

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Craddock
Vice-Chairman Foley
Mr. Beyer
Mr. Coulter
Mrs. Hayes (late)
Mr. Horn (late)
Mr. Malone
Mr. Rackley
Mr. Vergiels

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

GUESTS PRESENT John Hawkins, Nevada School Board Assn.
Marvin Picollo, Nevada School Board Assn.
Richard Brown, Nevada Assn. of School Admin.
Joe Fisher, Nevada State Education Assn.
Joyce Woodhouse, Nevada State Education Assn.
Ted Sanders, State Department of Education
Cliff Lawrence, Carson City School District
James Lyman, Clark County School District
Claude Perkins, Clark County School District
Chuck Neely, Clark County School District
Dick Wright, Washoe County School District
Marvin Moss, Washoe County School District
Tom Hollis, Henderson Public Library
Lamont Downs, Visitor

Chairman Craddock called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m., and expressed the appreciation of the Committee for the guest's participation in this information gathering meeting. Scheduled today are: Representatives of the Nevada State School Boards Association and Clark and Washoe County School Districts.

Marvin Picollo, formerly of Washoe County and now representing the State School Boards Association introduced Mr. John Hawkins, also of the State School Boards Association.

Mr. Hawkins began by noting his talk would be centered around four areas: local autonomy of school boards, finance, employee-employer relationships, and public image of education today.

School Boards are created by the legislature but elected by the local voters. They are closer to the local voters and therefore more responsive to their needs, but are limited in their operation by much state-wide and federal legislation and controls. Examples of these areas are: special education, integration, Title IX, vocational education, non-English speaking, OSHA, hiring requirements. Many local single-interest groups also approach to try to add to the curriculum.

The School Boards Association feels that local control is not really in the hands of the Boards with so many constraints. They would like to have more local control to help the local groups as well.

Dr. Vergiels asked for some examples of present statutes limiting their control.

Mr. Hawkins responded with the example of hiring librarians in a school with over 250 students. At present, they operate many libraries with teacher aides and the program runs fine.

Dr. Vergiels asked if they wanted the legislature to include money with the mandates.

Mr. Hawkins felt the best approach was to let each local board establish their own priorities instead; rather than legislate new programs or curriculum for all boards.

Dr. Picollo also mentioned elementary counselors and programs for fire safety as other examples. If local boards have to use money to run these extra mandated programs, there is less money (and less time) to teach what each board feels is their own priority. What is good for Clark County is not necessarily good for Fallon, Lovelock or White Pine.

Mr. Hawkins reiterated that local boards can make better decisions as to local conditions and feelings.

Mr. Vergiels felt this might not be a problem because of the lack of funds in general so a lack of categorical funds this session.

Mr. Hawkins felt this might be so, but for the last four sessions, the same special interest groups have surfaced, and they feel they probably will again this time.

Mr. Hawkins continued, noting that even though the committee was not directly involved with finance, several points needed to be made anyway. Boards are concerned that when switching from local funding to state funding, controls also switch.

Another area is the fact that the Governor has many contacts other than schools such as highways, gaming, prisons. The educational department is separate from the Governor's office, with an independently elected State School Board. The Governor's budget does not, therefore, necessarily reflect all the needs of public education. Coming to the legislature is the last step to appeal these discrepancies of adequate funds. The districts have an obligation to bring this to the legislature's attention.

Employer-employee relationships: The teachers associations will attempt to broaden this area and the districts will attempt to narrow the area. Local autonomy should not be restricted.

Public image of education: Mr. Hawkins pointed out that committee members were probably exposed during election campaigns to public concerns about standards of education and about the product we are turning out. He felt television has affected students' ability for oral and written expression; family life and itinerant students have had an affect, de-emphasizing of educational values has had an affect. Other areas: class size, teacher salaries, Negotiations

Act, Professional Practices Act, the fact that salary negotiations are now out in the open showing administration and teachers in a confronting position. All these areas are in addition to the aforementioned federal and state constraints on the local school boards.

Dr. Vergiels asked why Mr. Hawkins felt the image was declining specifically.

Mr. Hawkins responded that they are dealing with two areas actually. One is the public concept of public education. The public doesn't have the same confidence as they have had in the past, whether they have performed as well as in the past or not. Mr. Hawkins' feeling is that they have, but as long as the public feels something is lacking, we all have a problem. School boards, with the many restraints, cannot respond to these problems with the same freedom as before, such as making local changes per local community. The other problem is that the type of learning has changed, such as with the passiveness of watching television having an affect on language arts.

Mr. Picollo pointed out that the polls have shown that the public has lost confidence in everyone, including themselves. However, they do hold public education at a higher degree of acceptance than the military, judiciary or elected officials, for instance.

Further, even though it appears that administrators and teachers are against each other right now, with the lack of finances, a better working together by both groups will be noticed.

Dr. Picollo noted a few interesting numbers from NEA: in class size, the state is fourth from the largest in the nation. The state was 28th in spending figures per child, now is 31st. The state was 8th in salaries, now 16th and slipping. All areas have been cut. State is now in a position where quality of education in Nevada is dropping. Local control is important, but finances will be more important.

Chairman Craddock mentioned that a letter had been received from the NEA offering their computer to distribute or gather information. (EXHIBIT A, attached)

Dick Wright, Director of Instructional Services for Washoe County, introduced Marvin Moss, Administrative Assistant in charge of Curriculum Programs for Washoe County.

Mr. Wright noted that they probably would be repeating many concerns already discussed, noting how they affect Washoe County. They will be mentioning curriculum concerns, pressure groups, population changes, affects of programs such as ESL. Mr. Wright yielded to Mr. Moss.

Mr. Moss began by noting that they agree in great measure with the presentation just made, and rather than repeat, will just add to. If they happen to repeat, it will be for emphasis.

Maintaining the quality of education is a mutual concern, shared with the school boards and Legislators. A number of things, however, continue to erode their ability to do this.

Many pressure groups continually contact the school boards to try to add to the school program. A few years back, it was a group for mandatory sex education. The school boards felt they were operating good programs, but because they were not going far enough for some groups and too far for other groups, it became a legislative matter.

Dr. Vergiels asked if this law should be repealed now.

Mr. Moss answered that it has handicapped them slightly because it does not provide for outsiders (medical authorities) to teach the course. If it were repealed, they would just continue on as they are doing it.

He continued that student population changes has also affected them. The ESL students have more than doubled in the last year. Their district has borne the burden of this program because they disagree with the methodology of the federal programs.

Mainstreaming of special education students is a problem as to the degree that it now occurs. Teacher training is needed. If too many children are mainstreamed into one classroom, the teacher is over-burdened.

Mr. Wright continued from here, mentioning SB 19, the Library Bill. Also, in the past, P.E., elementary counselors, art teachers. These are all of great concern to local schools. Legislation dictates what programs should be taught. Teachers say they no longer have time to teach the basic skills. The districts ask the committee's indulgence when these new requests surface.

Another example is 94-142. The IEP Committees are made up of local persons; teachers, aides, parents, etc.; but the recommendations they make are very costly to the school district and this does exceed the funds mandated. The extended school year for a slow learner is very costly. Summer School is generally self-supporting, but funds are now being borrowed from the right hand to pay for the left.

Professional Practices Act and probationary status of teachers and administrators should be looked at and possibly extended. This gives the employee the opportunity to grow during the two years before a school district has to make a final decision as to hiring.

Mr. Moss explained that the first year does not really constitute a full year. You may hire in August and must give notice of permanency by April 1st. Also the fourth evaluation falls after notification, on May 1st.

Dr. Claude Perkins, Superintendent of Clark County School District, introduced Dr. James Lyman, Chairman of the Board of School Trustees, and Dr. Neely, Director of Planning for the Clark County School District. (Dr. Neely is working full time with the Legislature.)

Dr. Perkins wanted to emphasize that whatever legislation should pass affects the school districts for a two-year period. They endorsed what has already been said as it seems to represent the thinking of all the school districts in Nevada.

Dr. Perkins distributed a folder to the committee members at this point. (EXHIBIT B, attached)

He noted several items on page one which they feel should be repealed from the statutes. One such item is all books placed in school libraries being approved by the State Board of Education. This is almost physically impossible to accomplish. Another area is proficiency testing. The testing is a good idea, but funds should be added to the mandate.

Dr. Vergiels asked if requests for drafting these bills had been made.

Dr. Perkins answered yes and continued that after the proficiency testing, the district was required to provide some kind of remediation for those that did not pass this test, and no funds were mandated for this. This is true of 94-142, special education also.

Business finance, pages 2 & 3: The County Planning Departments having ability to require school districts to put up traffic signs and lights. This should not be under school district funds.

Mrs. Hayes asked if this area concerned traffic guards.

They replied that it was signs and lights, not guards.

Mrs. Hayes asked about 1-1-B, if it related to the Open Meeting Law.

Dr. Perkins replied no, it had to do with posting any administrative changes for public interaction. This was from the teachers union and was not supported by the State Board Association or any other group than teachers.

The group returned to discussing the traffic lights. It costs about \$25,000 per traffic light when building a new school. The lights are required before construction plans are approved. It is different for already existing schools.

Mr. Horn asked about the cost of proficiency testing.

Dr. Perkins replied that it is a cost of purchasing and scoring the tests.

Dr. Perkins continued that they would like to see a resolution introduced insuring that school districts would not be affected by the installation of the MX missile, that excess costs would be provided by the federal government.

Chairman Craddock told them that this resolution is already in the mill, to have school districts receive aid directly from the federal government, and possibly having a resource pool that school districts could draw from until funds arrived.

Dr. Perkins moved on to 94-142, special education. The district has never received the money allocated by Congress to take care of special education. It costs twice as much to take care of a special education student than a regular student. Consequently, funds from other areas have been used. Also, failure to comply with this law has resulted in lawsuits to the district.

Another area is outside agencies that the district must provide services for, such as the Spring Mountain Youth Camp and Child Haven.

On page 7, clarification is asked for between the Professional Practices Act and the Negotiations Act where they conflict.

Dr. Perkins pointed out he had different figures than Dr. Picollo, ranking Nevada as 49th out of 50 states in pupil-teacher ratio. Clark County ranks 25th out of 50 largest school districts; being 35th in expense per pupil.

Dr. Perkins suggested that any entity, such as Health Department, OSHA, State Board of Education, be allowed to report to a legislative oversight committee when expenses exceed appropriations. Two years go by before the Legislature meets again to see how programs are going.

Mr. Malone asked what could be done to reduce pupil-teacher ratio, and they replied that in Clark County, it takes 1.6 million dollars to reduce the ratio by one student.

The District also supports extending the probationary period for teachers. They want to be fair to the employee and at the same time protect the students and the district.

Item IV-4 is just to help provide more for school board members expenses. They now receive \$35 per meeting.

Dr. Lyman began by saying that a school board must be responsive and responsible. He is concerned that every child as far as his ability permits, is prepared to communicate competitively in a very real and sometimes hostile world. He felt the best place for learning is in class in front of a competent teacher.

The NRS provides for elected boards and they formulate policy. Some of this policy is under fire and Dr. Lyman hoped that the right to formulate these policies would not be taken onto the Legislature. Local autonomy is necessary.

A lengthy discussion about Clark County's attendance policy followed. Chairman Craddock reminded everyone the time was about up and that the policy of discussing generalities rather than specifics was no longer being followed.

The Chairman called for further questions and there being none, announced the meeting on the 29th would probably start 15-20 minutes late. This meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Mobley
Dorothy Mobley,
Committee Secretary

(Committee Minutes)

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON..... EDUCATION.....

Date Wed, 1/28/81 Time 3:00 p.m. Room 214
Thu, 1/29/81
Wed, 2/ 4/81

Bills or Resolutions
to be considered

Subject

Counsel
requested*

COMMITTEE ORIENTATION MEETINGS

Presentations will be made by the following groups:

- Jan. 28th: Representatives of the Nevada State School Boards Association.

Representatives of Clark and Washoe County School Districts.
- Jan. 29th: Representatives of the Carson City and rural school districts in the state.
- Feb. 4th: Representatives of the State Department of Education including the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Representatives of organizations, such as the State of Nevada Employee's Association, which represents teachers.

Representatives of the Parent Teachers Association.

The general public.

*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.

N
E
V
A
D
A

The Nevada
Teaching
Profession

EXHIBIT A

Ne
vada state education ass
ociation

January 22, 1981

Assemblyman Robert G. Craddock
Nevada State Assembly
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Dear Assemblyman Craddock:

Congratulations on your appointment as Chair of the
Assembly Education Committee. I look forward to
working with you and the members of your committee.

The NSEA has a computer that can communicate with
all state teacher associations. We would be pleased
to secure data or information from other states as
needed by the committee.

The enclosed information recently released by the
association may be of interest to you and your com-
mittee members. Education needs to become one of
Nevada's priorities. With your leadership this year,
I am confident that process can begin.

Warmest personal regards,

Joseph E Fisher

Joseph E. Fisher 45
Executive Director
jef/plb
enc.

151
E. Park St.
Carson City
NV. 89701
(702)
882-5574

NSEA PROPOSAL FOR
STATEWIDE BASIC SUPPORT GUARANTEE INCREASE
(Expressed Per Pupil)

<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>% of Increase</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>% of Increase</u>
\$1,332	\$1,598	20.0%	\$1,838	15.0%

The request for increases of 20.0% and 15.0% in basic support guarantee for the biennium can be attributed to the following:

- (1) The state is experiencing only a slight increase in the enrollment growth rate. In most cases, the slight growth cannot be directly equated to reductions in staff. While some districts have reduced staff in response to enrollment decline, others with only slight decreases and some with increases are not able to reduce staff; therefore, the demands for higher salaries, operating costs, capital programs, and other costs contribute greatly to the high percentage request for increases in basic support.
- (2) Certain revenues are not materializing as projected. The restrictions placed on property tax levies coupled with demands for services, the economy contributing only slight increases in taxes and reductions to annual allocations of Public Law 81-874 (Federal Impaction) revenues, are the major factors contributing to restrained revenue growth and result in a greater percentage request for basic growth.
- (3) A comparison was made of current expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools per pupil in average daily attendance for 1979-80. Nevada spent \$1,806 compared to the national average of \$2,142 per pupil. Thus, Nevada's support per pupil was 85% of the national average. This ranked Nevada the 36th state in the nation (including the District of Columbia) and 11th of the 13 states in the western region. Although Nevada has increased these expenditures per pupil by 137% over the last decade, this increase has lagged below the national increase which was 177%. We must make an extra effort to avoid further serious erosion of school programs.

1/20/81

NEVADA PLAN ALLOCATIONS - 1981/83 BIENNIAL REQUEST
AS OF AUGUST 1, 1980

	<u>Estimate</u> 1980/81	<u>Request</u> 1981/82	<u>Request</u> 1982/83
Enrollment*	145,847	147,670	149,515
Adult Diploma Program	<u>820</u>	<u>840</u>	<u>870</u>
Total Enrollment	146,667	148,510	150,385
Basic Support			
1. Equalized Basic Support			
146,667 pupils @ \$1,271	\$186,413,757		
148,510 pupils @ \$1,506		\$223,656,060	
150,385 pupils @ \$1,732			\$260,466,820
2. Transportation @ 85% of Expenditure Rate			
146,667 pupils @ \$56	8,213,352		
148,510 pupils @ \$81		12,029,310	
150,385 pupils @ \$94			14,126,190
3. Wealth Equalization			
146,667 pupils @ \$5	733,335		
148,510 pupils @ \$11		1,633,610	
150,385 pupils @ \$12			1,804,620
4. Guaranteed Ad Valorem			
\$6,894,753,571 @ .002	13,789,507		
\$8,252,367,904 @ .003		24,757,104	
\$9,719,161,782 @ .003			29,157,485
5. Special Education Units			
730 units @ \$18,000	13,140,000		
805 units @ \$19,500		15,697,500	
855 units @ \$19,500			16,672,500
SUBTOTAL	<u>\$222,289,951</u>	<u>\$277,773,584</u>	<u>\$322,237,615</u>
DEDUCT: Local Funds Available			
1¢ Local School Support Tax	(59,534,590)	(73,121,072)	(84,198,444)
STATE RESPONSIBILITY	<u>\$162,755,361</u>	<u>\$204,652,512</u>	<u>\$238,039,615</u>
MAJOR DISTRICT RESOURCES			
Basic Support	\$222,289,951	\$277,773,584	\$322,237,615
Outside Basic Support:			
50¢ & 60¢ Capped Ad Valorem**	32,146,167	32,216,507	38,275,382
Motor Vehicle Privilege Tax	8,490,701	9,670,521	11,010,136
P.L. 81-874 (Impaction)	<u>4,147,912</u>	<u>4,146,408</u>	<u>4,351,176</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES	<u>\$267,074,731</u>	<u>\$323,807,020</u>	<u>\$375,874,309</u>

* Estimated @1.3% increase each year

** 1980/81 (60¢) capped levy, 1981/82 and 1982/83 (50¢) capped levy

NSEA PROPOSED
DISTRIBUTIVE SCHOOL FUND REQUEST

DISTRIBUTIVE SCHOOL FUND REVENUE

	<u>Estimated for 1979/80</u>	<u>Work Program 1980/81</u>	<u>NSEA Request 1981/82</u>	<u>NSEA Request 1982/83</u>
Regular Appropriation	\$131,391,063	\$140,458,456	\$173,876,232	\$202,314,401
Balance Forward From Old Year	-0-	6,985,042	-0-	-0-
Balance Forward to New Year	(6,985,042)	-0-	-0-	-0-
Mineral Land Taxes	6,939,325	7,000,000	8,750,000	10,940,000
Investment Income	1,291,044	1,484,700	1,603,480	1,731,750
Federal Slot Tax Credit	12,032,000	12,760,000	13,780,800	14,883,260
Revenue Sharing	5,964,408	2,950,000	-0-	-0-
O/S School Support Tax	<u>4,505,094</u>	<u>5,400,000</u>	<u>6,642,000</u>	<u>8,169,660</u>
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$155,137,892	\$177,038,198	\$204,652,512	\$238,039,171
AID TO SCHOOLS	<u>155,137,892</u>	<u>162,755,361</u>	<u>204,652,512</u>	<u>238,039,171</u>
REVERSION	<u>\$ -0-</u>	<u>\$ 14,282,837</u>	<u>\$ -0-</u>	<u>\$ -0-</u>

STATE APPROPRIATION REQUIRED:

Regular Appropriation	\$173,876,232	\$202,314,401
P.L. 81-874 Appropriation (Guarantee)	<u>4,147,912</u>	<u>4,147,912</u>
	<u>\$178,024,144</u>	<u>\$206,462,313</u>

Average Annual Salary of Nevada Classroom Teachers
as affected by the Consumer Price Index

Year	CPI	Average Salary	¹ Average Salary Const \$	Lost to Inflat.	% Change in Purchase	Average Salary Index	² Min. Sal/ CPI	³ Income Lost
1971-1972	100.00	10,439	10,439	+0	+0.00	100.00	10,439	0
1972-1973	104.60	10,882	10,403	-479	-.34	104.24	10,919	37
1973-1974	114.77	11,549	10,063	-1,486	-3.27	110.63	11,981	432
1974-1975	127.04	12,194	9,599	-2,595	-4.61	116.81	13,262	1,068
1975-1976	135.35	12,716	9,395	-3,321	-2.13	121.81	14,129	1,413
1976-1977	143.42	13,144	9,165	-3,979	-2.45	125.91	14,972	1,828
1977-1978	153.35	14,212	9,268	-4,944	+1.12	136.14	16,008	1,796
1978-1979	168.68	15,256	9,044	-6,212	-2.42	146.14	17,609	2,353
1979-1980	193.70	16,191	8,359	-7,832	-7.57	155.10	20,220	4,029
Change	93.70	5,752	-2,080	-30,848	-19.93	55.10		
Ave. Annual Change:	11.71	719	-260	-3,856	-2.49	6.89		

¹ Average Salary Constant

² Minimum Salary/Keep Pace with CPI

³ Income lost because Nevada teachers salary has not kept up with cost of living.

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SALARY OF NEVADA TEACHERS TO
INTERMEDIATE STANDARD BUDGET FOR FAMILY OF FOUR,
1971-79

School Year	Average Teacher Salary ¹	Intermed. Standard Budget ²	Ratio of Salary to Budget
1971-72	\$ 10,439	\$ 11,446	91.2%
1972-73	10,882	12,626	86.1
1973-74	11,549	14,333	80.5
1974-75	12,194	15,318	79.6
1975-76	12,716	16,236	78.3
1976-77	13,144	17,106	76.8
1977-78	14,212	18,622	76.3
1978-79	15,256	20,856	73.1

¹ State Department of Education, Finance section.

² Department of Labor estimates, reported in Allan C. Ornstein, "Teacher Salaries: Past, Present, Future," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 61, No. 10, June 1980, p. 678.

TABLE 1

ESTIMATED CURRENT EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
PER PUPIL IN AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE, 1979-80

<u>REGIONAL RANK</u>	<u>NATIONAL RANK</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>DOLLARS (\$)</u>
1	1	Alaska	4,779
2	13	Oregon	2,459
3	17	Wyoming	2,343
4	19	Washington	2,256
5	20	Montana	2,247
6	21	Arizona	2,236
7	22	Colorado	2,085
8	25	California	2,000
9	31	New Mexico	1,855
10	31	Hawaii	1,855
<u>11</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>NEVADA</u>	<u>1,806</u>
12	45	Utah	1,609
13	47	Idaho	1,542
		United States	2,142

Nevada 85.05 percent of National ^{Association} Association

Prepared by Nevada State Education Association

Source: NEA, Ranking of the States, 1980, p. 46

TABLE 2

PERCENT INCREASE IN ESTIMATED PERSONAL EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL IN AVERAGE
DAILY ATTENDANCE, 1969-70 to 1979-80

<u>REGIONAL RANK</u>	<u>NATIONAL RANK</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>PERCENT (%)</u>
1	1	Alaska	318.76
2	14	Arizona	191.21
3	18	Washington	190.41
4	19	Colorado	190.04
5	25	New Mexico	181.59
6	28	Oregon	178.94
7	30	Montana	177.49
8	35	Idaho	169.06
9	36	California	168.78
10	38	Wyoming	165.85
11	41	Utah	164.26
<u>12</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>NEVADA</u>	<u>137.35</u>
13	50	Hawaii	108.06
		United States	177.00

Prepared by Nevada State Education Association

Source: NEA, Ranking of the States, 1980, p. 47

TABLE 3

TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
IN 1978-79 AS PERCENT OF PERSONAL INCOME, 1978

<u>REGIONAL RANK</u>	<u>NATIONAL RANK</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>PERCENT (%)</u>
1	1	Alaska	7.29
2	2	Montana	5.88
3	3	Arizona	5.76
4	4	New Mexico	5.45
5	5	Maine	5.37
6	7	Utah	5.32
7	14	Wyoming	4.99
8	18	Colorado	4.83
9	25	Washington	4.70
10	29	Oregon	4.63
11	31	Idaho	4.39
12	44	California	3.92
<u>13</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>NEVADA</u>	<u>3.75</u>
14	51	Hawaii	3.55
		United State Average	4.50

Prepared by Nevada State Education Association

Source: NEA, Ranking of the States, 1980, p. 46

TABLE 4

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR ALL EDUCATION IN 1977-78 AS
PERCENT OF PERSONAL INCOME IN 1978

<u>REGIONAL RANK</u>	<u>NATIONAL RANK</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>PERCENT (%)</u>
1	1	Alaska	10.23
2	2	Montana	9.50
3	3	Utah	9.46
4	4	New Mexico	8.97
5	5	Wyoming	8.35
6	7	Arizona	7.89
7	10	Oregon	7.62
8	12	Colorado	7.36
9	13	Washington	7.33
10	25	California	6.88
11	27	Idaho	6.64
12	31	Hawaii	6.50
<u>13</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>NEVADA</u>	<u>5.17</u>
		United States	6.48

Prepared by Nevada State Education Association

Source: NEA, Ranking of the States, 1980, p. 44

TABLE 5

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR ALL EDUCATION AS PERCENT OF DIRECT EXPENDITURES FOR ALL FUNCTIONS, 1977-78

<u>REGIONAL RANK</u>	<u>NATIONAL RANK</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>PERCENT (%)</u>
1	1	Utah	47.95
2	2	New Mexico	46.98
3	5	Arizona	43.22
4	7	Colorado	42.84
5	9	Montana	42.34
6	11	Washington	41.09
7	13	Wyoming	40.58
8	26	Oregon	38.39
9	28	Idaho	38.02
10	34	California	37.15
11	48	Alaska	30.34
<u>12</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>NEVADA</u>	29.71
13	50	Hawaii	28.76
		United States	37.48

Prepared by Nevada State Education Association

Source: NEA, Ranking of the States, 1980, p. 43

Synopsis of
LEGISLATIVE PACKET
1981 NEVADA LEGISLATURE



Clark County School District
Approved by the Board of School Trustees
August 14, 1980

BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES

Dr. James Lyman, President
Mr. Robert Forbuss, Vice President
Mrs. Shirley Holst, Clerk
Mrs. Virginia Brooks Brewster, Member
Mr. Donald R. Faiss, Member
Mr. Thomas Semmens, Member
Mrs. Lucille Lusk, Member
Dr. Claude G. Perkins, Superintendent

Prepared by
Office of Information Services

I. LOCAL AUTONOMY

Mandated Curriculum Programs

Management Prerogatives	I-1
A. Requirements to Develop Lists of Books for School Libraries	
B. Policies, Requirement to Give Notice Before Adopting, Repealing or Amending	
Curriculum	I-2
A. Arbor Day: Proclamation by Governor	
B. Proficiency Examinations: Funding	
C. Instruction in Thrift	
D. Environmental Education	
Standards or Programs Established by Outside Agencies .	I-3

II. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Unemployment Benefits	II-1
NIC	II-2
PERS	II-3
Budget Preparation	II-4
Miscellaneous	II-5
Taxation	II-6
State and Local Revenue	II-7
The Nevada Plan--Support Level	II-8
Capital Funds	II-9
MX Implications	II-10
State Assistance for Vocational Education	II-11
Police, Sanitary, Vagrancy, Traffic Ordinances: Enactment and Enforcement	II-12
School Zone Speed Limits: Posting of Informational Signs	II-13
Protection and Discipline of Children	II-14
Offsite Improvements	II-15
Traffic Laws: Respective Powers of State and Local Authorities	II-16
Participation in Federal Matching Grants for Energy Conservation	II-17
Expenditure or Revenue Caps	II-18

III. INSTRUCTION

Driver Education	III-1
Association of Interscholastic Athletics	III-2
Special Education and Health	III-3
A. Related Services for Special Education Students	
B. Services Beyond 180 Days for Certain Handicapped Students	
C. Age of Admission to Special Programs for the Academically Talented Minors	
D. Funding	
1. Special Education (Severely Profound Physically/Mentally Handicapped)	
2. Spring Mountain Youth Camp	
E. Educational Services to Post Secondary Handicapped Persons	
Age of Entrance	III-4
Juvenile Court Services--Child Haven/Detention Center	III-5

IV. PERSONNEL

Limitation on Maximum Salary	IV-1
Collective Bargaining	IV-2
A. Definitions: Bargaining Unit	
B. Scope of Mandatory Bargaining	
1. Grievance and Arbitration Procedures	
2. Teacher Preparation Time	
3. Matters Reserved to Employer without Negotiation: Right and Responsibility of the Local Government Employer to Manage	
C. Submission of Dispute: Last Best Offer	
Professional Practices Act	IV-3
A. Payment of Salaries to Teachers	
1. Preparation Periods	
2. Unused Sick Leave	
3. Number of Sick Leave Days	
B. Definitions	
C. Personnel Grounds for Suspension, Demotion, or Dismissal, Refusal to Reemploy Teachers and Administrators: Absent without Approved Leave	
D. Admonition of Certificated Employee	
1. Duty of Administrator: Removal of Records	
2. Removal from Records	
3. When Admonition Not Required	
E. Suspension of Certificated Employee	
1. Notice and Hearing	
2. Limitations	
F. Recommendations for Demotion, Dismissal, or Against Reemployment	
G. Notice of Intent to Recommend Demotion, Dismissal or Refusal to Reemploy	
H. Request for Hearing: Action by Superintendent	
I. Suspension, Revocation of Teacher Certificates	
J. Evaluation of Teachers, Certificated School Support Personnel	
1. Work Performance Standards	
2. Quality and Quantity of Services	
K. Evaluation of Administrators	
1. Development of Objective Policy	
2. Quality and Quantity of Services	
L. Hearing Officers: Appointment Duties	
M. Challenge of Members of Hearing Officer List	

- N. Hearing Procedures
- O. Written Report of Hearing: Contents; Time Limitations
- P. Action of Superintendent Following Receipt of Hearing Report; Action by Board; Notice to Teacher; Judicial Review
- Q. Peremptory Challenges of Designated Hearing Officers
- R. Reemployment of Certificated Employees: Procedure
- S. Probationary Employees: Length of Probation

Board of Trustees: Salaries of President, Clerk, Other Trustees . IV-4

General
August 28, 1980

I. LOCAL AUTONOMY

The Clark County School District supports the concept of local autonomy and opposes any attempt by any agency to preempt or usurp this vested authority by any means. Certain Nevada statutory provisions are in conflict with this position, therefore, the CCSD will maintain the legislative posture that these statutes be repealed or amended. They are:

- 1-1. A CCSD will recommend this statute be amended from the requirement that lists of books for use in public school libraries must be approved by the State Board of Education, to require only the approval of such lists by local superintendents and school boards.

- 1-1. B The CCSD will recommend the repeal of this statute which requires the Board of Trustees in a county with a population over 100,000 to give notice before adopting, repealing or amending policies and regulations.

- 1-2. A CCSD will recommend the repeal of subsection 3 of this statute which requires that Arbor Day be observed by public schools by Proclamation of the Governor.

- 1-2. B CCSD will recommend that the real and actual expenses incurred for the administration of state mandated proficiency examinations be borne by the State Department of Education.

- 1-2. C CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 389.080 which provides that all teachers shall teach lessons on the subject of thrift.

- 1-2. D CCSD will recommend that all three statutes be deleted as they require Legislature mandated instruction in certain categories of environmental education which violates local control.

- 1-3 CCSD will recommend that this statute be amended to include another subsection which restricts other governmental agencies from imposing standards or programs which have a fiscal effect on the District without first insuring funding from the state Legislature or the Interim Finance Committee.

II. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

In the area of Business and Finance, the CCSD will aggressively pursue the development of a sound financial base for the long-range continuity of program planning necessary to the provision of quality education. Legislative action is sought on the following statutes:

- 11-1 CCSD recommends that existing legislation on Unemployment Benefits be maintained.

- 11-2 CCSD recommends that existing legislation on Nevada Industrial Insurance (NIC) be maintained.

- 11-3 CCSD recommends that any significant increase in the Public Employees Retirement System payment of benefits be supported by a corresponding increase in contributions.

- 11-4 CCSD recommends that existing legislation on Budget Preparation be maintained.

- 11-5 CCSD recommends that legislation which impacts the District by added regulation, increased paperwork, or added cost must be carefully assessed as to any adverse impacts.

- 11-6 The CCSD position will be to encourage and assist legislators in developing tax legislation to provide sufficient local and state revenue for the 1981-83 biennium and for subsequent year; and return at least 60 percent of the funds to local sources.

- 11-7 CCSD position calls for Nevada school districts to be authorized to collect an additional one cent sales tax to be designated as Local School Support to the Distributive School Fund, and the removal of the revenue cap established under SB 204.

- 11-8 CCSD position will support the 1981-83 State Distributive School Budget recommendations of the State Department of Education, and will maintain the position that support of basic state aid is of primary concern and that any other program or service be considered in relationship to this basic requirement.

- 11-9 CCSD will encourage and assist legislators to establish Capital Reserve Funds to meet short range building needs, through the enactment of appropriate legislation.
- 11-10 CCSD will recommend that federal revenue be provided to pay for the operational and capital costs of education in the event that the proposed MX project is initiated, and that state revenue be provided where federal money does not meet these costs.
- 11-11 The CCSD will support the resolution adopted by the Nevada State School Boards Association by proposing a draft of legislation relating to School Finances, and by presenting it to the 1981 legislature for action.
- 11-12 CCSD will recommend that responsibility for pedestrian and traffic control on public streets adjacent to schools and at school crossing intersections remain with those public agencies now responsible.
- 11-13 CCSD will recommend that existing statutes assigning responsibility for traffic control remain under the jurisdiction of those agencies now responsible.
- 11-14 CCSD will oppose any effort to require the District to be responsible for pedestrian school crossing guards.
- 11-15 CCSD will oppose School Construction Offsite Improvements mandated by city or county governing bodies as a requisite for approval of building permits or use permits without prior consultation with appropriate school personnel.
- 11-16 CCSD will recommend that control of student, pedestrian and motor vehicle traffic on dedicated public streets adjacent to schools or school crossing intersections remain the responsibility of those public agencies now responsible.

11-17

CCSD will recommend the Legislature appropriate funds to the State Dept. of Energy to permit the state to participate in the federal matching grant program.

11-18

CCSD will recommend the removal of the SB 204 cap on either school district expenditures or revenue.

III. INSTRUCTION

The Clark County School District will oppose all state mandated curriculum and forced inclusion of noninstructional programs in order to allow the District to fulfill its basic responsibility of providing a quality education for all students.

The District recognizes its shared responsibility with the home and with other institutions and will seek to clarify those areas where there appears to be overlapping and duplication of effort.

- 111-1 CCSD will recommend the deletion of all or part of these statutes which prohibit the District from providing a quality driver education program on a self-sufficient basis.
- 111-2 In 1973, the Legislature established many statutes recognizing the Nevada Interscholastic Athletics Assoc. as a political subdivision of the state but CCSD, while enrolling more than 50 percent of the students who are affected, is allowed only 25 percent representation of the Association's Board of Control. Therefore, the CCSD will recommend NRS 386.420 be revised to mandate a guarantee of equitable representation on the governing Board using a proportional membership based on student population or on a proportion similar to that which allocates members of the assembly to the state Legislature.
- 111-3 Federal and state legislation in the form of PL 94-142 and NRS 389.015 have had a considerable impact on the financial standing of CCSD, causing it to expand its programming and service to students at a rate inconsistent with available funds. Hence, the intent of the legislative packet in regards to Special Education and Health is to contain the expansion of unfunded and/or under-funded special programs and services and to seek funding for such previously approved programs and services.
- 111-3. A CCSD will recommend that the Nevada State Department of Education be responsible for assuming the coordination and costs of providing medically related services for Special Education Students from funds separate and apart from educational appropriations for instructional activities.

111-3. B

CCSD will recommend that the State Board of Education make provisions for additional funds to meet the full costs of providing programs for certain handicapped students who require special education and related services in excess of the regular school year of 180 days. Also, CCSD will recommend the State Board of Education prescribe standards to identify the eligible handicapped school-age persons.

111-3. C



CCSD will recommend a revision of section 4 to change the age of admittance into programs for academically talented minors, from 4 years to 5 years.

111-3. D1

CCSD will recommend that Severely Profound Physically/ Mentally Handicapped students now enrolled at Variety and Stewart Schools be housed in state operated facilities conducive to their specific needs for multiple related services, and that their educational training be provided by CCSD personnel at the housing location. And, the real and actual expenses associated to be totally reimbursed to CCSD by the state.

111-3. D2

CCSD will recommend that a contract between the State of Nevada and the CCSD be established to allow for the total reimbursement of all salaried positions, instructional supplies, furniture and equipment, and expenses of special programs for the Spring Mountain Youth Camp. CCSD will provide the services of the educational program on a non-profit basis in the same manner as to other schools in the District.

111-3. E

CCSD will recommend that Chapter 396 be amended so that the University of Nevada system transfer to the Community College Division the responsibility for the education services to handicapped persons who complete programs at the School District level. Further, CCSD will recommend that administrative agencies of the state be encouraged to provide appropriate services for the post secondary handicapped population.

111-4

CCSD will recommend no change be made in these statutes which set the compulsory school attendance ages.

111-5

CCSD will seek legislation which would provide for full coverage of all expenses associated with the operation of educational programs at Juvenile Court Services - Child Haven/Detention Center.

IV. PERSONNEL

The CCSD Board and Administration, in order to insure valid personnel policies and practices, will seek legislative changes in area of duplication of employee benefits or eroded management authority. The overlapping of statutes in areas of professional practices, administrative procedures and collective bargaining has created multiple avenues for the employee to pursue and has caused a multitude of problems for the District.

- IV-1 CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 281.123 which limits the salary of all persons (except dentists and physicians) in public employment to 95% of the Governor's salary.

- IV-2. A CCSD will recommend this statute be amended to exclude administrative employees as defined in NRS 288.025 which defines bargaining unit.

- IV-2. B1 CCSD will recommend this statute, subsection 2(o) be amended to specifically exclude the application of grievance and arbitration procedures to Board policies and administrative regulations.

- IV-2. B2 Due to conflicts in certain subsections of NRS 288.150 having to do with the content of the workday and the quality and quantity of services to be offered to the public CCSD would recommend that teacher preparation time be removed from the list of negotiable items in the statute.

- IV-2. B3 CCSD will recommend that subsection 5 be amended to restrict the number of school days certificated employees may be authorized to serve on state appointed boards and committees during any school year.

- IV-2. C CCSD will fight any and every effort to retain last best offer for public employee groups by an arbitrator.

- IV-3. A CCSD will recommend this statute be amended to prohibit paying an employee twice for a given period of time during the teachers work day (covering a class for an absent teacher.)

- IV-3. A2 CCSD will recommend the repeal of subsection 5 regarding the payment for unused sick leave.

- IV-3. A3 CCSD will recommend the repeal of subsection 6 which limits number of sick leave days which may be credited in any one school year.
- IV-3. B* CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.311 which defines certain terms as "administrator, board, demotion, postprobationary period," etc. since these definitions fall within the scope of mandatory bargaining as mandated in NRS 288.
- IV-3. C In the event that NRS 391.311 is not repealed, CCSD will recommend that NRS 391.312 be amended to provide for automatic dismissal of employees by the Board of School Trustees when the certificated employee is absent without approved leave for five days.
- IV-3. D1* Due to the fact that discipline is a mandatory subject of bargaining according to NRS 288, CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.313 which allows for reasonable time for improvement which shall not exceed three months for the first admonition.
- IV-3. D2 In the event that NRS 391.313 is not repealed, as an alternative, CCSD would recommend that subsection 1(b) be amended to allow an admonishment to remain for an indefinite period for employees who continue to require improvement.
- IV-3. D3 As an alternative to the repeal of NRS 391.313, CCSD would recommend the revision of subsection 2 to read... (p) and (d). An admonition should be required for insubordination.
- IV-3. E1* Due to the fact that employee discipline is a mandatory subject of bargaining according the NRS 288, CCSD would recommend the repeal of NRS 391.314 which allows for the Superintendent to suspend an employee without notice and without hearing. Since this statute is already covered in NRS 288 it is unnecessary duplication to have it included in NRS 391.314.
- IV-3. E2 In the event that NRS 391.314 is not repealed, CCSD would recommend the amendment of subsection 4 to allow for suspension of 30 working days (rather than 2) with loss of pay during any contract year at the discretion of the Superintendent.

* Priority

- IV-3. F* CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.315 which allows for Superintendent to dismiss certificated/administrative employees and for the Board to dismiss the Superintendent. The rationale for repeal is because this statute is already covered under NRS 288, which relates to mandatory subjects of bargaining, and therefore constitutes an unnecessary duplication.
- IV-3. G* CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.317 which relates to the notice of intent to recommend demotion, dismissal or refusal to reemploy, as it is a mandatory subject of bargaining under NRS 288, and therefore constitutes unnecessary duplication.
- IV-3. H* Due to the fact that NRS 391.318 is already covered under NRS 288 and is part of the negotiations process, CCSD would recommend that it be repealed. This statute relates to actions required by Superintendent regarding requests for hearing.
- IV-3. I NRS 391.320, subsections 1 and 2, pertaining to suspension, revocation of teacher certificates, currently reads "The State Board of Education may suspend or revoke the certificate of any teacher for any cause specified by law." CCSD recommends that the word "may" be changed to "must."
- IV-3. J1* CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3125, which relates to development of objective evaluation of teacher personnel in each school district, because it conflicts with NRS 288.150, subsection 3(c-1) which states... "and work performance standards, ... is subject reserved to the local government employer without negotiation."
- IV-3. J2 As an alternative to the repeal of NRS 391.3125, CCSD would recommend the deletion of subsection 2, because it conflicts with NRS 288.150, subsection 3(c) (the quality and quantity of services to be offered to the public is not within the scope of mandatory bargaining and is reserved to the local government employer without negotiation).

* Priority

- IV-3. K1*** Because work performance standards, according to NRS 288.150, subsection 3(c-1) are reserved to the local employer without negotiation, CCSD would recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3127 which relates to the evaluation of administrators.
- IV-3. K2** In the event that NRS 391.3127 is not repealed, CCSD would recommend the deletion of subsection 1 which conflicts with NRS 288.150 subsection 3(c) (the quality and quantity of services to be offered to the public is not within the scope of mandatory bargaining and is reserved to the local government employer without negotiation).
- IV-3. L*** CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3161, relating to the appointment and duties of hearing officers, because it is in conflict with NRS 288 relating to mandatory subject of bargaining.
- IV-3. M*** CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3191, which allows Superintendent and employee to strike five names each from the list of hearing officers, because this statute conflicts with NRS 288 relating to mandatory subject of bargaining.
- IV-3. N*** CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3192, which relates to set of uniform standards or procedures to be used in a hearing. The recommendation to repeal is based on the fact that this statute relates to mandatory bargaining which is already covered in NRS 288.
- IV-3. O*** CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3193, pertaining to the contents and time limitations of written report of hearing, due to the fact that this statute is already covered in NRS 288 and is a mandatory subject of bargaining.
- IV-3. P*** CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.3194, relating to Superintendent's recommendations to Board and appeal of a decision, because it relates to mandatory subject of bargaining already covered under NRS 288.

* Priority

IV-3. Q*

CCSD will recommend the repeal of NRS 391.31915, which relates to procedure for exercising challenges to the hearing officer and hearing commission chairman because it relates to mandatory subject of bargaining under NRS 288.

IV-3. R

CCSD will recommend the amendment of NRS 391.3196, subsections 1 and 3, changing the dates from April 1 and April 10, to May 1 and May 10 respectively, as the dates that the Board must notify certificated employees about reemployment, and the date that the employee must notify the Board of acceptance of employment.

IV-3. S

CCSD will recommend subsection 1 be amended to provide that teachers employed be on a probationary contract for the first three consecutive years of employment and that they may be dismissed at any time at the discretion of the Board.

IV-4

CCSD will recommend and increase to \$55 per meeting (not to exceed \$220 per month) for the clerk and president of the Board, and an increase to \$50 per meeting (not to exceed \$200 per month) for the other trustees of the Board.

* Priority