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It is a real pleasure once again to speak to you about the progress of Community Colleges in the State of Nevada. Many things have happened since we last talked with this group in August.

The advent and growth of community colleges in our state in the early 1970’s continues to be the highlight of happenings in post secondary education. We now have over 13,000 students enrolled in our three community colleges. Over 6,000 in both Clark County Community College and Western Nevada Community College, and almost 1,000 in Northern Nevada Community College.

Our philosophy is still basically the same. We are comprehensive two year colleges devoted to four major programs with a strong emphasis on guidance and counseling to fulfill our mission. Our chief function continues to be to provide occupational programs designed to provide students with vocational or technical skills so that they may enter the labor force upon completion of their program. We still have the function of providing the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program. A third function is to provide developmental courses to assist students in removing deficiencies in such subjects as English, reading, and mathematics so they can qualify for either occupational or university parallel programs. A fourth function that I think needs continuing attention in the 1970’s is to provide community services primarily for adults in the community. This is the function that we must place great emphasis upon because it is here that we bring the community college into the community and make it truly a community college. Many varied and diversified programs at different points can be offered to all segments of the community so that people can be assisted culturally and physically as well as educationally.
in the narrowest sense. Our objectives in our continuing education program are to assist in the solution of community problems by making staff resources and physical facilities available to the community, to assist individuals to assume responsibility for their own continuing education, to provide programs of instruction beyond the classroom and laboratory in seminars, workshops and conferences, to assist all adults in the community to update and upgrade their skills in a variety of vocational-technical programs, to assist in raising the cultural level of the community by offering opportunities for participation in programs of a cultural nature, to provide individuals and groups in the community with opportunities to learn recreational skills and to participate in recreational programs, and to enhance the public community to the college in a service area by attempting to serve the educational, cultural and recreational needs of the community.

These programs must be made a vital part of our total comprehensive community college. Each one of the programs, courses, workshops that are somehow developed for continuing educational programs should be totally incorporated with the other programs at the college and treated exactly the same way. We must continue to give community college credit for any program that we offer. If it is worthy of being offered, it is worthy of being given credit. We must also not restrict these kinds of programs to adult and evening programs. The same kind of program must be offered throughout our total 14-hour day with no differentiation between day and evening classes. All the services of the college must be made available including strong counseling and guidance services for all students.
If we are to continue to serve all segments of the community including the poor and the disadvantaged, we must move even closer and deeper into the community. Our central campus must be extended into all geographic areas of the community. Close cooperation with existing community agencies and with federal programs must exist. It is in this manner that this college has been able to reach out into the community. We can never be all things to all people, but we must work in harmony with all existing agencies in the society we serve.

We must continue to emphasize a complete adult basic education program that is designed to serve the needs of at least 20% of the total population over 18 years of age or educationally disadvantaged. We must continue to place emphasis upon quality programs rather than numbers of individuals served. It is far better to offer fewer programs and not have unnecessary proliferation of courses which never leads to quality. We must continue, too, to diversify programs to serve the poor and the unemployed and the underprivileged, and the high school dropout, with an emphasis upon passing, not failing. We must have experimental programs with the freedom of innovation to assist the community in solving its problems. And lastly we must have a systematic system of evaluation of the total continuing education program.

I would still like to emphasize three key words in our vocabulary: diversity, flexibility, and quality. Our goal is still to have a diversified program through the monies available with flexibility to meet student and community needs, all being done within the framework of quality in everything that is offered. We must be committed to programs of excellence, that honor the dignity of every human being.
Our goal is to have 60% of our students in occupational programs, 20% in university parallel programs, 10% in developmental and 10% in community service programs. We have achieved our most important goal of approximately 65% of the students enrolled in occupational programs. We have about 25% in university parallel, 5% in developmental and 5% in community services. We still wish to emphasize our policies such as open door admission, relatively low admission fees, wide range in absence for students, individualized remedial programs, a no failure grading system, alternate semester and flexible scheduling, and with a high emphasis on guidance and counseling.

We are now approaching another legislative year. I should like to try to bring you up to date as to where we stand at the moment. As you know the University of Nevada System gets $5,000,000 each year from the slot machine tax rebate. These funds were totally committed in the last legislative session for the period 1973 to 1977. In addition, $2.2 million dollars was borrowed from the 1977-79 biennium to complete Phases II and III for Clark County Community College. Our number one priority for this legislative session is to have the legislature forgive this $2.2 million from the slot machine rebate and take it from the General Fund in 1975. Our second priority in the System is to have supplemental funds of $850,000 to complete Phase II of Western Nevada Community College. Our third priority is to have $2,088,000 of supplemental funds in order to complete Phases II and III for Clark County Community College. All of these projects are also high on the recommended lists of the State Public Works Board. In addition, the Board of Regents has
asked the Public Works Board to consider allocating funds for campus improvements for Western Nevada Community College and Northern Nevada Community College. We also hope to be able to get planning funds for the West Charleston site for Clark County Community College.

Our operating budget request for 1975-76 is $4.9 million dollars for Clark County Community College, $783,000 for Northern Nevada Community College, and approximately $3.7 million dollars for Western Nevada Community College, which will total almost $9.5 million. This was based on predicted FTE enrollments of 3,000 for Clark County, 250 for Northern Nevada and 2,200 for Western Nevada Community College.

The Governor's recommendation has been for considerably less than that: $3.6 million dollars for Clark County Community College, $2.5 million dollars for Western Nevada Community College and $545,000 for Northern Nevada Community College. These figures represent a 32% increase over the present budget for Clark County Community College, 6 1/2% for Northern, and 20% for Western Nevada Community College. At the same time they represent a decrease of 27% over the request for Clark, 30% for Northern and 34% for Western. They provide for no new positions in administration and general expense for student services. They provide for a 12.1% increase in professional compensation. Student-faculty ratios are increased from an asking of 20 to 1 to 24 to 1 for Clark and Western and 20 to 1 for Northern. Out-of-state travel requests were reduced to $50 for full-time equivalent professional. The library budgets were substantially reduced. Operating budgets were pretty much what we had asked for in our request. Building and grounds areas were pretty much as what we had asked for. The three major places that were...
cut were instructional, faculty and classified, student services -- both professional and classified, and the library. We will make every effort possible to restore all of these to the figures that we originally requested and that were approved by the Board of Regents.

This is the year of our self-study in preparation for our final visit for full accreditation. I understand that the self-study is proceeding rapidly. I am sure that it will be well done and in time enough for our accreditation visit which is scheduled for next fall. It is good for any college to have to study itself internally, review its objectives and purpose, its method of financial support, its physical facilities, materials and equipment, its library, its total educational program, instructional staff, administration and its various student activities. I am pleased that you are making excellent progress in this self-study, and if we can be of any service in the completion of it please feel free to call us.

While these issues are not necessarily involved in an institutional self-study they are at least six issues that we must deal with as a faculty and administration in the next few weeks. I refer to (1) the University of Nevada System four year plan, (2) the faculty work load proposal, (3) salary recommendations, (4) affirmative action proposals, (5) collective bargaining proposals, and (6) articulation. Prior to 1973 the University of Nevada System was required by the State Legislature to make a 10-year plan every two years. In 1973 the legislature amended the statute to comply with a four-year planning cycle. Accordingly, the Chancellor's Office prepared a document which was presented to the Board of Regents at its last meeting. This represented a comprehensive
University of Nevada System Plan for the period 1975-79. The community colleges of the state have been included in this comprehensive System plan. Much of the material in the System plan has been taken from our State Plan or from statistics which our office has gathered. However, there is one section I would like to call your attention to. It is the issues in the future for the System. These are incorporated with the University issues. Two of them, I think, are particularly pertinent: the admissions standards and tuition and fees. We have already objected to the statement on admissions standards which says, "If it is determined that a large percentage of community college students are dropping out before meeting their educational objectives it may be necessary to reconsider the absence of admissions standards which is the present policy." We object because we do have an admissions standard, even though it is open admissions standards, and we object to the use of the term "dropout" for our students. Hopefully this will be changed before the final draft is submitted to the Board of Regents. I would also like to call your attention to the fact that under tuition fees the community college students pay about 17%, whereas the university students pay about 12%. These percentages should come closer together as a result of the recent increase in fees for some, but not all, university students. We will continue to resist any pressure, as indicated here, to increase the proportion of the student contribution to the full cost of the community college education. The System plan is also being considered as the System State-wide plan for the so-called 1202 Commission. The 1202 Commission has been appointed and consisted of the nine Board of Regents members for 1974, plus two representatives from minority groups
and proprietary schools. I would like to quote from the federal law on the 1202 Commission:

"Any state which desires to receive assistance under Section 1203 or Title X, shall establish a State Commission which is broadly and equitably representative of the general public, and public and private non-profit and proprietary institutions of secondary education in the state, including community colleges, junior colleges, post secondary vocational schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, four year institutions of higher education and branches thereof."

Under Section 1203 mentioned above, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to this state commission to expand the scope of studies and planning required in Title X through comprehensive inventories of and studies with respect to all public and private post secondary educational resources in the state including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded or altered, so that all persons within the state who desire and who can profit from post secondary education may have an opportunity to do so.

May I also point out to you that Title X is entitled, "Community Colleges and Occupational Education." Part A is for the establishment and expansion of community colleges. Part B is for occupational education.

We do have a tremendous stake in this 1202 Commission. It is currently being funded through the Chancellor's Office. It behooves us to read this System Plan carefully and to await future developments.
The second issue that we must discuss is the proposed amendment to the Board of Regents Handbook by adding a faculty work load, professional contract regulations policy. This encompasses some 18 new sections which specify the University of Nevada System faculty work load. The resolution which was sent to the Board of Regents last month preceding the proposed amendments considers this particular policy necessary because of the increased comments concerning accountability in education and as a means whereby the Board of Regents will seek more effective ways to assign faculty and provide a basis for improved ways to evaluate their accomplishments for purposes of salary determination and promotion.

It does state that there are differences between community colleges and university level work and that experimentation is desirable. The main gist of the policy is that it redefines faculty work load in terms of service units. It is considerably more detailed than our present work load policy, which, as you know, consists only of three items. Our teaching load is divided either into the number of credit hours taught per week or the number of contact hours taught per week, or total number of student credit hours. I believe the faculty should study this work load proposal very carefully and send in detailed recommendations concerning it so that the Board of Regents can be fully aware of the faculty's viewpoint toward this policy.

A third issue, and probably the one that's most important to all of us, is that of faculty compensation and employee health and accident insurance. As you undoubtedly know, the University of Nevada System Salary and Benefits Committee has recommended a 21% increase in total faculty compensation for fiscal year 1976. This compares with a 12.1%
recommendation by the Board of Regents and the Governor's Office. There are substantial differences as you can see between these two figures. Any negotiations on the part of the faculty must be included through the University of Nevada System Salary and Benefits Committee. I would like to speak just briefly on one point that was made and that is the salary gap between community college and university division faculties. When the community college's faculty salary schedule was made it was predicated on the University salary schedule but included only salaries from the instructor, assistant professor and associate professor levels. Our schedule still adheres pretty closely to this kind of an arrangement. The major difference between the average community college faculty salary and the university faculty salary is a matter of number of steps. It is the same reason that the University of Nevada, Reno faculty average salary is higher than the average salary at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. We are prepared to make a recommendation, as I have indicated before, to increase the number of steps on the community college salary schedule. There was not a need to do this before since we had no one at the top of the salary schedule. I would also appreciate the faculty analysis of the report from the Systemwide Committee to review health and accident insurance. There are a number of statements in their priority list that should be discussed by the faculty to see if you agree with their priority listing.

A fourth issue is the affirmative action program and policy statement for equal employment opportunity for the University of Nevada System. As you know, this has been presented to the Board of Regents and as it has become necessary for the System to adopt some policy statement in order to have federal funds continue. It seems to me there are two main
issues—-one is that we must be guided by the principle that there shall be no difference in the treatment of persons because of race, creed, color, sex, age or national origin and that equal opportunity and access to facilities shall be made available to all. This principle is applicable to students and faculty. There has been some widespread misapprehension that the federal government requires colleges to hire more women and more members of minority groups. In a recent letter from Peter Holmes, Director of the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare he has stated that institutions of higher education are entitled to hire the best qualified persons for any position without regard to race, sex, or ethnic origin. The college or university not the federal government is to say what constitutes qualification for any particular position. A major purpose of the affirmative provisions of the Executive Order is to broaden the pool of applicants so that women and minorities will be considered for employment along with all other applicants. It does not require that job requirements be waived or lowered in order to attract women and minority candidates. Further, it requires that once valid job requirements are established they must be equally applied to all candidates.

A fifth major issue is that of collective bargaining. As you recall, the Chancellor's Office presented a proposal for the establishment of collective bargaining for community college faculty. At the last Board of Regents meeting it was not voted upon, was not discussed at any great length. The Deputy Attorney General has ruled that it is within the province of the Board of Regents to grant such collective bargaining rights. There are however some people who feel to the contrary that it
is up to the Legislature to grant collective bargaining rights. The primary difference would seem to be in whether binding arbitration would be used to settle any impasses that might occur in negotiating the collective bargaining agreement. I think that this must be discussed because it is a national issue as well as a local issue. As a result of five years experience with collective bargaining in the State of Michigan I am not in favor of collective bargaining in community colleges. I believe the principal value in that state to faculty was that it temporarily raised faculty salaries during the first two years but as soon as contingency reserves and other reserves were eaten up, then faculty salaries remained more constant. I do not think it improved working conditions, gave faculty more control over the institution, nor in general improved the quality of education. If collective bargaining would do all these things, I would be very much in favor of it. To go back to the three words that we mentioned earlier -- flexibility, diversity and quality -- I think collective bargaining has a way of infringing upon each one of them. Flexibility is lost because restrictions are placed in a contract in which a person cannot deviate. Diversity is lost because each community college becomes more like the other community college instead of maintaining its own identity. At the same time quality of education does not seem to be improved.

To paraphrase a person that many of us heard at the recent meeting of the Northwest Association of Community and Junior Colleges, if we had a consultative, democratic management instead of authoritarian, an active instead of passive management, decentralized control instead of centralized control, and a management who believes in the development of people
rather than a direction of events, we would have no need for collective bargaining. However, I believe we need to discuss these through collective bargaining to see if the faculty feels that it would be of greater benefit to them to operate under such a system. If after open discussion the faculties of our community colleges feel that collective bargaining would be desirable for all involved improving the quality of education in our institutions, then I would support it.

I would like to now turn to my favorite subjects -- curriculum and instruction -- and pose some questions that you might like to deal with as a faculty in terms of curriculum the remainder of this year and in the future, as well as to make some comments about the kinds of things that we should be looking forward to in programming in the future. Some of the questions that I would like to pose are these:

1. Have you formulated behavioral objectives for your courses and set standards of competency?
2. Do you experiment and innovate in curriculum and instruction?
3. Is your instructional program based on a thorough knowledge of the learning process and an understanding of the many different cognitive, effective and emotional styles of learning?
4. Do you utilize a variety of forms of instruction and are you constantly working to improve these forms?
5. Do you have adequate equipment, learning materials, and spaces available at all times?
6. Are you contemplating utilizing the computer for computer-assisted instruction and for individualized prescribed instruction?

7. Are you keeping up-to-date with the modern practices in business and industry in the particular subject that you teach?

8. Are you involved in the life and work of the community so that you can be responsive to the educational needs of the youths and adults of this area particularly as it affects the subject matter that you teach?

9. Are you making adequate use of the materials available to you from our learning resources center?

10. Are you making use of the excellent knowledge of your colleagues especially in your subject in a team approach to teaching?

11. Are you concerned with the progress of every individual student in your class?

12. Do you take the student where he is and try to teach him from there and not assume that he is emasculated fundamentals that he might be expected to know?

13. Am I interested in preparing the students in my class both for work and for living?

I am confident that if you spend time discussing these questions during future meetings that your college will be most successful.
Now looking into the future for programs, colleges must tune in the shifting job opportunities evolving as a direct result of a changing focus in the energy fields. The need for retraining engineers and technicians makes good sense when surpluses and shortages show up simultaneously in job markets. If engineers for example are to maintain productive careers and leading into appropriate technologies there will be a gradual shift to surplus engineers from such areas as aerospace and civil engineering to coalgasification, solar power, nuclearfission, hydrogen and other energy fields. The need for better interface of the real world implies expansion of courses and studies in such promising fields as solar energy, electricity from socio-thermal energy, solar cells which can convert light directly into electricity without moving parts, wind-generational electricity, synthetic fuels, geothermal power and a host of others.

Our community colleges must continue to stress environmental career education and pollution control with assorted ecological types of programs. Waste and wastewater technology have already contributed greatly to the cleaning of many of our polluted rivers and lakes in recent years. Our community colleges must continue to assume responsibility for preparing technicians in all areas of environmental control including air pollution control, noise pollution control, solid waste management, waste and wastewater treatment, radiation pollution control, and land reclamation. The strain being placed upon American energy resources has a grave implication for occupational programs education programs in our community colleges. We can probably keep our colleges busy if we only concentrated on training technicians for coping with the inefficiency of home-heating
systems. The trained auto mechanic, heating and air-conditioning technicians, power plant technicians and many other technicians in occupational fields relating to energy production and maintenance seem to now be in demand.

Hopefully we will continue in our community colleges to gather data information to work on individualized instruction in all areas of the college and to continue to work strongly in the field of community education.