

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Bremner
 Vice Chairman Hickey
 Mr. Bergevin
 Mr. Brady
 Mr. Coulter
 Mr. Glover
 Mrs. Hayes
 Mr. Horn
 Mr. Marvel
 Mr. Rhoads
 Mr. Robinson
 Mr. Vergiels
 Mrs. Westall

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Bible, Fiscal Analyst; Judy Matteucci,
 Deputy Fiscal Analyst; Mike Alastuey, Deputy
 Budget Director (SEE ATTACHED GUEST LIST)

Chairman Bremner called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Distributive School Fund

Mr. Ted Sanders introduced Dr. Marvin Picollo, Acting Temporary Secretary of the Nevada State School Boards Association, who addressed the budgets and distributed a handout (EXHIBIT A). He stated that the State Distributive School Fund provides direct state financial aid to Nevada County School Districts in accordance with the Nevada Plan for school support. Further, under the Governor's Plan for the first year of the biennium, there is a short fall of \$18,000,000 and for the second year there is a short fall of \$22.7 million. He added that education has not fared as well as some other groups, but he pointed out the adjustments in the allocations should be done in an even manner. Mr. Picollo stated that the budget as set forth drives the education system in the state into very unequal kinds of funding, adding that some counties drop 87% of their spending power while others are up 103%. He stated that the requests being made by the State Department of Education are modest requests and are supported by the statistics in the handout.

Mr. Marvel asked how many handicapped children are being educated in the public schools. Dr. Picollo stated that Nevada ranks 10th insofar as the number of children per 100 of the population, which accounts for 5.8% of the population of recognizably handicapped. Mr. Sanders added that there are just over 11,000.

Mr. Bergevin asked what the criteria is for determining a handicapped child, and if this process is being abused. Mr. Sanders responded that the criteria is stringent. He added that a review of the testing on each child is done by a multidisciplinary group composed of principal, teacher, psychologist, and nurse, and this insures that the criteria is not being abused. He added that the criteria differs according to the different handicaps. He stated it is just as important to keep children out of special education programs that do not belong there as it is to get those children in who do belong there.

Mr. Glover asked if cuts in the human resource area by the new administration will impact the special education programs. Mr. Sanders stated that there may be some impact, adding however, that 94-142 will not be that seriously impacted. He stated that other reductions, such as in Welfare, may directly effect what is being done in the public schools, especially the 395 program.

Mr. Robinson asked who makes the decision about the lower threshold for handicapped children; stating that teachers have complained to him that they are glorified babysitters since some severely handicapped children have been "mainstreamed" in their classes. Mr. Sanders stated that the courts have determined that the schools are the institution in society who has the final authority for these particular youngsters, adding that if the state does not place them or have an institution available for them, the responsibility falls upon (Committee Minutes) the schools.

Mr. Robinson further asked what happens to the children who are so disruptive in classes that the teachers must spend so much time with them that they neglect the remainder of the class. Mr. Picollo commented that while some of the youngsters are disruptive to classes, some do make some amazing and marvelous recoveries by being placed in the public schools. He added that it is difficult to work with these children in the public schools, because they do not have the money nor the staff to provide the specialized care the children need. Mr. Sanders stated that the Federal Law 94-142 requires the public schools to serve handicapped youngsters in, what is classified by the Federal government, the least restrictive environment. He stated that it is difficult to remove these children from the classroom without going through a maze of legal procedures. He added that a study has been done at Far West Laboratory which indicates that when there are more than three handicapped students "mainstreamed", the educational opportunity of the regular student is seriously being jeopardized.

Mr. Glover asked whose decision it is to place the child in the least restrictive environment. Mr. Sanders stated that the decision is made through a process called an "individualized educational program" for that youngster. He added that this is done in concert between the district and the parent, and upon disagreement, other administrative procedures are followed. He added when those are exhausted, then the matter goes on to the courts. He stated that appeal procedures can be followed and a matter of this sort can be carried on to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Glover asked if the State has the flexibility of defining what education is as compared to training. Mr. Sanders stated that attempts have been made to do so, and there are presently a number of cases in the courts trying to do just that.

Mr. Robinson asked what portion of the 11,000 handicapped children are mentally retarded as compared to physically impaired. Mr. Sanders stated that he has the data and added that it should be recognized in a classification of this sort you can run from severely handicapped youngsters to those who are just mildly handicapped. He indicated that he would supply the data to the Committee.

Mr. Vergiels stated that money alone will not solve the problems created by the emotionally disturbed being in the public school classrooms. Mr. Picollo stated that this is true; however, money will help to serve those who are not presently being served.

Ms. Joyce Woodhouse, President of the Nevada State Education Association, addressed the committee and distributed a handout (EXHIBIT C) and discussed it for the committee members.

Mr. Marvel asked what school of agriculture Ms. Woodhouse was referring to in her comments. Mr. Joe Fisher stated that the study used was published by the Department of Nevada Wage Survey and he was not sure which school of agriculture was being referred to.

Mrs. Hayes asked if money was saved running the year around schools in Clark County. Mr. Ed Greer of Clark County stated that there are no savings realized in keeping the schools open year around. He added that in one of the schools in Clark County, unless the population in the school increases, it is going to be more costly to operate year around than normal nine-month schools. Additionally, Mrs. Hayes asked if teachers get paid more for teaching year around. Mr. Greer stated that their contracts are extended and they do benefit from a larger annual salary but it is on a prorated daily rate basis. Mrs. Hayes stated that perhaps this mode of teaching should be looked at seriously especially if MX comes in. Mr. Greer stated that if a zone is rapidly growing, then there will be districts where it will be worthwhile to implement the year around system.

In response to Mrs. Westall's question concerning teacher salaries, Mr. Fisher stated that the amount of the budget spent for teacher salaries is decreasing. He added that the inflationary spiral has effected all states, and counties are spending less on teachers' salaries. Mrs. Westall requested what percent of other state budgets are spent on education. Mr. Fisher stated that he would provide this information. Mr. Greer, in response to Mrs. Westall's question, added that there is a report out by the Security Bank of San Francisco which may provide information useful to her. He stated that he would make a copy of this available.

Mr. Robinson referred to Attachment E to EXHIBIT C and asked what impact the 8/10ths of 1 percent would have on teacher salaries, classroom size and student/teacher ratios. Mr. Fisher stated that the department's budget request provides for a minimal raise. He added that better than 50 percent of the teachers in the state last year had only a 6 percent raise, while the cost of living went up 12.4 percent.

Mr. Glover asked where Nevada ranks in the United States and in the region as far as the test scores of our students are concerned. Ms. Woodhouse and Mr. Fisher did not have the information but stated they would provide it to the committee. Mr. Sanders stated that among the different tests that are done, the students score at and above the national averages. He stated that the high school proficiency test, which grew out of AB 400, reflects that about 20% of the students do have problems. Mr. Glover commented that if there is a better group of students going in, then obviously not as much money need be spent per pupil. Mr. Sanders stated that in part this is true, however, by looking at the proficiency test data and some of the other test data, Nevada is not so blessed that it does not have students that are on the lower end of the learning curve too.

Mrs. Hayes asked if teachers are leaving the profession and going on into other fields. Ms. Woodhouse stated that there is a loss of teachers to other professions, and cited an example of math and science teachers going into professions such as computer work, oil industry, etc. Mrs. Hayes additionally asked if there is a shortage of teachers for hiring. Mr. Sanders stated that different areas in the schools have different kinds of experiences in this regard. He added, as an example, that speech therapists are in great demand and are almost impossible to find.

Mrs. Hayes asked if the teacher graduates from UNLV and UNR stay in the state. Mr. Sanders stated that many of them stay in the state, adding that there are statistics available on the number that do stay.

Mr. Bergevin commented that comparing expenditures in the State of Nevada to other states is unfair. He stated that the tax burden on the individuals of this state is much different than other states. He added that Nevada does not have the multitude of taxes that other states have; adding further that the statistic used in their statements that Nevada has the third highest personal income average is distorted. He stated that perhaps there are a small number of very wealthy people in Nevada while the rest are rather poor; thus falsely inflating the average income. Mr. Fisher stated that expenditures on education could be increased but still not at a sacrifice.

Mr. Robinson asked if the Clark County schools have many more applicants than there are openings when they are hiring teachers. Mr. Greer stated that because so many different types of teachers have to be hired, that extensive efforts go into recruiting teachers from different parts of the country. He added that there are usually several applicants for each regular teaching job.

Mr. Glover asked if the school districts wouldn't prefer hiring entry level teachers so lower salaries can be paid, and thus relieving pressures on the budget. Dr. Picollo stated that in Washoe County it has long been recognized that it is less expensive to put in a teacher fresh out of the University. He stated this has not been a priority in recruitment, but rather it has been stressed that the best person be employed. He said the average teacher in Washoe County has a B.A. and 28 additional credits.

Chairman Bremner asked Mr. Alastuey what the Governor's proposal of 7.6% and 8.7% will mean in terms of salaries for teachers. Mr. Alastuey stated that the salaries would have to be decided by the individual districts, in conference with the group of teachers that it employs. He added that under the proposals as the Governor has outlined, the district will have to suffer some constraints and may well have to curtail some programs, increase class size, and institute administrative cost cut backs. Mr. Greer commented that the Governor's proposal, if enacted, will not give the same type of a salary increase to teachers as is proposed for other state employees.

Mrs. Westall asked if there is any type of psychological testing for teachers to guard against teachers being in classrooms when suffering from stress and other physical or psychological ailments. She cited an example, "job burn-out" that is so often heard of today. Mr. Sanders stated that there is no such screening device in the State of Nevada nor does any other state in the nation have a psychological test administered to teachers before they are certified and able to practice. Mr. Fisher added that "job burn-out" is a serious problem, stating that teachers are leaving the profession or taking early retirement because of stress. He added that NIC cases are beginning to be filed for stress-related occupational concerns of teachers. He added that the Retirement Board has many cases of people asking for disability retirement because of stress.

Mr. Vergiels added that UNLV student teachers who are marginal in their abilities are not hired for service in the public schools of Clark County. He added that this is a screening process that would help guard against hiring teachers that may be a detriment in classroom performance. He added that in some of the small rural areas where mining industries are being built up, it is not only difficult to keep teachers, it is difficult to keep employees in all phases of school work because of the higher pay offered at the mines.

Mr. Brady stated that statistics show that people change jobs at least three times in life, so to think by paying people more salary will entice them to stay is really an incorrect assumption. He asked if a study has ever been done comparing the job change rate of teachers to other professions. Mr. Sanders stated that he did not know of any scientific comparisons that have been done. He stated that he had looked at turnover data in the technical electronic firms in Clark County and one of the firms reflects a 22 percent turnover rate per year. He stated this is higher than the turnover rate of teachers but the study does have firm data in terms of the adverse effect of turnover upon productivity.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Tom Sanders addressed the budget requests of the State Board of Education and stated that there are substantial changes across the budget accounts. He said they are requesting approval from the Federal Government to apply an indirect cost rate to all of the accounts so that they can better spread the administrative costs across all programs. He added that several general administrative functions have been included in that indirect cost assessment.

Mr. Sanders stated that the costs of printing the school directories would be offset by the income derived from selling them to text book publishers and other interested businesses.

Mr. Sanders drew the attention of the committee to the Governor's recommendation to eliminate 2 positions from the work program in the area of child abuse and driver education. He stated that an education consultant position is eliminated which works in the area of science and environmental education. He added that these are slated for transfer to education support services which is a new program to receive these administrative functions. He said it is funded from the indirect cost assessment. He added that 2 positions in the Federal School Lunch Program are slated for transfer and will be paid from the administrative overhead costs derived from the Federal government for the operation of this program.

Mr. Sanders stated that the quick copy operation will be placed under the management and control of the State Printer. He said printing costs will be charged back to the respective programs as they utilize the printing services.

Chairman Bremner asked why travel amounts were not decreased accordingly with the reduction of personnel. Mr. Sanders stated that the travel projections are based upon those individuals who actually do travel in the performance of their duties. He said the type of people that are transferring to the indirect cost account budget are people who do not travel in the performance of their duty.

Mr. Glover asked what the advantage is of having the State Printer take over the printing operations. Mr. Sanders stated that it is of no particular advantage to him, in fact it will inflate his printing costs rather than save money for the Department of Education. He stated that the machinery that they have is not utilized to its fullest capacity and the state benefits and saves money by putting the machinery to use for more than one department.

Mr. Glover asked if the machinery would be transferred from the Department of Education facilities and who would staff it. Mr. Sanders stated that it would be left in place and staffed by the State Printer. He said the Department of Education would receive priority on their printing requests. He added that there have been two positions operating the equipment. He said the position of the printer itself will be maintained and the job control graphic artist position is recommended for deletion by the Governor's proposal.

Mr. Alastuey stated that the administration of these printing functions will be transferred to the State Printer but the actual hardware itself will not be moved from the building where it is being housed. He added that an agreement has been made with the State Printer and the Department of Education that education needs will be served on a priority basis.

Education Support Services

Mr. Sanders addressed the committee and stated that this is a new budget account that has been established to house the general administrative support derived from the indirect cost assessment. He added that there are several positions transferring into the budget account to staff the various work programs. He stated that in this budget account there are 2 new positions requested and recommended by the Governor; one is for an additional auditor and the second is a position to work in the fiscal services area to meet the increased work load that is being experienced there.

Mr. Sanders pointed out the substantial amount budgeted for out-of-state travel, stating that it is primarily for the audit staff who must travel to the schools to conduct audits.

He stated that an increased amount has been requested in legal and court fees, and will be used to purchase full time services of a Deputy Attorney General for the Department of Education. He added that this is needed because of increased legal activity dealing with certification problems in the state.

Mr. Glover asked how long the lease is on the building presently being used by the Department of Education. Mr. Sanders stated they have a five-year lease on the building in Carson City, and the space rented in Las Vegas is on an annual basis. Additionally, Mr. Glover asked what the rent costs were for the building in Carson City. Mr. Sanders stated that it is rented for \$.77 per square foot and it is predicted that the cost may rise to \$.84 and \$.90 in the next two years. He added that in Las Vegas the present rent fee is \$.75 per square foot.

Mr. Glover asked who paid the utilities at the Carson City building. Mr. Sanders stated that they are paid by the landlord, however increases in utilities will be passed on to the rentor. Mr. Glover stated that the Carson City building (Stokes Building) is not energy efficient.

Chairman Bremner distributed a handout (EXHIBIT D) from the Nevada Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education.

Vocational Training

Mr. Sanders addressed the budget and stated the vocational education efforts at the state level are responsible for vocational training and education at the local level. He added that the budget has several changes. He stated that the Federal grant portion is available for use in matching state administrative costs 50/50. He pointed out that there are some exceptions to the funding proposals as set forth by the Governor.

Mr. Glover asked if it is Federal law that the portion of the program to remove sex bias and discrimination from the programs be staffed at the state level. Mr. Sanders stated that it is Federal law and the funds to accomplish this portion of the program are entirely Federal.

Mr. Sanders stated there are several changes in the revenue side of the budget. He stated that this is in part due to a reduction in staff and in part due to a reduction in aid to school districts for vocational programs. He added there is a new item in this budget which is a transfer from CETA of \$54,775. He said this is the 6 percent vocational money that is made available to the state in the Governor's grant and must go for vocational education programs.

Mr. Sanders pointed out the differences between the Department requests and the Governor's recommendations in the aid to school category. He pointed out that the Governor's recommendations include \$103,500 in the first year of the biennium and \$112,850 in the second year of the biennium. He stated that this does not make much difference in some of the larger and medium size schools. He added that the revenues that a county such as Lincoln would derive from the Federal vocational dollars would not make it beneficial for them to accept those dollars because vocational classes are more expensive than regular courses.

Mr. Robinson asked where the \$50,000 used for elimination of sex bias and discrimination shows up in the budget. Mr. Sanders stated that the \$50,000 must be applied for and if it is accepted, will be budgeted in the administrative costs portion. He said the funds will go to support an education consultant and the administrative aide that accompanies this position. He added that the education consultant and the administrative aide positions are actually engaged in completing the projects that the money was to be used for, even though the funds don't really show up in the bottom line figures.

Mr. Glover asked if the Federal Government decides to give the state some money because of MX, would it go through the Department of Education budget. Mr. Sanders stated that this would depend on the type of funding mechanism that is chosen by Congress to flow the funds to the state. Mr. Sanders stated that he feels that it is appropriate that the funds flow through his department but added that this may not be the method chosen by Congress.

School Lunch Program

Mr. Sanders stated that this is a program to equip cafeterias, provide lunches, breakfast foods, the special milk program and nutrition education for students. He added that it has a very complex Federal matching requirement attached to it. He stated that these requirements will be discussed in detail with the subcommittee and added that \$324,000 should be earmarked in the Distributive School Fund Appropriation for the purpose of meeting these matching requirements.

Mr. Sanders pointed out that \$75,000 is available to the state in this program for nutrition education. He pointed out that travel costs are extensive in this program and the department will discuss in detail with the subcommittee the various intricacies of the travel requirements.

Mr. Glover asked if any direction is received from the Federal Government on what should be taught in the nutrition education program. Mr. Sanders stated that there are no specific directions received from the Federal Government on what should be taught.

Mrs. Hayes asked if the state is mandated to have a breakfast program. Mr. Sanders stated that there is no mandate for this program, it is optional to the school districts. He added that the entire program operates on a cost reimbursement basis which flows through the State Department of Education.

Mr. Alastuey commented on the proposal to earmark a certain component of the school fund for a match in this program. He said there is a proposal in the suggested Appropriations Act that earmarks \$200,000 per year, which lines up with the Department's proposal of \$324,000. Mr. Sanders stated that more work needs to be done on these figures to make sure that the correct figure is requested.

Driver Education

Mr. Sanders stated that the State Board of Education recommends that the program not be funded any longer. He said districts, if they do operate driver education programs, will probably assess fees to students adequate to offset the cost of the program.

Chairman Bremner asked if the programs would be lost. Mr. Sanders stated that it is not known to what extent the programs will be lost. He added that it would be dependent upon the parents' and the students' abilities to pay for the program. He added that car dealers no longer make cars available for the programs and the districts cannot afford to buy cars. Chairman Bremner asked that the districts be polled and their intentions in regard to the driver education programs be brought back to the subcommittee.

Mr. Marvel asked how the money is allocated among the various districts. Mr. Sanders stated that it goes out to the districts on the basis of \$35.00 for each student driver enrolled in driver education.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Mr. Sanders stated that this program provides funding to school districts and to other public agencies to establish a compensatory program for disadvantaged children. He stated that target schools are singled out where these programs may be established. He said children who are served by these programs are identified on the basis that they are educationally disadvantaged, which is determined by testing programs.

He stated that Federal entitlements during the second year of the biennium may be cut by as much as 65 percent by the Federal Government.

He stated that there are 2 positions requested for this budget which will carry out additional monitoring and enforcement requirements that have been imposed upon the states. He added if there is a reduction in the Federal funds, these two positions will be deleted.

Mr. Sanders pointed out the dramatic increase in out-of-state travel. He stated that this is to pay for some of the staff and a Deputy Attorney General to travel to Washington to resolve the Federal Title I audit exception that has been taken against the Washoe County School District. He said this has been pending since the last session of the Legislature, at which time it was stated that additional funds might be needed.

Mr. Sanders stated that the funds requested for office furniture may not be necessary if the additional staff is not granted.

Mr. Rhoads asked if the state is obligated to continue with the state money if the Federal Government withdraws some or all of its funding on some of the Federally matched programs. Mr. Sanders stated that if the Federal funds are not forthcoming, then programs and staff would be cut proportionally. He said no attempts would be made to ask the state to pick up the Federally funded portions of the various programs.

Mr. Bergevin stated that information has been received from Washington, D.C., that grants may be changed to block grants rather than entitlements. He asked if Mr. Sanders would encourage the funds going into the schools as a block to be used as the schools saw fit and questioned the effect of this type of funding. Mr. Sanders stated that he does support the block grant kind of approach because there are fewer Federal strings attached and greater latitude to use the funds.

Elementary and Secondary Education Title IV B & C

Mr. Sanders stated that this Federal program basically provides resources to school districts for libraries and learning resources and also for innovative programs to meet unique needs in a particular locale. He added that there are not so many Federal strings and regulations on these funds. He stated that about \$400,000 of the funds can be competitively sought by the different schools to enable them to try some sort of program unique to their locale. He stated that classroom programs and experiments have been successfully funded by these Federal funds.

Mr. Glover asked for examples of what the money is used for. Mr. Sanders cited an arts project in Clark County that was operated by the district to develop an arts curriculum that could be integrated into the school. He cited a particular small project where a teacher wanted some materials to do a newspaper type of activity in the classroom. He said the teacher was successful in getting \$300-\$400 to complete the program. He stated that there were gains in the students' abilities to write because that elementary teacher engaged in that particular program.

ESEA - Title V

Mr. Sanders stated that this is a block kind of grant which has existed for many years which is intended to strengthen State Departments of Education. He stated that it is basically available for states to use for purposes they deem appropriate. He stated that most often the funds have been used to provide operational monies for regular state responsibilities such as planning and evaluation staff and teacher certification assistants.

He stated that if Federal funds are restricted in this budget, it will be difficult for the Department to meet state responsibilities such as teacher certification.

Mr. Sanders stated that the recodification that was authorized during the last session has been accomplished and that a very useful product to the state in the form of the State Board Policy was the outcome of this expenditure.

ESEA - Title VI

Mr. Sanders stated that this is the money for Public Law 94-142. He stated that there are no changes recommended in regard to positions. He added that no substantial cuts are anticipated from the Reagan Administration. He added that this program is a heavy user of in-state travel funds because of the requirement that every program must be monitored in the state for handicapped children.

Mr. Marvel asked how much of the \$2,000,000 of this budget goes to defray the costs to the school districts for accommodating the handicapped students in the public school classrooms. Mr. Sanders stated that the Distributive School Fund is requesting \$13 or \$14 million in the special education area, but he stated that school districts use their general operating funds derived from the students. He added that there may be a total of \$15 million expended in direct aid to the school district for assistance in their special education programs.

Discretionary Grants Program

Mr. Sanders stated that this program is set up to house very small grants to the state for unique purposes. He stated that one of the programs is intended to share educational practices that have proven successful, to avoid others from having to "reinvent the wheel."

Teacher Training for Handicapped Children

Mr. Sanders stated that this budget is tied to handicapped children and is a competitive grant that must be applied for. He said it is intended to provide additional training to teachers of the handicapped and also to regular classroom teachers who have handicapped children in their classrooms.

Adult Basic Education

Mr. Sanders stated that there is a 10 percent match on these funds and the Department is requesting that the full state and local match be met. He added that the Governor is recommending that only the state level match be met. He stated that this program provides educational services to about 3,000 adults and the primary focus is literacy. He said the end result is generally the passage of the GED test. He stated that the service cost is about \$90 per adult.

Department of Education - CETA

Mr. Sanders stated the transfer of revenues into the vocational education account is an important aspect of this budget. He stated that this program does provide vocational training to CETA eligible youngsters.

Care of Handicapped

Mr. Sanders stated this is the NRS 395 program which sets up the structure of the program, adding that it was projected for this year of the biennium to serve some 50 students. He said efforts to reduce that number have been made. He added that today some 39 youngsters are being served out of state with this program. He stated that the inflationary costs on the out-of-state placements are rising rapidly and causing difficulties in the program. He stated that there is a need for travel in this budget to monitor the placements.

Higher Education Student Loan Fund

Mr. Sanders stated that this program is set up to guarantee student loans under a program authorized by the Federal Government. He stated that there is about \$18 million in loans to students at the current time.

Professional Standards Commission

Mr. Sanders stated that this commission was established by the Legislature in 1979, adding that in this current biennium, only the travel costs for the commission have been underwritten. He stated that secretarial support is being requested for the upcoming biennium.

Mr. Alastuey commented that the last appropriation does not contemplate any staff support and simply recommends continuation of the existing appropriations for travel and other administrative costs.

Proficiency Testing

Mr. Sanders stated that there is no request for an appropriation into this particular budget for the biennium. He added that the contract money in Title V is intended to support some of the maintenance costs of this testing program. He said that contracting at the state level on behalf of the districts to purchase the tests and the scoring services, will create a cost savings to the districts. He stated that this places a need on the part of this budget to show that this is actually being received from the districts.

Displaced Homemakers

Mr. Sanders stated that this budget was established by the Legislature in 1979 and is now located at Clark County Community College in Las Vegas. He added that this request would provide funding for centers in both north and south areas of the state.

Mr. Rhoads asked what the attendance has been in Las Vegas. Mr. Sanders stated that the attendance has been very good, stating that in the first year of the biennium, some 500 were served, and that figure doubles during the second year of the biennium.

Chairman Bremner asked in what manner these displaced homemakers were served. Mr. Sanders stated that services were provided in a variety of ways and added that Mrs. Fern Latino, the Director of the Center in Las Vegas could better answer the question.

Mrs. Latino distributed a handout (EXHIBIT E) and addressed the committee with regard to this handout. Mrs. Latino's comments are attached to these minutes as a portion of EXHIBIT E.

Mrs. Latino stated that there is a critical need to expand the services to include displaced homemakers under the age of 35. She stated that 50 percent of those served are over 35 years of age, while 50 percent are under 35 years of age. She added that although AB 151 stipulates an age criterion of 35 years, neither CETA nor Vocational Education have an age criterion, and since both of these major resources are utilized, Mrs. Latino stated that this program must serve all ages.

Chairman Bremner asked if the law had been violated in serving displaced homemakers under the age specified by the law. Mrs. Latino stated that the law had not been violated because the charter group of 35 years and older have not been neglected. She added that the age of the client is not asked until after they have been served. Chairman Bremner commented that when the law was enacted, it specified that service would not be provided to anyone under the age of 35 and the law has not been modified.

Ms. Sharon Ryno, Information and Referral Specialist at the Displaced Homemaker Center, commented on her experience as a displaced homemaker and her success in working with the Center in securing an education for herself.

Ms. Darleen Thompson, an associate at the Center, presented comments to the committee on her experience as a displaced homemaker and the success she has achieved through services rendered to her by the Displaced Homemaker's Center.

Mr. Glover asked if the Center is legally able to ask the age of people who come to the Center for service. Mrs. Latino stated that on the intake form, there is a section which asks this information but it is optional and some do not supply the information. She stated that some refuse to give their ages and sources of income but this has no effect on whether services are provided or not.

Mr. Horn asked what will happen to the Center if the funds requested are not provided. Mrs. Latino stated that the program will continue but it will not be the kind of program that has been built to date.

Mr. Horn asked if the vocational instructor is currently funded on two grants. Mrs. Latino stated that this position is funded on vocational education money which will terminate at the end of March 1981.

Chairman Bremner asked if these are direct grants to the Center. Mrs. Latino stated that they are grants to the college. Mr. Sanders added that in the vocational education budgets reviewed earlier, there is a certain amount of funds that must be spent on this Center. He said this is about \$8,600 per year.

Mr. Horn asked if the Information Referral Specialist, the Vocational Instructor, and a classified position are currently being recommended to convert to state dollars. Mrs. Latino stated that this is correct and if these requests are not granted, then just herself and a classified position will be running the entire Center. She added that the work study position will not continue.

Mr. Horn asked how a person qualifies for the services of the Center if they are not gainfully employed. Mrs. Latino stated that being employed is not a prerequisite to receiving services.

Mr. Horn asked how many more people could be served if the funding requests of the program were granted. Mrs. Latino stated that 1/3 to 1/2 more people could be served.

Mr. Robinson asked if the amounts requested in the budget are recommendations or if they are actually needed to operate the program. Mrs. Latino stated that the figures shown are requests and added that in the past, 60 percent of the total budget requests have been received. She stated that she is asking that this method of funding be continued if this program is continued.

Mrs. Hayes asked if the case load would be cut in half if the Center complied with the law and if this would reduce budget costs. Mrs. Latino stated that the case load would be cut in half if the law were complied with, however, the budget costs would not be affected because the program that has been mandated cannot function under the funds that were first appropriated.

Mrs. Hayes asked if the law should be changed. Mrs. Latino stated that she would like an amendment to the law to eliminate the age specification. She added that this change can be justified by the services rendered to individuals under 35.

Mr. Robinson asked if men have been served by the program. Mrs. Latino stated that 20 men were served by the program during the last biennium. Mr. Robinson stated that it was very arbitrary to have had the program opened up to citizens under the age of 35, and added that the possibility exists that the funds expended illegally could be ordered repaid.

Mr. Vergiels asked what was done in the audit report to account for services rendered to people under 35. Mr. Sanders stated that this may not have been addressed specifically and he stated that he would provide the information to the committee.

Mrs. Latino asked that because she receives vocational education funds in the program, if she has to arbitrarily apply the 35 age limit to those funds because there is no such requirement on those funds.

Chairman Bremner stated that would be addressed at such time as the audit report is received.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

A PERMANENT COPY OF EXHIBIT A IS ON

FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF FISCAL ANALYSIS.

TABLE 6
SUMMARY OF PERCENTAGE EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS WITH
COST OF EDUCATION INDEX*

BUDGET AREAS	1977-78 COST PER PUPIL				1978-79 COST PER PUPIL			
	NATIONAL AVERAGE	AVERAGE OF NEVADA**			NATIONAL AVERAGE	AVERAGE OF NEVADA		
		LARGE DISTRICTS**	MEDIUM DISTRICTS**	SMALL DISTRICTS**		LARGE DISTRICTS	MEDIUM DISTRICTS	SMALL DISTRICTS
ADMINISTRATION	2.9%	1.9%	3.3%	4.9%	NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME FOR 1978-79	2.0%	3.2%	6.1%
INSTRUCTION	59.7%	62.5%	60.5%	52.8%		63.6%	58.7%	67.1%
ATTENDANCE SERVICES	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%		0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
HEALTH SERVICES	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%		0.6%	0.5%	0.7%
FOOD SERVICES	1.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		0.06%	0.06%	0.3%
TRANSPORTATION SERVICES	3.3%	3.5%	6.7%	8.9%		3.9%	6.5%	9.2%
PLANT OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	11.2%	13.1%	13.5%	13.0%		12.9%	12.8%	16.7%
FIXED CHARGES	11.8%	14.1%	11.6%	10.4%		14.7%	12.4%	13.8%
CAPITAL OUTLAY	5.0%	1.1%	0.6%	4.3%		0.7%	0.6%	3.2%
ALL OTHER CURRENT EXPENDITURES	5.9%	3.0%	3.0%	5.1%		1.5%	5.0%	8.6%
TOTAL NET CURRENT EXPENDIT.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
DEBT SERVICE	6.2%	14.5%	7.6%	4.4%	11.6%	6.9%	0.7%	
GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES	106.2%	114.5%	107.6%	104.4%	111.6%	106.9%	100.7%	

From "National Comparison of School Costs, 1977-78"
See page 6 for identification of districts by size.

EXHIBIT C

DISTRIBUTIVE SCHOOL FUND

Testimony Presented By:

Joyce L. Woodhouse, President
NEVADA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Presented to:
Assembly Ways and Means Committee

February 11, 1981

The Nevada Plan used to finance public education for the seventeen school districts is based on the premise that "the proper objective of state financial aid to public education is to ensure each Nevada child a reasonably equal education opportunity" (see Nevada Plan for Support of Public Education, 1981-1983 Biennial Request). It is a minimum foundation plan which seeks to equalize support among the districts both on a per pupil basis and on a program basis. Calculations to determine need of the districts are made primarily on projections of historical data rather than a thorough analysis of the state's and district's ability to support quality education for the students of the state. By any measure of comparison, Nevada places a low value on public education relative to other states.

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 (Table 1). 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 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% (Table 2). We must make an extra effort to avoid further serious erosion of school programs. In terms of growth of expenditures, Nevada ranks 48th in the nation and 12th in the region.

It would be expected that low per pupil expenditures would be found in the relatively poor states of the southeastern region rather than in Nevada which has the 3rd highest personal income per capita in the nation according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

Other reasonable explanations for low per student expenditures would be densely populated states where economics of scale in school programs could be enjoyed or in states where substantial private education is provided, such as in Hawaii. In fact, Nevada suffers from the problems of high cost programs in the sparsely populated rural counties (see Nevada Plan).

The question remains: Why does Nevada with one of the highest per capita income rankings in the nation support education so poorly relative to other states? In terms of total expenditures, as a percent of personal income, Nevada ranks 49th in the nation and 12th in the region (Table 3). Nine of the 13 western states rank above the U.S. average, and only Hawaii of the western states, which provides considerable private education, ranks below Nevada. When higher education

is included with elementary and secondary education, Nevada ranks below Hawaii at 50th in the nation (Table 4).

One reason Nevada ranks so low in support of education is the fact that it allocates a relatively small portion of state and local expenditures for education. State and local expenditures combined are used rather than separately because of the different reliance on state funding as opposed to local funding of schools among the states. State and local government expenditures for all education was 29.71 percent of all direct expenditures for all functions in Nevada in 1977-78. This compares with the U.S. average of 37.48 percent and ranks 49th in the nation and 12th in the 13 state western region (Table 5).

The Nevada Plan aims to provide a reasonably equal educational opportunity for students of the seventeen school districts. It should, however, go further and address the level of that equality or the means of arriving at the minimum foundation. Clearly, Nevada can afford to rank higher than 36th in the nation or 11th in the region in per student expenditures for education since it enjoys the third highest per capita personal income in the nation. Improvement can come from either of two directions. First, the tax capacity can be used more effectively. The most recent figures released by the Tax Foundation rank Nevada 7th in per capita, state and local tax revenues, but 16th in taxes per \$1,000 of personal income. Taxes per \$1,000 of personal income increased by only 6% in Nevada over the decade 1969-79. These figures clearly overstate the tax burden on Nevadans because some of our most productive tax sources are levied on visitors. Furthermore, the tax package enacted by the 1979 session of the Legislature reduces tax revenues relative to personal income. It is imperative that tax relief be balanced with increased support for education.

Instead of, or in addition to, considering new revenue sources, the state could allocate a larger portion of total state and local expenditures to education. Such consideration seems justified in light of the fact that Nevada ranks 49th in the nation and 12th in the region in allocating public expenditures in education.

The action of the 1981 session of the Legislature will largely determine the status of education in Nevada during the decade of the 1980's. You will not have another chance to deal with the tax cuts of 1979 until 1983. In all probability, Nevada's relative position will worsen by that time unless corrective action is taken now. Moreover, the state has taken on a greater responsibility

and reduced the local participation in financing education. There is little that local districts can do to deal with their own financial problems since much of their local source of funding has been removed by the Legislature.

We cannot allow this grim situation to continue. Class sizes in the State of Nevada are growing larger as the years go by. Presently, Nevada ranks fourth from the bottom in pupil-teacher ratio as compared to other states in the nation. Class size creates a tremendous impact on the instruction of the children and the morale of the teacher. Good educational philosophy dictates an emphasis on the individualization of instruction. As classes get larger, that special help is denied to the child who needs it. It is disgraceful that Nevada is already close to the bottom and that those class sizes continue to grow.

Another serious problem to be faced is that of payment for the services of the educational work force. At the same time that Nevada experienced a 15 percent increase in per capita personal income, the average teacher's salary in Nevada only increased by seven percent.

Teachers are being forced out of the profession due to inadequate salaries. The 1979 Nevada Wage Survey shows starting teachers' salaries are lower than those of mechanics, accountants, building construction inspectors, computer programmers, court clerks, and agriculturalists, among others. We don't begrudge those workers their salaries, nor do we wish ill on our public employee counterparts. However, when compared to state and local government employees in Nevada, teachers do not fare well. Over the ten year period from 1968-78, government employees' average salaries increased six percent more than the average teacher's salary.

Nevada ranks at the bottom of the scale in terms of teacher salaries in the Far West Region which includes our sister states of California, Washington, and Oregon. The average teacher's salary in Nevada comes in at almost \$2,500 below the average in other states: the average for the region is \$18,678, but the average in Nevada is only \$16,191.

In terms of cost of living, the situation is even more deplorable. Figures gathered from the Nevada State Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and NSEA Research show that our teachers have lost one-fifth of their buying power over the ten-year span from 1970-80. The figures show a loss of \$30,848 over the ten years, or \$3,856 per year. In order to stay even with the cost of living, the average teacher's salary should be \$20,220 rather than the \$16,191 that it is.

The problems of equitable salaries for services rendered by teachers is compounded by the impact of inflation on school districts. In sample school districts of Mineral, Clark, and Carson City, one can clearly see the declining percentages of school budgets that go to teacher salaries: from 1971-1972 to 1979-1980, Mineral County dropped from 52.35% to 38.3%, in Clark County the drop was from 56.9% to 49.9%, and in Carson City the decline was from 57.0% of the budget to 44.9% (Exhibits A, B, C).

For all of these reasons, the Nevada State Education Association, speaking for the teachers, requests additional monies in the Distributive School Fund. The Governor's recommendations translate into increases of 7.6% and 8.7% over the biennium for per pupil expenditures for school districts. These recommendations would, if adopted, cripple the educational opportunities of Nevada's children and would destroy the morale of teachers as well as plunge them into the abyss of poverty. The Department of Education has recommended - a 14.1% increase in the first year and 9.3% in the second year. This proposal for per pupil expenditures only provides maintenance of the status quo.

The NSEA believes that programs for students must be maintained and improved and that teachers must receive a fair salary increase for their vital services. We call upon you to fund the Distributive School Fund at an increase of 14.9% the first year and 12.9% the second year of the biennium (Exhibits D and E).

We thank you sincerely for the support you have given education in the past years. We urge your profound study of these issues. We appreciate the opportunity to address you today and are available for further discussions. Thank you.

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 Average

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

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	4.85
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

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

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

582

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	+ .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.

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHER SALARY COMPARED TO TOTAL BUDGET

Year	Total Budget	Teachers Salaries	% of Teachers Salary/Total Budget	% Increase % Decrease
71-72	\$ 1,844,220	\$ 965,391	52.35%	
72-73	1,936,577	982,695	52.23%	-.12%
73-74	2,176,427	1,019,929	47.05%	-5.18%
74-75	2,258,528	1,028,264	46.71%	-.34%
75-76	2,296,784	975,113	42.6%	-4.1%
76-77	2,263,320	942,962	41.6%	-1.00%
77-78	2,475,850	977,208	39.4%	-2.20%
78-79	2,639,280	1,018,536	38.3%	-1.1%
79-80	2,792,922	1,072,452	38.3%	0.0%

This exhibit proves that the percentage of teacher salaries has decreased in comparison to the total budget.

This shows that the District priorities have changed in Mineral County

SOURCE: Mineral County School District Budgets

MINERAL COUNTY TEACHERS AVERAGE SALARY
 COMPARED TO STATE AVERAGE SALARY

<u>Year</u>		
1975	State Average	\$ 12,716
	Mineral's Average	11,915
	Difference	<u>801</u>
1976	State Average	\$ 13,144
	Mineral's Average	11,995
	Difference	<u>1,149</u>
1977	State Average	\$ 14,212
	Mineral's Average	12,738
	Difference	<u>1,474</u>
1978	State Average	\$ 15,256
	Mineral's Average	13,192
	Difference	<u>2,064</u>
1979	State Average	\$ 16,191
	Mineral's Average	14,337
	Difference	<u>1,854</u>

Mineral County's average teacher salary runs consistently below the average state level.

SOURCE: Department of Education Biennial Report of Selected Data

PERCENT OF THE TOTAL BUDGET FOR TEACHER
SALARIES FOR CLARK AND CARSON CITY COUNTIES
FROM 1971-72 THROUGH 1979-80.

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>CLARK % OF BUDGET</u>	<u>CARSON CITY % OF BUDGET</u>
1971-72	56.9%	57.0%
1972-73	57.8%	54.2%
1973-74	55.7%	52.1%
1974-75	55.4%	54.6%
1975-76	50.2%	53.1%
1976-77	49.5%	46.4%
1977-78	50.3%	40.1%
1978-79	49.6%	42.3%
1979-80	49.9%	44.9%

SOURCE: School District Budgets for Clark and Carson City Counties.

NSEA RECOMMENDATION

Nevada Plan Guaranteed Support

SCHOOL DISTRICTS	FY 1981-82		FY 1982-83	
	Equalized Support	Total Support	Equalized Support	Total Support
Carson City	\$1,445	\$1,607	\$1,662	\$1,801
Churchill	1,415	1,595	1,627	1,852
Clark	1,496	1,572	1,721	1,808
Douglas	1,399	1,564	1,608	1,798
Elko	1,575	1,672	1,812	1,944
Esmeralda	2,290	3,192	2,634	3,816
Eureka	2,178	2,841	2,505	3,267
Humboldt	1,602	1,750	1,843	2,060
Lander	1,487	1,614	1,710	1,838
Lincoln	1,905	2,196	2,191	2,555
Lyon	1,490	1,765	1,714	2,013
Mineral	1,484	1,788	1,707	2,077
Nye	1,707	1,929	1,964	2,219
Pershing	1,423	1,703	1,636	1,978
Storey	2,010	2,486	2,312	2,596
Washoe	1,484	1,553	1,707	1,786
White Pine	1,592	1,911	1,831	2,203
STATE AVERAGE	\$1,499	\$1,598	\$1,724	\$1,837

SOURCE: NSEA Research

COMPARISON OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION/GOVERNOR/TEACHERS RECOMMENDATIONS

Expenditures of Local School Districts (Expressed per Pupil)

Counties	BUDGETED 1980-81	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION		GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION		TEACHERS RECOMMENDATION	
		1981-82	1982-83	1981-82	1982-83	1981-82	1982-83
Carson City	\$1,960	\$2,331	\$2,520	\$2,007	\$2,252	\$2,345	\$2,612
Churchill	1,873	2,151	2,382	1,946	2,136	2,165	2,471
Clark	1,852	2,114	2,313	1,970	2,159	2,129	2,408
Douglas	2,256	2,486	2,755	2,541	2,823	2,500	2,843
Elko	2,337	2,468	2,723	2,254	2,475	2,483	2,823
Esmeralda	4,779	6,210	6,845	5,476	5,970	6,232	6,990
Eureka	4,926	4,641	4,795	4,333	4,639	4,663	4,933
Humboldt	2,135	2,599	2,797	2,342	2,528	2,615	2,962
Lander	1,905	2,594	2,762	2,424	2,561	2,609	2,856
Lincoln	2,597	3,248	3,855	2,884	3,162	3,267	3,676
Lyon	2,266	2,502	2,726	2,226	2,464	2,517	2,821
Mineral	2,300	2,680	2,941	2,366	2,602	2,695	3,029
Nye	2,353	2,830	2,900	2,696	2,833	2,847	3,009
Pershing	2,584	3,067	3,373	2,709	2,984	3,082	3,463
Storey	3,635	4,486	4,727	3,939	4,218	4,506	4,855
Washoe	2,058	2,306	2,531	2,306	2,445	2,321	2,625
White Pine	2,410	2,533	2,755	2,223	2,438	2,549	2,856
Totals	\$1,964	\$2,241	\$2,450	\$2,114	\$2,293	\$2,256	\$2,545

Percent of Incr.

14.1%

9.2%

7.6%

9.7%

14.9%

12.9%

588

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

KEY= 290130018009

CAR

EFFECTIVE 9/80 STEP	NO. OF TEACHERS:						ENROLLMENT:	6,173
	BA	BA+16	BA+32	MA BA+48	MA+16 BA+64			
1	12,848	12,806	13,165	13,725	14,282	14,842	15,401	16,235
2	12,506	13,165	13,725	14,282	14,842	15,401	15,961	16,886
3	13,165	13,725	14,282	14,842	15,401	16,518	17,078	18,188
4	13,725	14,282	14,842	15,401	16,518	17,637	18,839	19,490
5	14,282	14,842	15,401	16,518	17,637	18,195	19,490	20,140
6	14,842	15,401	15,961	16,518	17,637	18,195	19,490	20,791
7	15,401	15,961	16,518	17,078	17,637	18,195	19,490	21,442
8	15,961	16,518	17,078	17,637	18,195	18,754	19,490	22,093
9	16,518	17,078	17,637	18,195	18,754	19,314	20,093	22,744
10	...	17,637	18,195	18,754	19,314	19,871	20,093	22,744
11	...	18,195	18,754	19,314	19,871	...	20,093	22,744
12	20,093	22,744
13	20,093	22,744
14	20,093	22,744

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 290010018009

DISTRICT: CHURCHILL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

CH

EFFECTIVE 9/80

NO. OF TEACHERS:

149

ENROLLMENT:

2,899

STEP	BA	BA+15	BA+30	MA BA+45	MA+15 BA+60
1	11,450	11,995	12,540	13,085	13,630
2	11,935	12,480	13,025	13,570	14,115
3	12,420	12,965	13,510	14,055	14,600
4	12,905	13,450	13,995	14,540	15,085
5	13,390	13,935	14,480	15,025	15,570
6	13,875	14,420	14,965	15,510	16,055
7	14,360	14,905	15,450	15,995	16,540
8	14,845	15,390	15,935	16,480	17,025
9	15,330	15,875	16,420	16,965	17,510
10	15,815	16,360	16,905	17,450	17,995
11	17,390	17,935	18,480
12	18,420	18,965
13	18,905	19,450
14
15
16	16,460	17,005	18,035	19,550	20,095
17
18
19
20
21	17,105	17,650	18,680	20,195	20,740

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 290020018009

DISTRICT: CLARK CO SD, LAS VEGAS

EFFECTIVE 9/80 NO. OF TEACHERS: 3,645 ENROLLMENT: 86,141

STEP BA BA+16 BA+32 MA IN FLD MA IN FLD+ MA IN FLD+ MA IN FLD+

16 HOURS 32 HOURS

STEP	BA	BA+16	BA+32	MA IN FLD	MA IN FLD+	MA IN FLD+	MA IN FLD+
1	11,561	12,242	12,918	13,599	14,277	14,954	
2	12,090	12,769	13,448	14,127	14,805	15,572	
3	12,619	13,296	13,976	14,653	15,333	16,193	
4	13,145	13,823	14,504	15,181	15,862	16,812	
5	13,674	14,353	15,032	15,711	16,390	17,430	
6	14,203	14,880	15,558	16,238	16,915	18,048	
7	14,728	15,408	16,087	16,766	17,444	18,666	
8	...	15,937	16,617	17,294	17,973	19,285	
9	17,143	17,821	18,501	19,903	
10	17,671	18,349	19,028	20,522	
11	18,199	18,878	19,557	21,140	
12	21,757	
13	22,376	
14	23,122	

RETIREMENT PAID BY DIST. NO STATE INCOME TAX.

BONUS: DOC=LANE 300+ \$ 500

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOL DIST.

KEY= 290030018009

EFFECTIVE 9/80 STEP	NO DEGREE	NO. OF TEACHERS:				ENROLLMENT:			*DS
		BA	BA+16	160 BA+32	MA BA+48	3,308 MA+16 BA+64	MA+32		
1	11,205	12,130	12,805	13,480	14,155	14,830	15,505		
2	11,670	12,595	13,270	13,945	14,620	15,295	15,970		
3	12,135	13,060	13,735	14,410	15,065	15,760	16,435		
4	12,600	13,525	14,200	14,875	15,550	16,225	16,900		
5	13,065	13,990	14,665	15,340	16,015	16,690	17,365		
6	13,530	14,455	15,130	15,805	16,480	17,155	17,830		
7	13,995	14,920	15,595	16,270	16,945	17,620	18,295		
8	...	15,385	16,060	16,735	17,410	18,085	18,760		
9	16,525	17,200	17,875	18,550	19,225		
10	16,990	17,665	18,340	19,015	19,690		
11	17,455	18,130	18,805	19,480	20,155		
12	17,920	18,595	19,270	19,945	20,620		
13	19,060	19,735	20,410	21,085		
14	20,200	20,875	21,550		
15	21,340	22,015		
16	22,480		

ALL UNITS ARE GRADUATE UNITS.

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: ELKO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
 EFFECTIVE 9/80

KEY= 290040018009

ELK

STEP	NO DEGREE	NO. OF TEACHERS:				ENROLLMENT: 3,620			
		BA	BA+12	200 BA+24	BA+24+MA	BA+36+MA	BA+48+MA		
1	11,102	12,200	12,810	13,420	14,030	14,640	15,250		
2	11,590	12,688	13,298	13,908	14,518	15,128	15,738		
3	12,078	13,176	13,786	14,396	15,006	15,616	16,226		
4	12,566	13,664	14,274	14,884	15,494	16,104	16,714		
5	13,054	14,152	14,762	15,372	15,982	16,592	17,202		
6	13,542	14,640	15,250	15,860	16,470	17,080	17,690		
7	...	15,128	15,738	16,348	16,958	17,568	18,178		
8	...	15,616	16,226	16,836	17,446	18,056	18,666		
9	...	16,104	16,714	17,324	17,934	18,544	19,154		
10	...	16,592	17,202	17,812	18,422	19,032	19,642		
11	...	17,080	17,690	18,300	18,910	19,520	20,130		
12	18,178	18,788	19,398	20,008	20,618		
13	19,276	19,886	20,496	21,106		
14	20,374	20,984	21,594		
15	21,472	22,082		

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: ESMERALDA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT KEY= 290050018009

STEP	76 HOURS	NO. OF TEACHERS:				ENROLLMENT:			ESM
		BA	BA+16	BA+32 BA+64	MA BA+42 BA+84	MA+16 MA+32	MA+32 MA+64		
1	8,881	11,600	11,950	12,300	12,650	13,000	13,350		
2	9,148	11,950	12,300	12,650	13,000	13,350	13,700		
3	9,416	12,300	12,650	13,000	13,350	13,700	14,050		
4	9,683	12,650	13,000	13,350	13,700	14,050	14,400		
5	9,844	13,000	13,350	13,700	14,050	14,400	14,750		
6	10,218	13,350	13,700	14,050	14,400	14,750	15,100		
7	10,571	13,700	14,050	14,400	14,750	15,100	15,450		
8	10,860	14,050	14,400	14,750	15,100	15,450	15,800		
9	10,914	14,400	14,750	15,100	15,450	15,800	16,150		
10	...	14,750	15,100	15,450	15,800	16,150	16,500		
11	...	15,100	15,450	15,800	16,150	16,500	16,850		
12	...	15,450	15,800	16,150	16,500	16,850	17,200		
13	16,150	16,500	16,850	17,200	17,550		
14	16,850	17,200	17,550	17,900		
15	17,550	17,900	18,250		
16	18,250	18,600		
17	18,600	18,950		
18	19,300		
19	19,650		

THE LAST CODE IN LANES 4-7 ARE FOR UNDERGRADUATE CREDIT ONLY

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: EUREKA CO. SCHOOL DISTRICT
 EFFECTIVE 9/80

KEY= 290060018009

EU

STEP	BA	NO. OF TEACHERS:			ENROLLMENT:		
		BA+16	MA	MA+32	MA+16	MA+32	DOC
1	12,500	13,100	13,700	14,300	14,900	15,900	
2	13,000	13,600	14,200	14,800	15,400	16,400	
3	13,500	14,100	14,700	15,300	15,900	16,900	
4	14,000	14,600	15,200	15,800	16,400	17,400	
5	14,500	15,100	15,700	16,300	16,900	17,900	
6	15,000	15,600	16,200	16,800	17,400	18,400	
7	15,500	16,100	16,700	17,300	17,900	18,900	
8	16,000	16,600	17,200	17,800	18,400	19,400	
9	16,500	17,100	17,700	18,300	18,900	19,900	
10	18,200	18,800	19,400	20,400	
11	19,300	19,900	20,900	
12	20,400	21,900	

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 290070018009

DISTRICT: HUMBOLDT CO. SCHOOL DISTRICT

HU

EFFECTIVE 9/80

NO. OF TEACHERS:

96

ENROLLMENT:

1,749

STEP

BA

BA+16

BA+32

MA

MA+16

BA+24

BA+48

1	11,908	12,563	13,218	13,873	14,528
2	12,384	13,039	13,694	14,349	15,004
3	12,860	13,515	14,170	14,825	15,480
4	13,336	13,991	14,646	15,301	15,956
5	13,812	14,467	15,122	15,777	16,432
6	14,407	15,062	15,717	16,372	17,027
7	15,002	15,657	16,312	16,967	17,662
8	15,597	16,252	16,907	17,562	18,217
9	16,192	16,847	17,502	18,157	18,812
10	16,787	17,442	18,097	18,752	19,407
11	17,382	18,037	18,692	19,347	20,002
12	17,977	18,632	19,287	19,942	20,597
13	...	19,227	19,882	20,537	21,192
14	20,477	21,132	21,787
15	21,072	21,727	22,382

LANE 2 IS UNDERGRADUATE UNITS.

STATE: NEVADA		KEY= 290080018009				LAN
DISTRICT: LANDER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT						
EFFECTIVE 9/80	NO. OF TEACHERS:				ENROLLMENT:	904
STEP	BA	BA+16	BA+32	MA	MA+16	
		BA+24	BA+40			
1	12,000	12,600	13,200	13,800	14,400	
2	12,480	13,080	13,680	14,290	14,880	
3	12,960	13,560	14,160	14,760	15,360	
4	13,440	14,040	14,640	15,240	15,840	
5	13,920	14,520	15,120	15,720	16,320	
6	14,400	15,000	15,600	16,200	16,800	
7	14,880	15,480	16,080	16,680	17,280	
8	15,360	15,960	16,560	17,160	17,760	
9	15,840	16,440	17,040	17,640	18,240	
10	16,320	16,920	17,520	18,120	18,720	
11	16,800	17,400	18,000	18,600	19,200	
12	17,280	17,780	18,480	19,080	19,680	
13	...	18,360	18,960	19,560	20,160	
14	...	18,840	19,440	20,040	20,640	
15	19,920	20,520	21,120	
16	21,000	21,600	

THE LAST CODES IN LANES 2 AND 3 ARE FOR UNDERGRADUATE CREDIT ONLY

NEVADA
 DISTRICT: LINCOLN COUNTY SCH DIST

KLY# 290090018009

DISTRICT	NO DEGREE	NO. OF TEACHERS:				ENROLLMENT:		
		BA	BA+16 BA+24	56 BA+32 BA+48	MA	928 MA+16	MA+32	
1	7,903	11,795	12,267	12,739	13,683	14,155	14,627	
2	...	12,267	12,739	13,211	14,155	14,627	15,099	
3	...	12,739	13,211	13,683	14,627	15,099	15,571	
4	...	13,211	13,683	14,155	15,099	15,571	16,043	
5	...	13,683	14,155	14,627	15,571	16,043	16,515	
6	...	14,155	14,627	15,099	16,043	16,515	16,987	
7	...	14,627	15,099	15,571	16,515	16,987	17,459	
8	...	15,099	15,571	16,043	16,987	17,459	17,931	
9	...	15,571	16,043	16,515	17,459	17,931	18,403	
10	...	16,043	16,515	16,987	17,931	18,403	18,875	
11	...	16,515	16,987	17,459	18,403	18,875	19,347	
12	17,459	17,931	18,875	19,347	19,819	
13	18,403	19,347	19,819	20,291	
14	19,819	20,291	20,763	
15	20,763	21,235	
16	21,707	

16 UNDERGRADUATE CREDITS.

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: LYON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
 EFFECTIVE 9/80

KEY= 290100018009

LY

STEP	NO. OF TEACHERS:						ENROLLMENT:	2,416
	BA	BA+16	BA+32	137 MA	MA+16	BA+48		
1	11,200	11,687	12,174	12,661	13,148	13,635		
2	11,687	12,174	12,661	13,148	13,635	14,122		
3	12,174	12,661	13,148	13,635	14,122	14,609		
4	12,661	13,148	13,635	14,122	14,609	15,096		
5	13,148	13,635	14,122	14,609	15,096	15,583		
6	13,635	14,122	14,609	15,096	15,583	16,070		
7	14,122	14,609	15,096	15,583	16,070	16,557		
8	14,609	15,096	15,583	16,070	16,557	17,044		
9	15,097	15,583	16,070	16,557	17,044	17,531		
10	...	16,070	16,557	17,044	17,531	18,018		
11	...	16,557	17,044	17,531	18,018	18,505		
12	17,531	18,018	18,505	18,992		
13	18,018	18,505	18,992	19,479		
14	18,992	19,479	19,966		
15	19,479	19,966			

ALL UNITS ARE GRADUATE UNITS.

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 290120018009

DISTRICT: NYE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

NYE

EFFECTIVE 9/80

NO. OF TEACHERS:

87

ENROLLMENT:

1,663

STEP

BA

BA+ 8

BA+16

BA+24

MA

MA+ 8

BA+12

BA+24

BA+36

BA+32

MA+12

BA+48

1	12,172	12,584	12,996	13,408	13,820	14,232
2	12,761	13,173	13,585	13,997	14,409	14,821
3	13,350	13,762	14,174	14,586	14,998	15,410
4	13,939	14,351	14,763	15,175	15,587	15,999
5	14,528	14,940	15,352	15,764	16,176	16,588
6	15,117	15,529	15,941	16,353	16,765	17,177
7	15,706	16,118	16,530	16,942	17,354	17,766
8	16,295	16,707	17,119	17,531	17,943	18,355
9	16,884	17,296	17,708	18,120	18,532	18,944
10	17,473	17,885	18,297	18,709	19,121	19,533
11	18,062	18,474	18,886	19,298	19,710	20,122
12	18,651	19,063	19,475	19,887	20,299	20,711
13	20,064	20,476	20,888	21,300
14	21,477	21,889
15	22,478

LAST CODE IN LANES 2-6 ARE FOR UNDERGRADUATE CREDIT ONLY.

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 290140018009

DISTRICT: PERSHING COUNTY SCHOOL DIST.

PS

EFFECTIVE 9/80

NO. OF TEACHERS:

39

ENROLLMENT:

683

STEP	BA	BA+24 BA+16	BA+40 BA+30	BA+54 MA BA+42	MA+20
1	11,500	12,000	12,500	13,000	13,500
2	12,000	12,500	13,000	13,500	14,000
3	12,500	13,000	13,500	14,000	14,500
4	13,000	13,500	14,000	14,500	15,000
5	13,500	14,000	14,500	15,000	15,500
6	14,000	14,500	15,000	15,500	16,000
7	14,500	15,000	15,500	16,000	16,500
8	15,000	15,500	16,000	16,500	17,000
9	15,500	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500
10	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000
11	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000	18,500
12	18,000	18,500	19,000
13	19,000	19,500
14	20,000
15	17,100	17,600	18,600	19,600	20,600
16	21,200
17
18
19
20	17,700	18,200	19,200	20,200	21,800

LANE 1 IS UNDERGRADUATE UNITS. LANE 2 AND 3 ARE GRADUATE UNITS.

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 290150018009

DISTRICT: STOREY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

ST

EFFECTIVE 9/80

NO. OF TEACHERS:

17

ENROLLMENT:

187

STEP	BA	BA+16	BA+24	BA+32	BA+48	MA	MA+16	MA+32
1	11,700	12,200	12,700	12,700	13,200	13,700	13,700	14,200
2	12,200	12,700	13,200	13,200	13,700	14,200	14,200	14,700
3	12,700	13,200	13,700	13,700	14,200	14,700	14,700	15,200
4	13,200	13,700	14,200	14,200	14,700	15,200	15,200	15,700
5	13,700	14,200	14,700	14,700	15,200	15,700	15,700	16,200
6	14,200	14,700	15,200	15,200	15,700	16,200	16,200	16,700
7	14,700	15,200	15,700	15,700	16,200	16,700	16,700	17,200
8	15,200	15,700	16,200	16,200	16,700	17,200	17,200	17,700
9	15,700	16,200	16,700	16,700	17,200	17,700	17,700	18,200
10	16,200	16,700	17,200	17,200	17,700	18,200	18,200	18,700
11	16,700	17,200	17,700	17,700	18,200	18,700	18,700	19,200
12	17,200	17,700	18,200	18,200	18,700	19,200	19,200	19,700
13	17,700	18,200	18,700	18,700	19,200	19,700	19,700	20,100
14	...	18,700	19,200	19,200	19,700	20,200	20,200	20,700
15	19,700	19,700	20,200	20,700	20,700	21,200
16	21,700

LANE 1 IS GRADUATE UNITS. LANE 2 IS UNDERGRADUATE UNITS.

STATE: NEVADA
 DISTRICT: WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
 EFFECTIVE 9/80

KEY= 290160018009

NO. OF TEACHERS: 1,548 ENROLLMENT: 30,318

STEP	NO DEGREE	BA	BA+16	BA+32	MA	MA+16	MA+32
1	9,963	11,135	11,760	12,385	13,010	13,635	14,260
2	10,588	11,760	12,385	13,010	13,635	14,260	14,885
3	11,213	12,385	13,010	13,635	14,260	14,885	15,510
4	11,838	13,010	13,635	14,260	14,885	15,510	16,135
5	12,463	13,635	14,260	14,885	15,510	16,135	16,760
6	13,088	14,260	14,885	15,510	16,135	16,760	17,385
7	13,713	14,885	15,510	16,135	16,760	17,385	18,010
8	14,338	15,510	16,135	16,760	17,385	18,010	18,635
9	14,963	16,135	16,760	17,385	18,010	18,635	19,260
10	...	16,760	17,385	18,010	18,635	19,260	19,885
11	...	17,385	18,010	18,635	19,260	19,885	20,510
12	18,635	19,260	19,885	20,510	21,135
13	19,885	20,510	21,135	21,760
14	21,135	21,760	22,385
15	22,385	23,010
16	23,635
17	24,260
18
19
20
21	15,263	17,685	18,935	20,185	21,435	22,685	24,560

STATE: NEVADA

KEY= 270170018007

DISTRICT: WHITE PINE COUNTY SCHOOL DIST.

WP

EFFECTIVE 9/80

NO. OF TEACHERS: 119

ENROLLMENT: 1,638

STEP	BA	BA+15	BA+30	MA BA+45	MA+15 BA+60	MA+30 BA+75
1	11,783	12,431	13,079	13,727	14,375	15,023
2	12,254	12,902	13,550	14,198	14,846	15,494
3	12,725	13,373	14,021	14,669	15,317	15,965
4	13,196	13,844	14,492	15,140	15,788	16,436
5	13,667	14,315	14,963	15,611	16,259	16,907
6	14,138	14,786	15,434	16,082	16,730	17,378
7	14,609	15,257	15,905	16,553	17,201	17,849
8	15,080	15,728	16,376	17,024	17,672	18,320
9	15,551	16,199	16,847	17,495	18,143	18,791
10	16,022	16,670	17,318	17,966	18,614	19,262
11	16,493	17,141	17,789	18,437	19,085	19,733
12	...	17,612	18,260	18,908	19,556	20,204
13	18,731	19,379	20,027	20,675
14	19,850	20,498	21,146
15	20,969	21,617
16	22,088

LANE 2 IS FOR GRADUATE UNITS.

BASE SALARY INCREASES FOR 16 OF THE 17
NEVADA SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR THE 1980-81 SCHOOL YEAR

Rank	School District	Base Increase in Percent	Top Increase in Percent
1	Eureka	17.9%	14.7%
2	Pershing	12.1	10.1
3	Storey	11.9	8.7
4	Esmeralda	10.6	8.7
5	Elko	10.1	10.1
6	Humboldt	10.0	10.0
7	Douglas	9.2	8.9
8	Washoe	9.2	8.6
9	Lincoln	9.0	9.0
10	Nye	9.0	9.0
11	White Pine	3.0 *9.0	3.0 *9.0
12	Carson City	8.48	8.48
13	Lander	8.1	8.1
14	Lyon	4.7 *7.5	4.7 *7.5
15	Churchill	7.0	7.0
16	Clark	6.0	6.0

The mean percent base increase is 9.0% while the mean dollar increase was \$974 for the 1980-81 school year.

*Increased to higher figure after approval of emergency funding request.

Ex. D.

A STATEMENT OF POSITION
FROM
THE NEVADA ADVISORY COUNCIL
FOR
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL
EDUCATION

The Nevada Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education (NACV-TE) through the drafting of specific vocational education legislation, has expressed their position that insufficient priority for funding of vocational education exists statewide. Although in general, the priority statewide is insufficient, NACV-TE recognizes that many school districts, through the use of Distributive School Fund, have placed a priority on vocational education.

While NACV-TE contends that vocational education is still critically under-funded, it is important that a position be clearly stated regarding the impact upon vocational education of money received by School Districts through the Nevada Distributive School Fund.

Without mandate, County Boards of Trustee and Superintendents currently use approximately \$10 million from existing Distributive School Funds to support their local efforts for operating vocational education programs. The local support (money) for vocational education is the largest contribution to vocational education in Nevada. Since the local contribution for vocational education is ten times that of any other source, NACV-TE must commit itself to the support of the Distributive School Fund as deemed acceptable by the County Superintendents, the State Superintendent, County Boards of Trustees and the State Board of Education. Any reduction in the Distributive School Fund, real or from inflationary loss, would logically bring about a reduction in the money allocated for use by vocational education on at least a proportionate basis.

While the local districts' contribution to vocational education has not significantly increased over the past four years, the amount of money spent by districts to support vocational education has remained at or near \$10 million.

Education in Nevada, like education nationwide, is being asked to assume more and more responsibility while inflation is continually eroding the real dollars available to education. In view of these facts NACV-TE strongly encourages the passage of a Distributive School Fund budget which will provide for the growing enrollments in our public schools as well as compensate adequately for the loss of real educational dollar value, which will be inevitably lost to inflation over the next two years.

TESTIMONY
TO
THE ASSEMBLY WAYS & MEANS COMMITTEE
ON
THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BUDGET

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MY NAME IS DAVID FULSTONE II. I AM A MEMBER OF THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND A MEMBER OF THE LYON COUNTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. BUT, I AM HERE TODAY, NOT AS A COUNCIL OR COMMITTEE MEMBER, BUT AS AN EMPLOYER IN THE YERINGTON AREA, TO STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO RECONSIDER THE BUDGET FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR.

I WILL TAKE VERY LITTLE OF YOUR TIME AS I KNOW YOU WILL BE HEARING MANY OTHERS TODAY. MY FAMILY AND I ARE MAJOR EMPLOYERS IN THE YERINGTON AREA IN BOTH AGRICULTURE AND IN AGRICULTURE BUSINESS.

AS A PRODUCT OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM AT YERINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, I AM CONCERNED AS TO WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IF TRAINING WELL PREPARED EMPLOYEES DOES NOT BECOME A HIGHER PRIORITY FOR MONEY IN THIS STATE. I COULD SHOW YOU A NUMBER OF VOCATIONAL GRADUATES FROM THE YERINGTON PROGRAMS WHO ARE SUCCESSFUL BUSINESSMEN AND WOMEN. I WILL TELL YOU WHAT I THINK THOSE EMPLOYERS WOULD SAY TO YOU IF THEY WERE KNOWLEDGEABLE OF THE SITUATION. THEY WOULD SAY, "WE NEED WELL-TRAINED EMPLOYEES TO KEEP THE ECONOMY OF THE STATE GROWING. WE NEED MORE PROGRAMS TO PREPARE YOUNG PEOPLE FOR THE JOBS NOW AVAILABLE AND TO ALLOW MORE OF OUR YOUNG PEOPLE TO BECOME CONTRIBUTORS TO OUR SOCIETY, NOT DEPENDENT UPON SOCIETY TO EXIST."

I DON'T KNOW ALL THE FACTS, BUT I WOULD BET THAT COMPARED TO THE MONEY YOU MUST APPROPRIATE FOR PRISONS, JUVENILE HALLS AND CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND THE LIKE,

THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED DECREASE IN STATE FINANCIAL BUDGET FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DEFIES LOGIC.

IT IS TIME THAT WE DO SOMETHING ABOUT MONEY FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION THEN MAYBE WE CAN REDUCE THE AMOUNT WE MUST SPEND ON SUPPORTING INCARCERATED YOUTH AND UNEMPLOYED YOUTH WITH OTHER SO CALLED PROGRAMS WHICH PRODUCE LITTLE IN RETURN. I WOULD LIKE TO BE IN YOUR SHOES TODAY BECAUSE I WOULD HAVE A REAL OPPORTUNITY TO HELP YOUTH AND YOU CAN BET I WOULD.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOUR CONSIDERATION OF A MORE APPROPRIATE PRIORITY FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN OUR NEVADA SCHOOLS. THANK YOU.

TESTIMONY TO THE
ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE
ON
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BUDGET

FEBRUARY, 1981

CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, MY NAME IS FRANK COLEMAN. I AM RETIRED, AFTER HAVING SERVED NEARLY THIRTY YEARS AS AN EMPLOYMENT COUNSELOR AND EMPLOYMENT COUNSELOR SUPERVISOR. I AM THE PAST NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT COUNSELORS ASSOCIATION. I GIVE YOU THESE FACTS BECAUSE I WISH YOU TO VIEW MY COMMENTS IN LIGHT OF MY EXPERIENCE IN FINDING EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE AND IN MATCHING EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ABILITIES. I AM NOT, IN A TRADITIONAL SENSE, AN EDUCATOR.

OVER THE PAST 25 YEARS AND INCREASINGLY IN THE 1960's AND 1970's, I WAS FACED WITH ATTEMPTING TO MATCH UNTRAINED OR INADEQUATELY TRAINED YOUNG PEOPLE WITH JOBS WHICH HAVE, AS I AM SURE YOU ARE AWARE, BECOME MORE AND MORE COMPLEX. MANY MANY TIMES I HAVE BEEN CONFRONTED WITH EMPLOYERS STATEWIDE WHO ARE RELUCTANT TO HIRE YOUNG PEOPLE, EVEN THOSE WHO HAVE COMPLETED TRAINING. MANY INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES FEEL YOUNG PEOPLE ARE INADEQUATELY TRAINED IN SKILLS THAT ARE IN DEMAND. THE INADEQUATE TRAINING FREQUENTLY CAN BE TRACED TO OUTDATED EQUIPMENT, AND LACK OF VARIED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS WHICH MINIMIZE CHOICES. THIS IS NOT TO CRITICIZE TEACHING STAFF OR THE QUALITY OF YOUNG PEOPLE PURSUING TRAINING.

SINCE THE INCEPTION OF MANPOWER AND CETA LIKE PROGRAMS, I HAVE OBSERVED THAT THE TRAINEES HAVE BEEN THRUST INTO PROGRAMS NOT BECAUSE THEY WERE DEVELOPMENTAL OR IN DEMAND, BUT SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY WERE AVAILABLE AND THE INDIVIDUALS LACK EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS. THE YOUTH HAVE VERY LITTLE CHOICE AS TO THEIR FUTURE. IF THERE HAD EXISTED A DIVERSITY OF HIGH QUALITY VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS WHICH WERE BASED ON EMPLOYMENT NEEDS AS WELL AS THE INDIVIDUAL'S NEEDS, A MORE COST EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SYSTEM FOR MATCHING INDIVIDUALS TO EMPLOYMENT WOULD RESULT. IT FURTHER WOULD RESULT IN MORE COST SAVINGS AS THE NEED FOR CRASH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WOULD SUBSIDE.

BUT RECOGNIZING THIS NEED DOES LITTLE TO OVERCOME IT. WHEN CONFRONTED WITH A PROPOSED BUDGET WHICH IGNORES THE NEEDS OF BOTH STUDENTS AND THE LABOR MARKET, AND LOOKS UPON SCHOOLS AS "HOLDING PENS" FOR X NUMBER OF YEARS BEFORE PLACING STUDENTS IN THE WORLD OF WORK, DOES NOT MEET ANY REAL NEED AND DOES NOT REFLECT MUCH PLANNING. IT WOULD SEEM THAT SOME CURRENT THINKING PLACES EMPHASIS ON DOLLARS IN CRASH PROGRAMS FOR TRAINING AND RETRAINING, INTO MAINTENANCE OF INCARCERATED OR UNEMPLOYED YOUTH, OR INTO MAXIMUM/MINIMUM SECURITY WHEN THEY ARE NO LONGER YOUTHS, RATHER THAN MEETING THE ABOVE NEEDS.

I AM A FIRM BELIEVER THAT THE LEAST EXPENSIVE EDUCATIONAL COURSE IS TO SELECT A PERSON FOR TRAINING WHICH LEADS TO WHAT HE IS BEST SUITED FOR AND FOR A WIDER CHOICE OF TRAINING, REFLECTING THE EMPLOYMENT NEEDS OF THE STATE. THIS REQUIRES FUNDING TO PROVIDE THE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS TO MEET NEEDS.

THE NEEDS OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN OUR SCHOOLS MUST BE ADDRESSED IN TERMS OF THE VARIED LABOR AND POST-SECONDARY OPPORTUNITIES AND OPTIONS THEY CAN BECOME INVOLVED IN.

THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE.

TESTIMONY TO THE
ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE
ON THE
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BUDGET

CHAIRMAN BREMNER, MEMBERS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MY NAME IS MIKE RASK, I AM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NEVADA ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION. I AM HERE TODAY TO PROVIDE SPECIFIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF THE AGENCY REQUESTS WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUDGET FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

ALL AGENCIES HAVE BEEN ASKED UNDER PRESENT BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS TO "BITE THE BULLET" - A TERM WHICH HAS BECOME POPULAR IN GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS. IT IS MY OBSERVATION THAT THE RECOMMENDED BUDGET FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ASKS US NOT TO "BITE IT BUT RATHER TO "EAT IT."

FROM THE LEGISLATIVE RECORDS OF THE COUNCIL WE HAVE FOUND THAT THE 1970 STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STAFF CONSISTED OF ONE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, TWO ASSISTANT DIRECTORS AND NINE CONSULTANTS. THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET, PAGE 268, WOULD REDUCE THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STAFF TO ONE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, SIX REGULAR CONSULTANTS AND ONE CONSULTANT FOR COMBINED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION/CETA RESPONSIBILITY. SINCE 1970 THE VOCATIONAL UNIT IN THE DEPARTMENT HAS LOST FOUR PROFESSIONAL STAFF, A REDUCTION OF 25%. THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE THE ADDITIONAL LOSS OF CLERICAL/SUPPORT STAFF. WE CONTEND THAT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION HAS GIVEN ITS FAIR SHARE, WHEN ENROLLMENTS IN PROGRAMS HAVE GROWN AT THE STEADY PACE SINCE 1970. AFTER CONTEMPLATING THESE FACTS, IT IS THE COUNCIL'S OPINION THAT OVER THE LAST DECADE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION HAS GROUND DOWN THE AMMUNITION PILE TO THE POINT THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE ASKED TO CONTINUE IN ITS PRESENT RATE OF DECLINE.

THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET HAS REDUCED THE AGENCY'S REQUEST FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF BY ONE PERSON. THE COUNCIL RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS YOUR DUE CONSIDERATION FOR APPROVING THE AGENCY'S REQUEST FOR STAFF RATHER THAN THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED REQUEST. THE REASON THIS REQUEST IS MADE IS RATHER SIMPLE. ACADEMIC TEACHER

TRAINING (ENGLISH, MATH, SCIENCE, ETC.) AND INSERVICE IS READILY AVAILABLE THROUGH THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF ITS OPERATIONS. VOCATIONAL TEACHERS SIMPLY DO NOT HAVE THAT LUXURY THROUGH THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM. THE UNIVERSITY SIMPLY HAS NOT ADDRESSED THE NEEDS OF VOCATIONAL TEACHERS IN NEVADA THROUGH ITS REGULAR OPERATIONS. THERE ARE AT PRESENT NO ORGANIZED INSERVICE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES FOR VOCATIONAL TEACHERS. IF A VOCATIONAL TEACHER IS TO RECEIVE THE KIND OF HELP NECESSARY FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, IT ALMOST WITHOUT EXCEPTION COMES FROM STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS. WHILE THE REMOVAL OF AN ADDITIONAL POSITION MAY NOT MEAN PROGRAM CLOSURE, IT WILL EFFECT PROGRAM QUALITY.

IT IS THE COUNCIL'S UNDERSTANDING THAT THE POSITION IN JEOPARDY IS THE POSITION OF THE TRADE & INDUSTRIAL, TECHNICAL AND INDUSTRIAL ARTS CONSULTANT. AS YOU CONSIDER THE BUDGET IT MIGHT BE WELL FOR YOU TO KNOW THAT THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION PROVIDES SERVICE TO SOME 291 TEACHERS AND 12,365 SECONDARY AND POST-SECONDARY STUDENTS. IN TERMS OF PRESENT AND FUTURE JOB DEMANDS, IT IS CLEAR THAT THE HIGHEST DEMAND FOR TRAINING WILL BE IN THE AREA OF TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL OCCUPATIONS. NOW IS NO TIME TO REDUCE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES TO VOCATIONAL TEACHERS IN ANY AREA- ESPECIALLY TRADES AND INDUSTRIES.

AS THE FINAL CONCERN OF THE COUNCIL, I WISH TO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGES 268 AND 269 OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUDGET. THE COUNCIL WISHES TO VERY STRONGLY SUPPORT THE AGENCY REQUEST FOR REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEXT TWO YEARS. AS YOU CAN READILY SEE, THE AMOUNT RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR REPRESENTS CUTS IN VOCATIONAL OPERATIONS IN EXCESS OF \$468,000 OVER THE NEXT TWO YEARS IN COMPARISON TO FISCAL YEAR 1981. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THAT REPRESENTS A TOTAL YEARLY CUT OVER 44% THE FIRST YEAR COMPARED TO 1981 AND A 40.46% CUT THE SECOND YEAR COMPARED TO 1981. IN THE EYES OF THE COUNCIL THE CUTS ARE DEVASTATING.

IF YOU WOULD PLEASE LOOK AT PAGE 269, SPECIFICALLY THE LINE ITEM "AID TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS." THE DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST FOR AID TO SCHOOLS - FOR OPERATING VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS - REFLECTED A MODEST FIRST YEAR INCREASE OF \$52,659 WHILE THE GOVERNOR'S

RECOMMENDED BUDGET WOULD REDUCE AID TO SCHOOLS BY \$212,913 FROM FY'81. THE SECOND YEAR REFLECTS A REDUCTION OF \$49,274 FROM FY'81. IF YOU SHOULD COMPARE THE FIGURES TO FY'80 THE LOSSES ARE EVEN GREATER.

SINCE 1964 THE COUNCIL HAS SUPPORTED AND WORKED TOWARD THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BASE GRANT TO EACH DISTRICT WHICH PROVIDES THAT DISTRICT WITH A MINIMUM SUPPORT BASE THAT IS WORTH DEALING WITH. THE PRESENT BUDGET WILL REDUCE THAT BASE TO \$5,000. WE FEAR THAT A REDUCTION IN SUPPORT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WILL, ESPECIALLY IN MARGINAL RURAL DISTRICT PROGRAMS, CLOSE DOWN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS. THE REALITY IS SIMPLE: MANY VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE MORE EXPENSIVE TO OPERATE AND DISTRICTS TRADITIONALLY LOOK TO CUT EXPENSIVE PROGRAMS WHEN THE PINCH COMES.

IT IS THE COUNCIL'S POSITION THAT IN THIS TIME OF HIGHLY TECHNOLOGICALLY IMPACTED EXISTENCE, INCREASING YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT AND CRIME, WHEN EFFORTS ARE BEING MADE TO DIVERSIFY NEVADA'S ECONOMY, WE CANNOT REDUCE OUR VOCATIONAL EFFORTS.

FOR THE GOOD OF NEVADA'S YOUTH AND THE FUTURE OF OUR ECONOMY WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO CLOSELY REVIEW THE AGENCY'S REQUEST AND ACT TO SUPPORT THAT REQUEST.

FACT SHEET

OCTOBER 31, 1980



Fern Lea Latino, Director, ext. 272

HOW MANY: THE DISPLACED HOMEMAKER CENTER HAS SERVED OVER 1,025 SINCE OPENING THE DOORS IN FEBRUARY 5, 1980.

THIS REPRESENTS A 97.56% GROWTH RATE IN LESS THAN NINE MONTHS OF OPERATION.

WHO ARE DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS? Persons 35 years of age and older, who after having spent most of their formative years in the home are faced with having to go to work due to loss of income because of divorce, widowhood or separation. The DH is usually not eligible for catagorical aid and too young for Social Security. Displaced Homemakers have little or no marketable skills and face the internal barriers of fear, low self-esteem and self-confidence. They also face a tight job market and the external barriers that ageism, sexism and raceism are sometimes still imposed in the work force. There are 4 million Displaced Homemakers in the U.S. Because Displaced Homemakers fall through the cracks of the system, there is no sane way of determining the number of Displaced Homemakers in Nevada.

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS OF DISPLACED HOMEMAKER CENTER - JUNE 1 through OCTOBER 31, 1980

Heads and Single Heads of Households		635 = 100%	
<u>Marital Status</u>	% Over Age 35 (35-60)	% Under Age 35 (20-35)	Total %
Married	11	5	16
Widowed	5	1	6
Divorced	19	13	32
Separated	20	13	33
Single	3	10	13
TOTAL	58%	42%	100%

<u>Income Levels</u>		<u>Educational Levels</u>	
% Under \$3,400	24	% Under 12 Grade	55
% Between 5,000	9	% 12 Grade	25
% Between 8,000	23	% over 12 Grade	19
Over	26	TOTAL	100%
Unreported	18		
TOTAL	100%		

TOTAL OPEN CASE LOADS 202 = 32% open cases

Case #112. Ginger after 25 years of marriage and being an abused wife, was divorced. In her unsuccessful quest for employment while living in a Temporary Shelter, she came to the Displaced Homemaker Center for help. She stated "They don't give certificated for raising 10 children, cooking, washing, ironing, cleaning and doctoring. It makes you a 'know nothing'!" Ginger is enrolled in CETA training for clerk-typist and is receiving counseling and is part of the Al-One Support Group. Her hopes and confidence are up and she can see a future for herself.

Case #1054. David, a single parent raising two sons, came into the office stating he had a parenting problem. Upon assessment it was found that David did not have a parenting problem but was facing a financial crisis and was so overwhelmed with worry he had a hard time defining his problem. The Displaced Homemaker Center counselor helped David prioritize his problems and suggested steps to take to get them worked out. The Vocational Instructor did David's resume' over and he has been referred to possible job opportunities. David is much more secure and confident in his job search. He is also beginning to make long range career change plans.

Case #612. Corine, divorced and living with her mother and one of her three children. Her exhusband lives in another state and has custody of the two other children. Corine has had long standing legal problems. She was counseled into enrolling in Clark County Community College and is working on a degree in Social Science for a career in counseling. Upon one of her visitations, with her other two children, Corine succumbed to her mothers heart and took her children home with her. After she realized what she had done she called the Displaced Homemaker Center for help. Corine was given free professional legal advise on the matter and arrangements were worked out so that she would not be in legal jeopardy. Corine comes in the Center daily for support and reinforcement.

Case #524. Sandy, divorced, with one small child, came into the Center in an angry, anxious state. She was in desperate financial straights. She was at times incoherent. Sandy needed all human services. She had lost her job, was behind in rent and utilities, no money for food or gas for her car. She also was suffering from an old back injury and could not afford treatment. The Center got her into mental health Counseling, ADC, Food Stamps and CETA training program, and eventually into low cost housing. Sandy is now motivated toward preparing for a career in health field. She got a BEOG grant and is going to school and working on her AA Degree. We see Sandy smiling face often.

Case #462. Helen was referred to us by WIN. She has two children. Her monthly income was only \$265 a month which forced her to live with her parents in a crowded, stressful situation. Helen's only work experience was in a day care center part-time. She was feeling angry, frustrated and trapped in a poverty cycle. Helen spoke in a husky wisper: The counselor thought she had a cold. It turned out that she had permanently injured vocal chords from an accident in youth. Helen was referred to Vocational Rehabilitation where she is receiving the training she needs. She was also taken to the Housing Authority for low-cost housing. She will be moving into her own home soon and is happily and enthusiastically responding to her new endeavors.

CLIENT FLOW - JUNE 1 - OCTOBER 31, 1980

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Contacts	635	
Intakes	419	
Information	635	
Referrals:	205	
(Employment)		
CETA/Training	159	
Placed	31	Total 19%
Job	113	
Placed	82	Total 73%
Career/Educational Counseling		
Testing and Assessment	93	
Enrolled at Clark County Community College	33	
Job Readiness Class	40	
Support Group	200	

CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DISPLACED HOMEOWNER CENTER

BUDGET REQUEST FOR YEAR 1981 - 1982

TOTAL: \$68,462.33

SALARY

Director (5% increase over 80-81)	\$21,000.00
Management Assistant I 12 Months-Grade 23 Step I (Classified)	10,337.64
Information and Referral Specialist (Classified)	10,337.64
Vocational Instructor (Professional)	14,000.00
	<u>\$55,675.28</u>

FRINGE

@ 15%	\$ 8,351.29
TOTAL SALARY	<u>\$64,026.57</u>

TRAVEL

\$ 2,000.00

OPERATING

Supplies, Fees	\$ 2,435.76
TOTAL REQUEST	<u>\$68,462.33</u>

INKIND FROM CCCC

60% Zerox Postage,	Supplies, Equipment, Telephone, etc.	\$33,528.00
TOTAL		<u>\$102,041.33</u>

CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DISPLACED HOMEOWNER CENTER

BUDGET REQUEST FOR YEAR 1982-1983

TOTAL: \$72,290.43

SALARY

Director (5% increase over 81-82)	\$22,050.00
Management Assistant I 12 Months-Grade 23 Step I (Classified)	10,854.52
Information and Referral Specialist (Classified)	10,854.52
Vocational Instructor (Professional)	14,700.00
	<u>\$58,459.04</u>

FRINGE

@ 15%	\$ 8,768.85
TOTAL SALARY	<u>67,182.89</u>

TRAVEL

2,500.00

OPERATING

Supplies, Fees	\$2,557.54
TOTAL REQUEST	<u>\$72,290.43</u>

INKIND FROM CCCC

60% zerox Supplies, Equipment, Telephone, Postage, etc. etc.	\$36,840.00
TOTAL	<u>\$109,130.43</u>

Feb 12, 1981

Thank you Mr. Sanders,

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of Displaced Homemakers.

The DHC is funded by the State of Nevada appropriation authorized by Assembly Bill 157 and implemented through the Nevada Department of Education.

The Center is organized to serve persons of mature age who are divorced, widowed or separated ~~or have~~ and ^{who} are forced to go to work due to loss of financial support. They usually have no small children and therefore are not eligible for categorical aid. ~~They~~ ^{and} are not old enough for social security.

Because they have spent most of their formative years in the home, taking care of their families, they

(2)

have little or no work experience or marketable skills. They face ~~the~~ a highly competitive and tight job market. Aside from the external barriers of ageism, sexism and racism which still persists in the labor market, the D/H faces the internal barriers of ^{many kinds} fears, and lack of self-confidence. They lack information about the labor market. ~~and~~ They lack knowledge of job seeking, job getting and job holding skills. They face a world for which they are ill prepared ~~in terms~~ of ~~skills preparation~~ both emotionally and attitudinally. They lack the basic abilities necessary to negotiate a living. Most of these women are leading a

hand to mouth existence depending on handouts from friends or ~~family~~ relatives. If they are fortunate enough to be employed they are earning a less than poverty wage. These are truly people who fall through the cracks of the system. The WIC is the only place they can get ~~a~~ ^{the} kinds of help they need.

The purpose of the WIC is to provide the direct ^{Center} services which enable them to become productive, self-supporting, tax payers ^{citizens} instead of ~~tax~~ consumers.

The services which are provided include the following: a highly sophisticated and comprehensive information and referral system to ^{health} community and campus resources, career, vocational and educational counseling which include assessment & testing;

without is continually occurs in #5

both men and women support groups; follow-up
service; Job Readiness classes, job placement, skills ^{placement into}
training, and ^{of course} enrollment into classes at CCC. ^{if we sell anything it}
We should hold workshops and conferences focusing on ^{education} ^{business} ^{what} ^{is}
employment and career opportunities; legal and health
issues, personal and professional development, back
to school orientation and entrepreneurship.

include no
not will
any litigation

We are fortunate to have a volunteer, retired attorney
who provides free legal advice. ^{many of the participants cannot} ^{afford attorneys and}
~~Another conference~~

~~is the volunteers for the Enterprise which allows~~

~~us to gain valuable skills and not paid~~

~~work experience if they can afford to volunteer~~

~~Full time.~~

✓ The ~~staff~~ DTC staff includes a full-time Director

... and Administrative Director

^{thru} Both salaries are paid through the State appropriation.

^{We have} a Vocational Instructor who works part time and is funded by ² ~~small~~ ^{grant} vocational education ~~minis~~ ^{grant}.

There are also 2 part-time workstudy students -- an Information and Referral Specialist and a clerk/counselor.

All staff are D.T. and can ~~not~~ ^{well} understand

the plight of the D.T. ^{many} ~~who~~ ^{who} comes into the office.

more female
business
able / project
action /
management
see
the Public

There is a Campus & Community Advisory

Committee which represents ~~most~~ segments of the community. ^{Including major womens groups such as AAUW, BRW, WU, Jr League, Leptinist.} These people, along with the entire ~~staff~~ ^{staff}

staff, are dedicated and committed ~~to~~ to serving

the D.T. ~~This is~~ Because of their concern, it is

^{We have} ~~not~~ ^{been} ~~so~~ ^{very} successful in carrying out ~~the~~ ^{of the our} goals and objectives.

6

We have formalized linkages with other human service agencies in the community. ^{mutual} Referrals are made on a regular basis. Referral to us are increasing every day.

Even though we have developed good public relations, most of the participants find their way to the Center because of a friend. Many come to us as a last resort. They are in the throes of depression and depression. It takes a lot of time ~~and~~ ^{re-}education and care to help them reach a point of job ready ^{or ready for} placement of any kind.

As of January 1, 1980, less than one year of operation, we have served 1,467 people, 30 of whom are men. These are real-life bodies. This count does not include telephone ~~or 3rd party~~ contacts.

The original target number was 500. We have almost tripled the expected number. This represents ^{an average of} 128 people per month. ~~The~~ Because of the volume of administrative and supportive type services demanded by this case load, we have recently started charging to the public on Fridays so that we can keep up ~~it~~ with the necessary paper work and follow up. ~~But~~ The staff agreed to reduce numbers and ^{receipt} not quality of service. We do not want to take on agency status which means ~~that~~ insensitivity to clients needs.

This ~~action~~ action indicates also the critical need for not only the existing service, but ^{that} the service need to be expanded.

Of the entire case load, approximately 50% are over 35 years of age while 50% are under 35 years of age.

~~At~~ ^{the bill} Although HB 151 stipulates ^{an age criterion} 35 years ~~of~~, neither

Vocational Education ^{Basic Grant} ~~Support II~~ or CETA have age

Criteria. Since we must use ^{both} these resources, we

must allow for the different eligibility criteria, and ^{serve all ages}

These percentages indicate the fact that age 35 should be removed from the law.

There are approximately ^{twice} 2 1/2 more divorced & separated people than widowed people. ^{Of single heads of households,} 25% have less than \$3,000

yearly income. 33% ~~is~~ ^{are} ~~in~~ ^{between} \$5-⁸ thousand ^{a year}.

~~This latter~~ ^{figure} The latter usually disqualifies them for CETA.

55% have less than ^a 12th grade education which correlates with the lower income.

According to a 1978 study conducted by the

National Center for Health Statistics, Washington, D.C. the national divorce rate was 5.2 per 1000 people.

The Nevada divorce rate was 16.8 per 1000 people, over 3 times the national rate. Clark County has 60% of ^{all} the divorces ^{in the state}. This rate will increase predictably ~~or~~ with the sociological and economical impact of MX

The current FY 80-81 Budget ~~is for~~ (July 1 - June 30) includes:

State Appropriation		\$ 38,950.
2 Vocational Education	<u>10,250</u> 4702	<u>6114.104</u> 7700.000
Support & Grant		<u>15,012</u>
Total		<u>\$ 53,902</u>

actual monies

Expended as of Jan 9th \$ 33,385

Balance through \$ 20,577

paid out

~~July + June 30~~
15% of the total budget are operational costs

- 85% of these monies are expended on salary & fringe

7,686
46,272

So

B.J. Jan 9, 1961
(10)

1-8-331-4300-275

BALANCE

ENCUMBRANCES

1100	Professor Salaries	\$ 240.04 DB	\$10,120.02	
1400	Classified Salaries	615.13 CR	4,549.32	
1600	Fringes	2,526.98 CR		
2100	Travel	3,298.24 CR		
3000	Operating Expenses	538.31 CR	41.00	
		\$6,738.62	\$14,710.34	Encumbered
			17,501.04	Expended
			6,738.62 +	Balance

Bal. \$ 21,448

\$38,950.00 Grant

1-8-331-4300-276

1100	Professor Salaries	\$4,238.00		
1600	Fringes	524.00		
		\$4,762.00	\$4,762.00	Balance
			.00	Expended
			\$4,762.00	Grant

6 | Jan 787.00
~~67~~

787.00
3975.00

1-8-331-4300-270

1100	Professor Salaries	\$1,807.00		
1600	Fringes	19.36		
2100	Travel	260.94		
3000	Operating	0 00		
5400	Equipment	200.00		
		\$2,287.30	\$2,287.30	Balance
			7,962.70 +	Expended
			\$10,250.00	Grant

Total Grants
\$ 853,902

Expended 21,448
3,975
7,902
\$ 33,385

Bal. June 30
\$ 20,577

We are a cost effective program

(11)

Our cost per participant is \$38.35 as compared
to CETA costs of \$3000 per client.

We place approximately 73% of our participants
in jobs and another 19% into CETA ~~subsidized~~ training
or subsidized employment.

We have not yet determined the enrollment ^{in college} ~~fee~~ at CCC
~~since~~ since the ^{spring} semester has just begun. ~~But~~ ^{we} have referred over 300 participants to financial aid. ^{during this} ~~year~~ ^{year.}

My own activities as Director of the program, aside
from the executive function is to minister all resources
for ~~the~~ services to D7. ~~We are part~~ We belong
to the National D7 Network, ^{out of work DC} have recently
received the honor of being selected as ^{a national} ~~an~~
exemplary program under the ^{Department of} ~~Ministry~~ Education
Equity Act. Project. ^{San West Laboratory} (San Francisco)

We also represent Nevada on the Educational Equity Committee for the Southwest Regional Lab in Los Angeles. which is ^{an} ~~an~~ ^{educational} ~~educational~~ ^{research & development} ~~an~~ ^{institutions}.

We have linkage with the US DOT Women's Bureau for Reg 9 in San Francisco.

These contacts ^{are} very important & time well spent in that resources. Although at this time there is no money for projects like ^{the} DVE.

Last August we were instrumental in forming the Nevada DVE Task Force, made up of agency people from around the state. The purpose was to organize ~~an~~ information network system particularly for rural d.e.'s.

_____ ^{same}
The ~~the~~ Nevada Dept of Education has requested DVE funds amounting to.

\$85,690 for 1st year & \$94,250 for the 2nd year.

The DHC needs approximately \$30,000 for each of the next 2 years in order to maintain the present operations.

We can increase the part-time positions to full-time positions and therefore increase these critical

needed services. This will include implementing the Nevada DHC Information Network, therefore serving the entire state.

I would like to conclude by again stating that the DHC at CCC is a very cost effective program with a proven successful track record.

The small amount of dollars invested ^{at the} ~~in the~~ front end of the operation will save the state thousands of dollars in social/welfare

type programs. I ask you to please allow us to continue placing ^{into the workforce &} ~~hundreds of~~ ^{women who can contribute} ~~hundreds of~~ ^{to the} productive ~~to the~~ state growing economy.

DATE: February 12, 1981

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

REPRESENTING:

FERN LATINO

Displaced Homemaker Center
Clark County Community College

Sharon ~~Ry~~ Ry No

DARLEEN THOMPSON

Joyce Woodhouse

Nevada State Educ. Assoc.

Joe Fisher

Nevada State Educ Assoc.

X Lillian Kelley

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ed Green

Clark Co. School Dist.

Doug Sever

Dept. of Education

Maurin Picallo

St. Bd of Education

Tom Sanders