluation, the recommendation of the Society is transmitted to an affiliated college or university. At present, the Society is working closely with Hamilton State University (Tucson, Arizona), the University of Corpus Christi (Reno,

EXHIBIT O

Kingston Christian College (Jamaica), and
Kanton Polytechnic Institute (Hongkong).

The recommendations of the Society are determined by a Board of Review, which is familiar with the requirements and interests of the various participating colleges and universities.

The fees received by the Society are shared with the affiliated colleges and universities.

THE HONORARY DEGREE

All colleges and universities grant honorary degrees--and for essentially the same purpose: to acquire extra funds for development and expansion. The number of degrees awarded annually must be limited, of course, and they never are offered in wholesale quantities. The recommendation of the Society is an important factor in the awarding of an honorary degree.

You have been sent this brochure because you have been nominated as a person worthy of an honorary doctoral degree--and because our preliminary investigation has corroborated your achievement in an important social area. We are convinced that you deserve such a degree, that you would wear it with pride and dignity, and that one of our affiliated colleges or universities will confer the degree upon our recommendation.

The Society must have a formal application, however, and it should be accompanied by the fee specified at the bottom of the application form.

Please file your application as soon as possible, before this year's quota of honorary degrees is exhausted.

VALUE OF THE DEGREE

You may not feel that an honorary degree will be of value to you. But it is more than a gesture, more than another certificate to hang on a wall. It is recognition of your personal achievement and use of God's powers. And it is a tangible evidence that you rank with less than one-half of one percent of all the people in the world!

As recipient of an honorary doctoral degree, you will be entitled to use the title of Doctor, which for thousands of years has been a mark of academic distinction (it is only recently that the medical and dental professions have tried to emphasize their status through use of the title), you will have the right to wear the cowl of the college or university in processions and robed affairs, and the handsomely engrossed Certificate will quietly tell everyone who views it that you are a person of unusual accomplishment.

But, just as important, is the fact that the Certificate is an evidence of your interest in your fellow men--and that, as a gesture of gratitude for your own success, you have helped a needy educational institution expand its services so that others may strive to improve society as you have.

ACCREDITATION

"Accreditation" is a term used to denote the bureaucratic efforts of more than 125 political agencies to dominate education in the United States. It is an archaic, complicated, back-biting system which takes an average of 14 years for any college to comply. The colleges and universities affiliated with the Society are, for the most part, "unaccredited" because they are either too new or are dedicated to an advanced form of education as yet unapproved by the agencies.

Accreditation is unimportant unless you happen to be a teacher and your salary is determined by the number of "credits" in your record. A doctoral degree, awarded *in honoris causa*, has nothing to do with credits, for it is an honor, pure and simple.

Many great universities are unaccredited. Bonn University (Germany), the University of Tokyo, and even our own Harvard University, are "unaccredited", a fact which does not cloud their roles as great educational institutions.

DELIVERY OF CERTIFICATE

The Society has already processed your nomination, and, upon receipt of your formal application, will prepare its recommendation to an appropriate college or university.

The college or university will notify you as soon as its trustees have approved the granting of the degree. The Certificate must then be engrossed, signed, and sealed. It will be mailed directly to you by Certified Mail. Please allow about four weeks for all this time-consuming processing.

Should your application be received too late to be acted upon under this year's quota of honorary degrees, or should your application be denied for any reason, the remitted fee will be promptly refunded in full by the Society.

Sec. 7 Any person, firm, partnership, corporation, association, or any other organization which violates any of the provisions of sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed \$2,500 for each violation, which shall be recovered in a civil action, brought in the name of the State of Nevada by the Attorney General or by any district attorney in a court of competent jurisdiction. As used in this section, "each violation" includes, as a single violation, a continuous or repetitive violation arising out of the same act.

Sec. 8 The Attorney General or any district attorney may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction, either as a part of any action brought under section 7 of this act or as a separate action, to enjoin any violation of the provisions of sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act.

Sec. 9 Every person, firm partnership or officer or managing agent of any corporation or association who violates any of the provisions of sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Reno diploma broker shut down

Reno diploma broker agreed to cease activities as a go between for an Arizona "diploma mill"

The agreement came under a judgment by Washoe Dist. Judge Roy Torvinen.

The judgment also requires Milton K. Ozaki, who operated the Society for Academic Recognition last year, to pay \$1,284 to Washoe County for costs of the civil action begun to halt his activities.

Anyone who purchased a "diploma" through Ozaki will be notified of the false statements made in an advertising brochure he circulated. He must refund the purchase price on request, the judgment states.

Ozaki's attorney, William Hammersmith, said the society has not operated since Ozaki was originally notified of alleged violations in April 1974.

Chief Civil Deputy Dist. Atty. Larry Struve called the order a "classic" consumer protection judgment.

The brochure mailed out by Ozaki was "pure sham", Struve said. "Anyone who bought one of the diplomas has a right to know that," he said.

In the judgment, Ozaki agrees that the brochure made false and misleading representations including the statement that the society was associated to three universities which do not exist.

The honorary degrees were not degrees because the university which supposedly issued them, Hamilton State University in Tucson, Ariz., never existed, Ozaki agrees in the order.

Hamilton State was established solely for the purpose of selling pieces of paper designated as honorary degrees, the judgment says.

Diplomas were sold to 80 people by Ozaki at a cost of \$100-\$125, exhibits attached to the judgment show.

Shirley Katt, head of the district attorney's consumer fraud division, said letters notifying all the purchasers of the facts in the case will be sent out immediately.

Ozaki's society was one of two such groups which were the subject of a Nevada State Journal investigation last spring. His society stopped operations, and the other, Jackson State University, moved from Reno following disclosure of their activities.

Gazette-Journal
Want Ads
Get Results!

144