

MINUTES OF MEETING - ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, 55TH LEGISLATIVE SESSION, FEBRUARY 12, 1969.

Present: Lingenfelter, Swallow, Wilson, Tyson, Foote and Prince.  
Absent: Webb

Chairman Lingenfelter opened the meeting and presented the members with a copy of a memorandum prepared by the Department of Education analyzing the application of factors applied to basic support financing of education program expenditures. He said that he had conferred with the Department and that he found that last year \$4,123,800 was actually applied to the program for handicapped children. This left over one million that was used in other programs.

The committee discussed AB 33 with regard to the advisability of amending the bill. It was developed that Senator Dodge is drawing up a revised formula for the support of this program which would increase the percentage of support and mandate the expenditure to the area of special education. Any unused portion of the funds would then revert back to the general fund. The committee agreed that Senator Dodge's proposed legislation should be given their full consideration but that in the event the Department of Education's position on the matter would delay action the committee should proceed with amendments on AB 33. It was agreed that the bill's financing portion should be separated and the committee should support an amended bill containing the mandate for expenditure of funds on the special education program.

Chairman Lingenfelter said that he would have an amended bill prepared for committee action. He said that previous objections of the Department of Education to allocation of funds earmarked for use in definite areas should not be supported. In meetings with the Department it has been developed that federal participation in various educational programs is increasing and the driver safety program is only one of what the Department has acknowledged will be a growing list of programs in which the federal government will provide support. This being the case the committee felt that the Department must be made to acknowledge this fund management and allocation.

Assemblyman Swallow stated that he felt the committee should have a representative from the Education Department assigned to work with the committee on these developing programs. Assemblywoman Tyson agreed that this should be done. Chairman Lingenfelter said he would make the proposal to the Department.

Chairman Lingenfelter then called for consideration of AB 130. The committee agreed that following the hearing which has been held that it will not be necessary for further evidence to be submitted. The bill actually is now in Ways and Means for final action.

Prince moved Do Pass AB 130.

Foote seconded.

The motion failed in a tie vote; Wilson, Swallow and Tyson opposing.

Prince moved AB 130 be moved out of the committee without recommendation.

Tyson seconded.

Motion unanimously passed.

Chairman Lingenfelter stated that SB 94 which increases the academic requirement for practice of optometry has been referred to this committee. It was agreed that this bill be held for further consideration and that a member of the State Board of Optometry be called to consult.

The following proposed bills were presented to the committee for introduction:

BDR 34-466\* which changes the method of apportioning driver education money to school districts.

BDR 34-459\*\* permits the Superintendent of Public Instruction to make final determination of need in the placing of deaf, dumb or blind persons for education and care at the state's expense.

BDR 34-464° permits the use of school buses for certain additional approved activities.

The committee agreed that the Chairman should have these bills introduced on the assembly floor.

Chairman Lingenfelter called attention to two senate bills that will be considered shortly. SB 72 would permit school districts to participate in group insurance plans and there is another bill that relates to teacher's benefits under the retirement plan.

The meeting then adjourned.

\*A.B. 260

\*\*A.B. 261

°A.B. 316

February 7, 1969

2, 358, 286 - pd in hand  
88  
\$ 4,123,800  
Actually applied

862.  
reducing

MEMORANDUM

TO: Burnell Larson

FROM: Lincoln W. Liston

RE: Analysis of Application of Factors Applied to Basic Support  
Financing as They Relate to Program Expenditures

This analysis is based on assumptions of pupil/certified personnel assignment ratios as they prevail on a state-wide basis. Per-pupil dollar amounts would be somewhat greater for districts with a preponderance of small schools, and only slightly less for populous districts, because Washoe and Clark counties dominate the state-wide averages.

Assumptions:

1. Every pupil is counted as available for assignment to a schedule of non-special programs at a ratio of 24.6 pupils per teacher -

Allotment value:

\$114.20 per pupil for best 6 months A.D.A.

\$250.00 per pupil for teacher allotment.

This counts every pupil, but only non-special teachers.

2. For every three teacher allotments, there is an additional certified employee allotment in order to provide financial assistance for administrators, principals, librarians, counselors, health personnel, and special program teachers -

Statewide ratios are as follows:

1 administrator per 1,807 A.D.A.; per-pupil value, \$3.44

1 principal/supervisor per 306 A.D.A.; per-pupil value, \$20.16

1 pupil/school service personnel per 290 A.D.A.; per-pupil value, \$21.26 (library, counselor, nurse)

1 special program teacher, other than handicapped, per 292 A.D.A.; per-pupil value, \$19.89 (art, music, vocational, etc.)

1 special handicapped program teacher per 347 A.D.A.; per-pupil value, \$17.75

The preceding assumes complete sharing of all the certified allotments by all pupils. Not included to this point are dollars allotted for handicapped pupils and for transportation.

Total per-pupil value to this point is	\$446.70
Total per-pupil value of handicapped allotment is	16.00
Total per-pupil value of transportation allotment is	<u>10.00</u>
	\$472.70

This \$472.70 per pupil is short by \$11.30 of the total weighted per-pupil basic support of \$484, because allotments to sparsely populated districts were made at A.D.A. per teacher allotment somewhat less than the 24.6 state average.

If the allotments for certified personnel other than non-special teachers were observed one at a time in a different relationship than with all pupils, some different significant relationships could be observed.

For example, most counselors and librarians serve secondary schools. More special program teachers serve secondary pupils than elementary pupils, except in the area of handicapped programs.

A more complete observation of handicapped programs is possible because there are records of handicapped enrollees.

If the allotment for handicapped teachers and pupils were isolated and measured in terms of handicapped pupils, the following analysis would apply:

1 handicapped teacher per 8 handicapped A.D.A.; per handicapped pupil value, \$770.00

per-pupil allotment for handicapped pupils, \$560.00

The basic support traceable, directly and indirectly, to the A.D.A. of handicapped pupils only, would then be:

regular pupil allotment	\$114.20
non-special teacher allotment	250.00
administrator allotment	3.44
principal/supervisor allotment	20.16
pupil/school service personnel allotment	21.26
special program teacher (other than handicapped) allotment	19.89
handicapped program teacher allotment	770.00
handicapped A.D.A. allotment	<u>560.00</u>
	\$1,758.95

1.	Speech Handicapped	5.00%
2.	Slight Handicapped	
	Blind	.02
	Partially Sighted (Educationally Handicapped)	.18
3.	Hearing Handicapped	
	Deaf	.50
	Hard of Hearing (Educationally Handicapped)	1.00
4.	Otherwise Physically Handicapped (crippled, special health cases, etc.)	3.00
5.	Mentally Handicapped	2.00
6.	Social and Emotional Problems	2.00
7.	Gifted	2.00