

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Vergiels  
Vice Chairman Craddock  
Mr. Banner  
Mrs. Hayes  
Mrs. Westall  
Mr. Stewart  
Mr. Malone  
Mrs. Wagner  
Mr. Webb

GUESTS PRESENT

See Guest List attached

Chairman Vergiels called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. He called for testimony on A.B. 674.

ASSEMBLY BILL 674

Joyce Woodhouse, representing the Nevada State Education Association, presented a prepared statement and proposed amendment, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit A.

Mr. Vergiels asked what the fiscal impact would be. Mrs. Woodhouse answered that the only cost would be within the local school district for a substitute if the teacher used those extra three days. This would apply to the very few teachers who teach the extra 40 days under the 220 day contracts.

John Hawkins, Nevada School Trustees Association, stated that one of the problems in A.B. 674 is the fact that school districts in the past have recognized that teachers with a contract for 180 days received a maximum of 15 days sick leave. Classified employees and administrative staff members who worked for periods beyond 180 days also receive a maximum of 15 days. This would change that concept if you made it applicable to teachers who were teaching all year round as it would seem to be applicable to other employees and that would increase the fiscal impact to school districts. If they accumulated additional sick leave and a negotiated agreement was made to pay an employee at termination or upon retirement for unused sick leave, then there would be a fiscal impact on the local school district.

Bob Petroni, of the Clark County School District, testified that school district employees probably receive more sick leave time than any other public employees, because about two sessions ago the legislature took off the limitation of 150 days accumulation so there is a non-accumulative period of time now for sick leave, and the day teachers sign their contract, in his district, have 15 days of sick leave coming. They don't earn it by the month.

Therefore, the school district is strongly opposed to raising it to 18 days because if it is there, then all other employees should be entitled to it also because they work all year round. It also takes that much more negotiating power from the school district as it was made negotiable by the legislature with a cap on it of 15 days.

Mrs. Hayes felt that teachers should get more sick leave to compensate for the hazards of being around children all the time as they have more communicable diseases than the rest of the population and pass those diseases on to the teachers. This would make a different situation than the office workers.

Mrs. Wagner asked Mrs. Woodhouse how she would respond to the fact that sick leave was a negotiable item and now they were asking for legislation rather than negotiation. Mrs. Woodhouse answered that if the legislation failed, they would turn to negotiation.

Mr. Petroni stated that since this system became law, in the teachers agreement there is the provision for the 15 days sick leave at the beginning of the school year without having to work any months in the school year plus anything else they have accumulated in the past depending on how many years they have been there, and there is no limitation on accumulation in school districts any more.

Mrs. Wagner asked Mrs. Woodhouse what has occurred in the negotiations regarding sick leave since it has been a negotiable item, and why are they asking for legislation since they did want it as a negotiable item.

Mrs. Woodhouse answered that they had negotiated for the 15 days credit at the beginning of the year as well as removal of the lid on the amount of accumulated sick leave. They will be looking at other leave provisions that go hand in hand with sick leave. They are asking for the legislation as they had a request from those teachers in Las Vegas who do teach 220 days.

Mr. Hawkins said the financial impact would be made by those teachers working more than the 180 days, the administrative staff, and the classified staff who also work more than 180 days. Also, the additional accumulated sick leave would be paid off upon termination or retirement.

Testimony was concluded on A.B. 674.

#### ASSEMBLY BILL 148

This bill had been heard first on February 7, 1979, and amendments are being submitted for consideration.

Joyce Woodhouse, Nevada State Education Association, stated that the first time the bill was brought up for hearing, everyone was pretty much in disagreement as to what was wanted in it, so they worked toward a program that they could all support. She gave a

prepared statement and presented the proposed amendments along with the Internship Budget, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit B.

Richard Kunkle, Dean, College of Education, U.N.L.V., presented a prepared statement, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit C.

In response to a question by Mr. Malone having to do with the length of time of the academic year, Dean Kunkle explained that the process of selecting has a statewide committee coordinating the distribution of where the internships would go. A local system applies to that committee operating out of the State Superintendent's office. They ask for the number of interns needed, and the local system would be controlling the calendar time.

Mrs. Wagner asked where the money would come from. Dean Kunkle said that it would already exist for use in hiring first year teachers. This is a different form of first year teacher.

Testimony was concluded on A.B. 148.

ASSEMBLY BILL <sup>715</sup>  
~~674~~

Assemblyman John Jeffrey explained that A.B. <sup>715</sup>674 originated with one of his constituents in District 22. Their child was failing in several subjects in school, the failing notices were given to the child to bring home and they never reached home. He feels that a great number of failing students never bring home notices of failure to their parents, and if they had, the parent may have been able to do something about it. More important than the cost is the benefit to the student if something can be done to help him in time. There is an accountability of the child to the parent and the parent to the school district.

Assemblyman Lloyd Mann opposed A.B. <sup>715</sup>674 and said that when Las Vegas used to mail failure notices home, too many times the child beat the mailman home, and this is the child who failed to deliver the notice when it was given to him to take home. There is not a problem in elementary schools because of parent conferences. In Clark County the teachers are required to follow up on failure notices to be sure the parent receives them, even to the point of calling and asking for a conference. Sometimes the child would be suspended until contact was made with the parent. He feels that this problem is taken care of without this type of a bill. He stated that 50 percent of the students in Clark County will fail one class or more. Many times this is just in the first nine week period. His school runs higher because it is a specialized school dealing with night operations where the student is usually working full time during the day and going to school at night. Sometimes the students decide which courses they like and pass those and fail the rest due to his work schedule. When they used to send out notices over 35 percent came back as non-deliverable, so there was a lot of wasted expenses. They adopted the

policy of telephone contact, and also when a student misses 13 classes he is automatically dropped from the class. If notices were send to parents for 40,000 students with failures each nine week period it would cost \$6,000 for stamps alone for each mailing, not even counting the labor and materials cost, and he doesn't even feel that it solves the problem. This would be included in the present spending caps.

Mr. Petroni said he feels they have the best system now whereby they send the failing notice home and ask that it be signed and returned. If it is not returned to the teacher it is followed up personally.

Mrs. Hayes felt that many of these notices are signed by the student. She felt that more mailed notices reach the parents.

Mr. Mann stated that there is a policy of the school district that a student can not be failed without notice to the parents. The main problem is with the type of student who fails most of his courses. Many times the parents do not care or fail to do anything about it and the student drops out of school. He feels that the money can be better used in educational pursuits, and that the present system does the job. It is the parent's responsibility to follow up on his child.

Mr. Petroni felt that the problem should be taken care of at the local level rather than with a state law. Different districts have different problems and they might be handled differently.

Mr. Craddock felt that Mr. Mann might be teaching at a school that has different kinds of problems than the normal since it is a specialized type of school, in that the students are working and going to school at a different time and his system might not work for the regular schools. Mr. Mann disagreed. He said that they do not have more problem children than average; their main problem is that they have to work, for one reason or another, in the day time, and still have to maintain a normal kind of social life along with going to school full time.

Mr. Jeffrey agreed that some schools may be handling the problem well, but this is not consistent throughout the school districts. He gave personal examples of how difficult it was to find out how his children were doing in school. Many teachers do not have the time to do all the followup work. Therefore, he feels that this bill has merit.

Mr. Mann does not want to be forced back into a system that they determined did not work well, and they now have a system that they feel is much better. He would like to see it left at the local level.

John Hawkins, School Trustees Association, stated that he does see the need for this bill because there has been a lack of communication between the schools and the parents, but it is extremely difficult to notify parents of the exact status of students on a day to day



basis. It appears to him that A.B. <sup>715</sup>~~674~~ mandates notification to the parent at any time a student was failing any class. This would be extremely difficult.

Mrs. Wagner asked how he would take care of the problem. Mr. Hawkins felt that the way Clark County is handling it would work. In the elementary schools it could be handled with conferences with parents because one teacher handles all the classes and knows each student all the way through. It would be different in junior high and high school and would be handled with notices sent to parents. If the parents do not receive report cards or regularly scheduled notices, it should be up to them to follow up.

Testimony was concluded on A.B. <sup>715</sup>~~674~~.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Assembly Bill 180

It was moved by Mrs. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Malone, that A.B. 180 be referred to the Committee on Elections. The motion was carried unanimously.

Chairman Vergiels explained that there had been a request that this bill be referred and it would be made from the floor, so rather than have two hearings it is being referred directly to the Elections Committee.

Assembly Bill 148

It was moved by Mr. Craddock, seconded by Mr. Malone, that A.B. 148 be amended and given a Do Pass as Amended and Re-refer to Ways and Means. The motion was carried unanimously.

Assembly Bill 122

It was moved by Mrs. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that A.B. 122 be referred to Ways and Means. The motion was carried unanimously.

It was felt that this bill more appropriately belonged in the Ways and Means Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Stewart, seconded by Mr. Malone, that the minutes of the previous meetings be approved. The motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Ruth Olguin*

Ruth Olguin  
Committee Secretary

GUEST LIST EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
April 11, 1979

<u>NAME</u> (Please print)	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	Bill No.	<u>WISH TO SPEAK</u>	
			Yes	No
Ten Johns	UNR	148		X
Joyce Woodhouse	Nev St. Educ. Assoc	674 148	✓	
<i>Ed K. ...</i>				
<i>Helen K. ...</i>				
<i>...</i>				
<i>...</i>				
Rich Kurb	UNLV	148	✓	
<i>...</i>				✓
JOHN HAWKINS	NEV. SCHOOL BOARD	674 715		✓ ✓
Ernest F. Bayard	DEPT. OF EDUC			✓

## ASSEMBLY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

A. B. 674

April 11, 1979

Chairman Vergiels and members of the Committee: I am Joyce Woodhouse, representing the Nevada State Education Association.

A. B. 674 was requested by the NSEA. However, as drafted, the bill does not accomplish our intent. We respectfully request that you focus your attention on the copy I have just submitted to you.

Presently, most teachers work a 180 day teaching contract, and they are credited with 15 days of sick leave per year. The intent of our bill is to provide additional sick days for those persons who work an extended contract. We are addressing in particular those employees working in the year-round school program under the 220 day teaching contract.

Therefore, we ask that you consider the language on page 2, line 4 to be: "In cases of an employee on an extended contract in the year-round school program, that employee shall be credited with an additional 1-1/2 days of sick leave for each month of additional work."

Our reason for supporting this bill is simple. We believe that if extra time is worked, then the teacher is entitled additional sick leave days.

We urge your support of the amendment to A. B. 674. Thank you.

Proposed amendment to A. B. 674

Page 2, line 3

delete brackets  
delete "1-1/2 days"  
delete "month"

Page 2, line 4

delete "of any 1"

Page 2, line 4

Add new sentence after "school year."

In cases of an employee on an extended contract in the year  
round school program, that employee shall be credited with  
an additional 1-1/2 days of sick leave for each month of  
additional work.



ASSEMBLY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

A.B. 148

Teacher Internship Program

April 11, 1979

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Joyce Woodhouse, representing the Nevada State Education Association.

The NSEA supports the proposed two year teacher internship program that has been worked out to replace A.B. 148. We have participated with Dean Cain and Dean Kunkle from the University of Nevada as well as State Superintendent Sanders in rewriting the program.

We support the program for these reasons:

1. We believe that this concept is a positive way to improve the quality of teaching. It will afford the intern (just out of college) additional help from his/her university supervisor as well as support from the on-site master teacher.
2. We also believe that as practitioners in the field we, as an organization, must be involved in the program. The program, as set forth in this proposal, brings our organization, the university deans, school districts, and the State Department of Education together in a cooperative action to improve education.
3. This program can offer a further effect to the master teacher -- he/she will have an opportunity to interact with the intern, view other teaching styles and materials. This affords an opportunity for further improvement.
4. This will not be an "easy" program. The intern will have to work. We have built in some incentives to appeal to the intern and to the master teacher.

We share the concern of the public and legislators about the quality of teachers, teaching, and education. We sincerely wish to be a part of improving the system.

(Explanation of bill)

PROPOSAL FOR 2 YEAR TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Section 1. A fifth-year teacher internship program is hereby established during the 1979-81 academic years for the purpose of developing and studying the effectiveness of extended internships as a means for better preparing the new teachers of this state. The program consists of 10 intern positions, five for the college of education at the University of Nevada, Reno, and five for the college of education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The office of the state superintendent of public instruction shall organize and coordinate the program with the cooperation of the colleges of education, the county school districts that wish to participate in the program, and the county local teacher professional organizations.

Section 2. 1. The interns must be allocated and screened for rural and urban distribution by a joint committee composed of:

- a. A representative of the office of the superintendent of public instruction;
- b. A representative of the Nevada State School Boards Association;
- c. A representative from each college of education of the University of Nevada;
- d. A representative of the Nevada State Education Association; and
- e. A representative of the Nevada Association of School Administrators.

2. The interns must be selected by the state superintendent of public instruction in consultation with the local school district, the local teacher association, and the appropriate university and appointed by the local board of school trustees.

Section 3. The following conditions and requirements apply to the fifth-year teacher internship program:

1. The applicant must be eligible for initial certification in the state of Nevada.
2. A participating school district must employ the intern under a 1 year teaching contract so that the internship is concurrent with employment under that contract.
3. The intern must agree, in addition to his teaching duties, to pursue a Master's degree program in education sponsored by a Nevada institution of higher education.
4. The salary of the intern, including all applicable fringe benefits, must be that of a beginning teacher on the salary schedule in effect in the school district in which the internship is taken.
5. The institutions of higher education, the participating school districts, and the local teacher association are jointly responsible to certify to the intern's successful completion of the internship.
6. The internship terminates at the end of the academic year. If the school district wishes to retain that person who was the intern, it must do so by hiring that person as a regular employee of the school district. That person shall receive one year's credit on that district's salary schedule.
7. An intern employed in the school district for a second year will receive a tuition stipend equal to the cost of fourteen (14) credits to be taken at a Nevada institution of higher education.

Section 4. The office of the superintendent of public instruction shall prepare an interim report containing an evaluation of the internship program and including any recommendation concerning the program. The report must be submitted to the head of the educational institutions, the superintendent of schools of the school districts which participated in the program, the presidents of the local professional organizations which participated in the program, and to members of the legislature not later than February 28, 1981.

Section 5. 1. There is hereby appropriated from the state general fund to the state department of education, for the purpose of establishing the fifth-year teacher internship program established by section 1 of this act for the biennium beginning July 1, 1979, and ending June 30, 1981, the sum of \$293,904.

2. After June 30, 1981, the unencumbered balance of the appropriation made in this section may not be encumbered and must revert to the state general fund.

INTERNSHIP BUDGET  
TWO YEARS WITH SALARY SUPPORT\*

Item	First Year
<u>The Student</u>	
1. Credits 18 x \$23.00 x 10	\$ 4,140.00
2. Salary \$10,000 x 10	100,000.00
3. Fringe \$1,400 x 10	14,000.00
4. Per diem \$43.00 x 2 days x 10	860.00
Travel 578 miles x 2 trips x .10/mi x 10	1,156.00
5. Substitute 2 days x \$39.00 x 10	780.00
<u>On Site Supervisor</u>	
6. 17 substitute days x \$39.00 x 10	6,630.00
7. 3 credits per semester stipend 3 x \$23.00 x 2 semesters x 10	1,380.00
<u>College Supervisor</u>	
8. Travel and per diem	8,870.00
<u>Allocation and Screening Committee</u>	
9. Travel + per diem for 6 members	605.00
	TOTAL COST FIRST YEAR <u>\$138,421.00</u>
<u>Second Year</u>	
10. <u>The Student</u> 14 credits x \$23.00 x 10	3,220.00
	TOTAL COST SECOND YEAR <u>\$155,483.00</u> (Same as first year, plus 10% inflation, plus student tuition)
	TOTAL COST, TWO YEARS <u>\$293,904.00</u>

\*Projected on the basis that the intern beginning in the second half of the biennium will receive 14 credit stipend from the new biennium and district will pay the salary.

EXPLANATION

The Student

1. Credits: Eighteen credits at \$23.00 per credit for ten students.
2. Salary: Entry salary anticipated at \$10,000 x ten students.
3. Fringe: Estimated at 14%.
4. Travel and per diem: Based on one trip per semester to campus, overnight, from maximum distance of Elko to Reno. Computed on 578 miles (roundtrip) at ten cents per mile, for two trips, for ten students. Per diem based on six meals per trip for two trips for ten students.
5. Substitute: For intern based on two days at \$39.00 per day x ten interns.

On Site Supervisor

6. Substitute time: Based on \$39.00 per day for seventeen days. This is figured on a thirty-six week school year and allows for approximately one day every two weeks or one-half day each week, excluding beginning and ending week(s), for ten students.
7. Supervisor honorarium: Three credits stipend per semester based on \$23.00 per credit x two semesters x ten interns.

College Supervisor

8. Based on one trip every two weeks (eighteen trips) with a maximum distance of Reno to Elko, overnight, with multiplier of ten students. Per diem at \$17.50 per night lodging and \$25.50 for meals over two days per trip.

Allocation and Screening Committee

9. Costs based on six members meeting for approximately two days. Figure includes \$43.00 per diem including one night lodging and 578 miles travel at 10¢ per mile.
10. Fourteen credit stipend for all interns remaining in the district a second year: 14 credits x \$23.00 x 10 students

Source: Richard C. Kunkel, Dean  
College of Education  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Edited: 3/27/79

STATEMENT TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REGARDING ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 148

Thank you, Chairman Vergiels and members of the Committee on Education. Dr. Cain, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno, and I would like to take this opportunity to support and embellish Assembly Bill No. 148 submitted by Assemblyman Glover.

We in the University of Nevada System wholeheartedly endorse the internship proposal contained in this bill. For many years the state of Nevada and the profession of teacher education have been addressing ways to systematically upgrade the pretraining and early experiences of teachers in this state. We believe that the fifth year teacher internship program is a strong step in this direction. At a time when our state is seriously addressing competencies and accountability as they relate to both teachers and students, a fifth year program offers great potential. We strongly support the idea of the fifth year internship for the following reasons:

1. It offers the professionals in the public school systems and the institutions of higher education an opportunity to monitor and supervise in more depth the performance of students entering the field of teaching.
2. It is a way to support the fifth year of advanced work on the part of the university student while at the same time deliver additional service to rural and urban public schools.

-more-

3. If the experiment shows that this is an effective way to move teachers from the college classroom into the public schools, the model should be used more totally by both institutions as a regular part of the training program and have the following impact:
  - a. a more thorough, supervised training program of those people moving into teaching;
  - b. a more mature attitude of the necessary training for teachers which indicates, as in the professions of law and medicine, that essential competencies and skills cannot be acquired in only four years of regular college education.

Professional organizations have for several years expressed a belief in a fifth year internship program (AACTE, AASA, NEA, AFT, NASSP, NAESP, ASCD, etc.). A limiting factor, so far, has been financing. The schools and universities cannot afford the cost of the internship. We are, therefore, limited in Nevada in effectively testing the idea. More research is needed.

At the secondary level--nationally--only 13% of a student's coursework is in education (at UNLV--20%); at the elementary level, about 33%--including 12 hours of student teaching. Students need more preparation in their own professional fields.

By adding the fifth year (based on medical models)--a paid internship, under joint supervision of the universities and the school districts--we would be allowed more subject area attention

-more-

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 148

-3-

Kunkel

in the first four years. The cooperation between the state department, school districts, professional organizations and the universities would be an enhancement for the profession of teaching. We know that you and the Legislature of the State of Nevada will seriously reflect on Assembly Bill 148. We know that you will see the merit in the experimental nature of the request and the potential for long term impact. We know that you are concerned about the quality of teachers working with our children today and you are concerned with ways to enhance this quality in the future. We assure you that both of our universities will do all that is possible to see that the internship program is a quality experience from the points of view of the teachers in training and the children with whom they will work.

Thank you.

-End-