

H B

375

HB 375: Section-by-section analysis

- Sec. 1: Makes community college system a separate component of university, under jurisdiction of Board of Regents.
- Sec. 2: At least one member of the Board of Regents is a student. This section requires the student regent to be a community college student every other term. In other words, a university center student would serve on the Board for a two year term, then a community college student would serve for the next two year term, and the student regent position would continue to alternate in this fashion as long as this section of the law is in effect.
- Sec. 3: Requires Regents to appoint community college system president, and allows the president of the community college system as well as the president of the university centers to attend meetings of the Regents.
- Sec. 4: Requires Regents to fix the salary of the community college president.
- Sec. 5: Technical.
- Sec. 6: Requires Regents to approve and regulate academic courses taught at community colleges, with advice of local campus presidents and policy committees.
- Sec. 7: Technical.
- Sec. 8: Technical.
- Sec. 9: Technical.
- Sec. 10: Gives community college system president the power to: (1) give general supervision to community colleges, with approval of Regents; (2) appoint local campus executive officers, subject to the approval of policy committees; (3) direct and supervise local campus executive officers; (4) submit academic programs, approved by policy committees, to Regents for their consideration; (5) submit local campus budget request to Regents for their consideration.
- Sec. 11: Gives community college system president the authority to suspend or expel community college students.
- Sec. 12: Technical.
- Sec. 13: Technical.
- Sec. 14: Establishes a comptroller for the community college system.
- Sec. 15: Technical.

- Sec. 16: Allows municipalities to establish and operate community colleges jointly with the University.
- Sec. 17: Clarifies Board of Regents' ultimate authority over community colleges that are run jointly with a municipality.
- Sec. 18: Provides minimum criteria for the establishment of a new community college. Criteria include: (1) the college must be functioning as an extension center at the time it applies for full college status; (2) its service area must include at least 12,000 residents; (3) the college must provide academic transfer, vocational, student services, community service, and ABE programs; (4) a certain number of full and part time instructors in each major discipline area. Application procedures are spelled out; procedures include a detailed feasibility study that must be submitted to the Board of Regents. All decisions on applications must be made within two years.
- Sec. 19: Technical.
- Sec. 20: Establishes an executive officer, approved by the policy committee and the Regents but appointed by the community college system president, for each local campus.
- Sec. 21: Further specifies Regents' authority over academic curriculum, and establishes municipality's authority over nondegree activities and personnel.
- Sec. 22: Technical.
- Sec. 23: Establishes policy committees for each community college (policy committees would take the place of the currently existing policy advisory councils). Committees must have not less than five nor more than eleven members, and members must be broadly representative of the community, and would be appointed to serve three year terms. Committees will coordinate college activities with local school district activities. Committees have the power to approve the appointment of the local campus executive officer, the annual budget request, new academic programs, and nondegree programs, before they are offered to the Regents or to the municipality for final consideration.
- Sec. 24: The effect of this section is to "grandfather" all colleges in existence at the time the bill goes into effect.
- Sec. 25: Definitions.
- Sec. 26: Technical.
- Sec. 27: Same effect as section 24.
- Sec. 28: Effective date: July 1, 1981.

HB 375: Sponsors' suggested amendments

PAGE 4, line 12: amend to read, "(3) submit the annual budget request approved by the policy committee for each community. . ."

PAGE 13, line 8: delete "Members [SHALL BE APPOINTED FROM PERSONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OR MUNICIPALITY AND] shall reside within the area served by the community college."

(LC: 3/29, '81)



Nevada Public Affairs Review

Higher Education
in Nevada

1981, Number 1

One Dollar

A History of the Community College Movement In Nevada

by John A. Caserta

Starred
Sections
may be
of
particular
interest

Nevada Community Colleges Become a Reality — 1966-1970

From 1864 until 1967, the lagging population growth and slow industrial progress in Nevada did not trigger any great demand for special education or vocational training needs which could not be met by the local school systems or the University of Nevada System. A need for comprehensive community colleges was not felt until the late sixties.

In the 1966 campaign for governor, Paul Laxalt became the first major political figure to broach the concept of a state system of community colleges, when he included the establishment of community colleges as part of his campaign platform. After becoming governor in 1967, Laxalt appointed a Governor's Council to determine the feasibility of community colleges in the state. That same year, the citizens of Elko banded together and raised funds totaling \$44,356 to launch Nevada Community College. Tribute must be paid to the citizens of Elko. Not only was the University of Nevada first established in Elko in 1874, but in 1962 Elko business and community leaders attempted to establish a junior college by offering land to the Board of Regents for such a college in Elko. Even though this effort was unsuccessful, Elko citizens established Nevada's first public community college on their own in 1967.

Elko leaders recognized that they could not support a community college from private funds. Thus, Assemblymen Norman Glaser and Roy Young of Elko joined Governor Laxalt in the 1968 special legislative session in attempts to get community college legislation passed. This effort came to no avail, primarily because of concern that community colleges would further dilute funds badly needed by public schools and the universities.

The governor immediately began working with Assemblyman Glaser to present Assembly Bill No. 2, which required no funding but allowed the Elko Community College to become a function of the Elko School District and permitted the Elko trustees to accept gifts or grants from any source. The bill, which also called for the State Department of Education to launch a feasibility study for community colleges, passed both houses without dissent on February 26, 1968. The community college concept had been salvaged and the groundwork laid for dramatic future development.

The first major development was a donation of \$250,000 contributed by Howard Hughes in May, 1968. Without solicitation, Hughes volunteered the gift with the specification that half of the amount be used for the

continuation of Elko Community College and the other half to fund a legislative study on the feasibility of community colleges for Nevada. It was the Hughes money, coupled with the leadership of the governor and others, that resulted in the establishment of community colleges for Nevada.

The Board of Regents, at its February, 1969 meeting, made the community colleges a division of the University of Nevada System. Chancellor Neil Humphrey was authorized to develop organizational and basic program plans in conjunction with Governor Laxalt, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Burnell Larson, and officials of Elko Community College.

A nationwide search began for the president of the new division and, in 1970, Dr. Charles R. Donnelly arrived from Flint, Michigan, to become the first and only president of the Community College Division. Dr. Donnelly was made responsible for the development of a state plan for community colleges and for the activation of new colleges in Reno, Carson City, and Las Vegas.

By February, 1971, a bill had been passed which directed the conveyance of 200 acres of state-owned property to UNS for a community college and led to Western Nevada Community College's first building being located in Carson City rather than at Reno.

Also in 1971, Assemblyman William Swackhammer introduced Assembly Bill 459 which created a Higher Education Construction Fund with receipts from the slot machines tax. Expenditures from this fund were authorized only for construction projects for the University of Nevada System. AB 459 gave priority to construction of Clark County Community College for the 1971-73 biennium. Coupled with a congressional amendment to the Tax Reform Bill which stipulated that 80 percent of the revenue obtained from the slot machine tax would be returned to Nevada, this bill was a boon for the community college movement.

First Years of the Community College System, 1971-72

In 1971, Elko Community College was the oldest of the three community colleges comprising the new division. It was the first of the colleges to have all five occupational areas in operation: agriculture, business, health, industrial, and public service. Elko also had another unique "first" — it was the first institution of higher education in the state to have a senior citizen center established on campus. The college also established outreach centers in Winnemucca, Wells, and Ely. Western Nevada Community College began its operations in the Civic Center

building in Carson City; its outreach centers serviced Reno, Stead, Fallon, Yerington, Hawthorne, Incline Village, and Zephyr Cove. Clark County Community College, whose initial operation occupied the old Las Vegas Review Journal building and Skill Center in Las Vegas, had outreach classes extending to Boulder City.

The Board of Regents chose the location of the first community college campus site in Clark County to offer excellent access to the lower economic groups of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas. The black community had been concerned that the college be located near their own center of population, and their concern was borne out by figures which indicated that 23 percent of the enrollment on the downtown campus came from minority groups and that 83 percent of the students enrolled at the Skill Center were from the black community.

Enrollment in 1971-72 for all three colleges amounted to 589 FTE (using the base that 16 credit hours equals one full-time student equivalent).

In April, 1973, the college at Elko moved into the state's first new community college building — another "first." At the same time, the college received a new name, Northern Nevada Community College. Probably the most significant event of the 1972-73 year was the transfer of the Washoe County School District's adult education program to Western Nevada Community College. This action accounted for a 7.6 percent increase in headcount and a 355 percent increase in FTE, thus providing a much-needed base for funding.

The search for a location for the new Reno campus resulted in selecting property adjoining the Desert Research Institute site north of Reno. The regents were influenced by the fact that costs would be restricted to site development expenses and, also, by the fact that in view of Carson City having its own campus, there was not a need to have the community college located where it could serve both Reno and Carson City.

Clark County Community College did not receive the initial support from the school district which western Nevada had enjoyed. Despite the support of Dr. Kenny Guinn, Clark County School District Superintendent, the Board of Trustees was concerned about possible dilution of school funds and the college's possible threat to the success of the recently completed Southern Nevada Vocational Technical Center. For these reasons the board would not transfer their adult education program to the community college.

In December, 1972, President Donnelly had made a public commitment to keeping each community college in the system under 5,000 full-time equivalent enrollment and maintaining the two-year identity of each college, and he reiterated these commitments in June, 1973 to allay fears that the community colleges wanted to become four-year institutions. The community colleges had opened the 1972-73 school year with attendance nearly triple that of the first year, and statewide FTE reaching 1,413. The rapidly expanding enrollments were a cause of concern to university staff people and legislators who expressed fears of competition for scarce financial resources.

President Donnelly was a strong supporter of community education; he mandated that college credit be given for the college's community service courses and that these credits be made applicable toward the Asso-

ciate of General Studies degree as general electives. Donnelly initiated meetings among educators and lay people to explain the community education philosophy and the community school structure.

The well-attended ground breaking ceremony held in Fall, 1973, for the Carson campus of Western Nevada Community College gave evidence of the strong community support for the community college movement. Another notable event was the bringing into use of the second new building on the Elko campus; dedication for both of the new buildings took place on Saturday, September 8, 1973.

Conflict between the universities and the community college regarding university parallel courses developed in February, 1974, when the University of Nevada Arts and Science Ad Hoc Committee on Articulation Problems recommended to Acting President Dr. James T. Anderson that no university parallel courses be taught in the community colleges in the Reno-Sparks area, including Stead, and in the Las Vegas area, on the grounds that such courses were being offered already by the universities. Strong sentiment against the proposal was voiced by Community College division President Charles Donnelly and other system officers. The Board of Regents referred the matter to the Chancellor's Cabinet, which developed an approach to the problem that was acceptable to all concerned. In March, 1974, Senator Cliff Young raised the question of the intent of community colleges in regard to building athletic facilities for football and other group sports. President Donnelly responded that there was no intent to build stadiums and engage in intercollegiate sports; he emphasized the community college's main emphasis in athletics would be toward intramural programs and physical activities which students could pursue on a lifelong basis.

In May, 1974, Northern Nevada Community College received full accreditation from the Northwestern Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

Clark County Community College occupied its first new building in North Las Vegas on the Cheyenne campus. However, the more significant event of the 1973-74 school year was probably the transfer of the adult education program of Clark County School District to the college. The result was a doubling of enrollment with an increase from 1,530 headcount to 3,249 headcount for the 1973-74 school year.

Clark County Community College also began to promote concern for educating persons having handicaps. Clark County Community College also led the way in the development of flexible scheduling, a characteristic of community colleges deemed by many to be one of their major reasons for success.

Despite the fact that the State Plan for Community Colleges called for the establishment of community service courses, a number of legislators challenged state financing of special interest courses desired by adults in the community. In compliance with a mandate from the legislature, President Donnelly issued a policy memorandum making community service courses supported only from registration fees. Credit for community service courses would be applicable only to the Associate in General Studies degree.

Also in response to the 1975 legislature, the Community Education Center, which had been housed in the

Community College Division office in Reno, was transferred to the State Department of Education in Carson City on July 1, 1975. The leadership role for community education passed to the public school system and the State Department of Education. * * * * *

The question of a separate state board for community colleges was raised in September, 1974. Norman Glazer and the Elko Community College supporters had never abandoned their desire for a separate state board; they had only agreed to be placed under the umbrella of the Board of Regents as a matter of expediency in order to get their community college started. Governor Laxalt, from the outset, anticipated eventual involvement into a separate governing body for community colleges. Consequently, the issue kept being raised, but no formal action was taken by the regents. * * * * *

Another controversy between university and community college personnel occurred when the lower registration fees at community colleges (especially for college parallel courses) was questioned by some university personnel. In 1974, the Community College Division began to serve more headcount students than either one of Nevada's universities and became the largest division in the University of Nevada System. This development was perceived as a threat by some legislators and university personnel; the ideas of raising community college fees was, in large part, a reaction to that threat. The Community College Division and Western Nevada Community College administrators vigorously opposed this recommendation, placing emphasis on the fact that raising the fees would deny access to higher education to many students who tended to be older individuals with families to support. The regents rejected the concept of raising community college fees, and this issue has not surfaced again.

On the financial scene all was not well. Although the budget recommended by Governor O'Callaghan provided a 20 percent increase, it actually represented a 34 percent decrease from Western Nevada's request. The decrease was caused by the fact that the student-faculty ratio was to be increased from 20-1 to 24-1. This ratio posed a hardship because occupational courses requiring specialized equipment could only accept limited numbers of students. The State Board of Nursing specified a ratio of 15-1 for nursing programs, and smaller county centers would have great difficulty supporting classes on a 24 to 1 student-faculty ratio, simply because of the small number of people in such areas.

The problem was further compounded by the fact that federal vocational education monies were included in the regular biennium budget rather than being placed in a category separate from the state appropriation. The net result was that the college would be receiving approximately \$200 less support per FTE student than it had been receiving in the 1974-75 budget.

Western Nevada Community College was also facing another problem. Although the 1975-77 budget provided for a 47 percent increase, the actual increase in enrollment over the preceding biennium was 16.3 percent. A repetition of that growth rate would trigger critical financial problems.

The enrollment of Clark County Community College was also burgeoning, reaching 2,768 FTE. The faculty and students had not even settled in their new quarters

when it became evident that a second college campus would soon be needed. Regent Bill Morris, before a special meeting of the Board of Regents and the Nevada Public Works Board in September, 1974, proposed a second campus on government property located at West Charleston Boulevard and Torrey Pines.

In the spring of 1975, Clark County Community College made a push in another new direction — a step which would lead to the second community college for Clark County being established at Henderson rather than the Torrey Pines campus. Under the direction of Betty Scott, Henderson coordinator, a pilot program was started which would offer three liberal arts courses and one community service course in addition to the ongoing Spanish culture program which the college had been sponsoring.

Problems of articulation between the community college and the universities continuously arose. President Donnelly and the community colleges resisted a new course numbering system proposed by the articulation board to aid in the transfer process between the community colleges and the state's two universities. Donnelly argued that (1) the proposed numbering systems would separate and divide faculty and programs; (2) the numbering system proposed would demean the community service and developmental courses and that insufficient numbers had been allotted for community service courses; and (3) all occupational courses offered by the community colleges should be accepted at some four-year college or university somewhere and that all general education courses taught at the community college were of baccalaureate level. Donnelly also challenged the uneven representation on the articulation board. He noted that in the instance of the proposed numbering system, the vote was four university members voting for the new system and two community college representatives voting against it.

The Board of Regents generally supported Donnelly's arguments; the net result was that a different numbering system was adopted rather than the one proposed by the articulation board and one more community college member was added to the articulation board.

Two additional issues presented themselves at the first statewide meeting of all citizen advisory boards called by President Donnelly in May, 1976. Dr. Marvin Sedway from Las Vegas requested (1) that the group issue a statement endorsing intercollegiate athletics in community colleges and (2) that consideration be given to having a separate statewide board for the governance of community colleges. Sedway's first issue was submitted to the individual advisory boards. There was general consensus that there should not be a separate board at this time although such action might be desirable at a later date.

In May, 1976, the one-year trial program allowing White Pine and Elko county high school seniors to enroll in the community college was adopted permanently by the Board of Regents. Nearly 100 White Pine students and approximately 70 Elko students had enrolled in the program during the 1975-76 school year.

For Western Nevada Community College, the most important event of the 1975-76 year was action taken by President Donnelly to separate Western Nevada Community College into two colleges. The college would still have one identity, but it would consist of two separate campuses, each having its own administrative staff.

budget and responsibility for its actions. One significant advantage would be that the Reno-Sparks campus could concentrate on occupational education while the Carson campus could concentrate on better service to the rural centers.

The Board of Regents approved the reorganization on April 2, 1976 and steps were taken to create two separate administrative structures. This action later became a problem with legislators because they had not been adequately informed as to why one college had so many administrators.

Western Nevada and Clark County Community College received accreditation in December, 1975. In the short period of four years, all of Nevada's community colleges had received full accreditation.

It was on October 1, 1975, that a site feasibility report recommended the establishment of the Torrey Pines Campus in West Las Vegas. Notwithstanding the great odds against them the Reverend Caesar Caviglia, pastor of St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church in Henderson, and Regent James Buchanan (elected from that area) launched an effort to establish the second community college campus in the vicinity of Henderson and Boulder City.

From the initial enrollment of 98 persons in the spring of 1975, there were now nearly 300 students attending 14 courses taught in Henderson's Roman Catholic church, the Civic Center, and Basic High School. This increase indicated the desire of Henderson and Boulder City residents for college classes in their own area. The City of Henderson also set aside 80 acres of city-owned land at the lowest possible price permitted if the second campus would be built in Henderson.

Clark County Community College's total enrollment of 7,040 headcount students was almost on a par with the University of Nevada at Las Vegas which had enrolled 7,621 students. CCC also continued to outdistance Western Nevada which had a headcount of 6,246.

As President Donnelly entered the 1976-77 college term, the success of the community college system was a matter of pride to him — he had taken a new system and developed it into a structure which rivaled the University of Nevada in numbers of students served. Little did he realize the upheavals in the community colleges that would occur during this year. When the governor sent his proposed budget to the legislature, the budget, which contained major cuts, quickly elicited outspoken criticism from Donnelly and other community college supporters. Governor O'Callaghan then recommended that eight positions be abolished in President Donnelly's office and that Donnelly and a small staff be transferred to the chancellor's office. A temporary victory for Donnelly ensued when the Senate Finance Committee voted to keep the reduced community college administration intact rather than merge it with the chancellor's office.

Ripples from the budget rift spilled over into the controversy as to whether or not there should be established a separate state governing board for community colleges. Because of university system budget-cutting procedures, instituted when O'Callaghan recommended a \$120 million budget as compared to the \$138 million budget requested, there emerged a feeling among some community college staff and supporters that the university system had not dealt fairly with them. There was also the feeling

prevalent that the university system may not have presented adequately the financial condition of the community colleges.

Another event giving momentum to a separate governing board for community colleges occurred on January 11, 1977, when a contingent of community college supporters, some of whom had traveled from Reno and Elko to Las Vegas, were denied access to speak before the Board of Regents by Chairman Buchanan.

The community college supporters were infuriated and from this group Dr. Marvin Sedway of Las Vegas emerged as prime spokesman for support of Senate Bill 389, which would have created an autonomous governing board for community colleges. Sedway also produced correspondence from Paul Laxalt which confirmed that separation of the community colleges from the university system (when the colleges matured) was an original concept held by both Laxalt and members of Elko's first community college committee. The hearings in April, 1977 led to retaining the single structure for the administration of higher education; however, rumblings from legislators and educators left no doubt that the issue would surface again in the future.

Some of the loudest rumblings came from President Donnelly who, at the May community college graduation ceremonies held throughout the state, openly criticized the governor and the legislature. The Board of Regents, in a surprising move in June, 1977, then abolished the Community College Division presidency and offered Dr. Donnelly a teaching position with the community college. Board Vice-Chairman Molly Knudtsen of Austin stated that the decision was purely a financial one made in the wake of the legislature's elimination of nearly all of Donnelly's central office staff members which left him to function merely as a figurehead. The regents came under fire because official statements and press releases from the University of Nevada System gave the impression that the abolition of Donnelly's position had been finalized. Larry Lessly, General Counsel for the regents, explained that the regents should have first amended the by-laws and codes to accommodate abolishing the president's position.

The community colleges in Nevada now had a headcount enrollment which exceeded the two universities. Statewide enrollment for community colleges was 16,004 while statewide enrollment for the two universities was 15,922. Western Nevada Community College had moved into its first new facility for the Reno-Sparks area in December 1976. When the Nevada State Legislature convened in January, 1977, it approved an addition which would more than triple space to provide instruction in a variety of occupational programs.

Elliot Lima, Western Nevada Community College administrator in charge of the Fallon Center, was receiving strong support and urging from Fallon citizens to seek a building and campus to serve that area. This effort received increased impetus in Fall, 1976, when the college was able to start a day operation in the abandoned Oats Park Elementary School. Senator Carl Dodge's strong efforts and those of the Fallon community did not bear fruit at the 1977 legislature, but they did not admit defeat. While Dodge was not successful in getting a campus established at Fallon, it was primarily through his efforts and those of Assembly Speaker Joe Dini that the legisla-

Discussion of a consulting firm's 1978 study of community colleges, known as the Tadlock report, raised once again the issue of dividing Western Nevada Community College into two separate colleges. The WNCC Faculty Senate expressed the faculty's concern that the two campuses be divided into two separate colleges. They also recommended that the Community College Division office not be re-established, that some mechanism be created to expedite the adoption of by-laws for the colleges, and that the colleges be better represented on UNS committees. The regents indicated they would pursue these concerns and also approved Chancellor Baepfer's recommendation not to re-establish a Community College Division presidency, but to provide for a Coordinator of Community Colleges.

The Tadlock report also triggered discussion on the concept of separating the community college system from the University of Nevada System. In March, 1979, Dr. Marvin Sedway of Las Vegas spoke on behalf of separation before the Senate Human Resources Committee, which was studying proposals to have the regents appointed, to shorten their terms, and to have a separate community college board and president. The move to separate spearheaded by Senator Glaser, was unsuccessful once again.

The colleges were not without internal problems, as well. The Reno-Sparks area was facing a surge in minority problems, and WNCC's English as a Second Language program almost doubled in size within one year, reaching approximately 1,400 immigrants. Enrollment of immigrants and minorities in regular college programs also increased and it was necessary to appoint a committee on minority affairs. There was also the problem of lack of funding by the legislature for interscholastic community college programs. Although the Wildcat team had been a major contributor to the identity of the college, a decision was made to abandon this program in accordance with legislative intent.

Clark County Community College also reflected new growth. President Paul Kreider obtained approval from the Board of Regents for three new departments — Real Estate and Finance, Fine Arts and Communications, and English and Foreign Language.

As Nevada community colleges approached the end of their first decade of existence, they found themselves involved in a number of significant developments. Western Nevada Community College was divided by the Board of Regents in December, 1979. The Reno-Sparks campus became Truckee Meadows Community College, while the Carson City campus and its outlying centers retained the Western Nevada Community College title. James Eardley was promoted to become first president of the new college.

Truckee Meadows Community College was expanding both its facilities and its instructional programs. Business occupation classes had increased by 60 percent from 1976 to 1979. New majors were added in small business management, insurance, and hotel-motel management. Also, the business and mathematics departments were in the process of instituting a major thrust in computer-assisted instruction. The Community Education Division was offering over 100 classes as well as reaching another 1,300 persons in its adult basic education program and approximately 1,100 teachers in its school district inservice train-

ing program. In addition, Truckee Meadows Community College was undergoing a self-study in preparation for accreditation which it received in June, 1980.

Western Nevada Community College was in a building program at both its Carson City campus and the new Fallon campus. WNCC was also involved in self-study for accreditation and the development of new programs. In May, 1980, WNCC received the regents' approval for new two-year programs in Automotive Technology, Surveying Technology, Welding Technology, and Traffic Safety.

Northern Nevada Community College was preparing for a building program. Approval was received from the regents in March, 1980 to develop on-campus housing for NNCC students. This was an important development for rural students who could find no housing in Elko.

Clark County Community College found itself in a program of expansion and self-study for accreditation. In addition to the college's own remodeling and building program, it was involved with construction of the new Henderson facility. The college developed a new gaming careers program, a new outreach program to expand college classes to Boulder City, Mesquite, Indian Springs, Overton (Moapa Valley), Jean, and Pahrump in Nye County, and an Associate of General Studies Tele-course Degree in conjunction with Coastline Community College District and Nellis Air Force Base. New President Judith Eaton also found herself in the midst of an organizational restructuring occasioned by a mandate of the 1979 legislature that administrative costs be reduced.

The Board of Regents took a variety of relevant actions during the 1979-80 term. Upon the recommendation of Regent McBride, the Board dissolved the old community college division structure and eliminated the position of a vice-chancellor for community colleges, substituting a community college analyst in its place. Expressions of concern were voiced by some regents, especially in regard to standards, admission requirements, coordination and availability of staff expertise at a higher level. The board adopted the concept that the colleges should share information and expertise, and that there should be opportunity for rational diversity within a general policy framework.

The Board of Regents approved a collective bargaining election at the request of the Nevada State Education Association which was seeking to represent the faculty of the Community College Division. When the returns were counted in November, 1979, however, the request was defeated by a vote of 87 to 66.

The community colleges started the decade of the eighties on a positive note. The Max C. Fleischmann Foundation, which had given all three community colleges \$100,000 each to start their libraries, now made generous donations to the university system and the community colleges when the foundation was dissolved on July 4, 1980.

In less than a decade, Nevada would have six separate community college facilities and could boast of strong community support. The cooperation between the school districts and the community colleges which had enabled the colleges to achieve so much so soon showed every sign of continuing. The news media had been supportive of the community college movement, and the many institutions and agencies with which the community colleges

had been working continued to give their support and cooperation.

Two major hurdles remained to be overcome. One was the need for increased money to finance the rapidly expanding colleges at a time when "economy" was the by-word of every political platform; the second was the need to obtain consensus among legislators, educators and citizens of the state about the role and functions of its community colleges.

Reference

Caserta, John A. *A History of the Community College Movement in Nevada*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, UNR, 1979.



John A. Caserta is Dean of Adult Community Education at Truckee Meadows Community College. His B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in Education are from the University of Nevada, Reno. Dr. Caserta has worked in education in Nevada for 30 years.

The Future of Community College Education In Nevada

by Judith S. Eaton

Introduction

The future of community college education in Nevada will essentially be determined by the responses to three major questions: 1) What is the mission of community colleges for the 1980s? 2) What are the funding opportunities for community colleges in the 1980s? 3) What lies ahead for governance of community colleges in the 1980s?

The community college movement within Nevada is young, healthy, and has experienced rapid growth throughout the state. In 1971, 1,740 students were enrolled in the state's two-year public institutions.¹ In the fall of 1979 this figure was 19,455.² This does not include those individuals within the community who may have pursued some of the many non-credit activities offered by our various institutions. The four community colleges in the state can anticipate additional growth in population and increased demand for services, programs, and access. The Nevada story is part of a nationwide successful pic-

ture of 1,230 community colleges which, in 1965, enrolled 1.3 million students and in 1979 enrolled 4.5 million. The number of these educational institutions almost doubled during this time period.³ Half of all college freshmen throughout the country are enrolled in community colleges. These institutions are unique and reflect a national commitment to accessibility of education which is virtually unprecedented in western history.

Indications are that the community college movement will continue to grow and that prospective enrollments will reflect an increase in the number of students being served. This prognosis is made with particular comfort concerning sunbelt states, and includes Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and Idaho. While there is concern about the future of higher education institutions in general and significant warnings concerning the need to identify clientele, community colleges appear to continue as somewhat protected from the problems of economic recession, a limited youth population, and ongoing questions about the worth of educational undertakings.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM
Net Annual FTE Enrollments
1971-1980*

	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Clark County Community College									
Occupational	95	468	930	1,427	1,511	1,242	1,464	1,642	1,607
University Parallel	76	217	449	735	965	949	1,077	1,191	1,119
Developmental	3	35	50	284	264	276	373	195	307
Total CCC	174	720	1,429	2,446	2,740	2,467	2,714	3,028	3,033
Northern Nevada Community College									
Occupational	89	76	117	114	140	145	152	155	207
University Parallel	99	66	106	160	180	186	199	203	220
Developmental	14	7	11	13	15	17	13	9	4
Total NSC	202	149	234	287	335	348	364	367	431
Truckee Meadows Community College									
Occupational	0	0	0	0	0	688	772	892	875
University Parallel	0	0	0	0	0	451	545	570	621
Developmental	0	0	0	0	0	49	70	78	72
Total TMCC	0	0	0	0	0	1,188	1,387	1,540	1,568
Western Nevada Community College**									
Occupational	118	306	812	899	967	389	383	432	431
University Parallel	91	221	434	646	903	267	112	350	371
Developmental	4	17	83	54	77	39	50	32	40
Total WSCC	213	544	1,329	1,599	1,947	695	745	814	842
Total Community Colleges	589	1,413	2,992	4,332	5,022	4,698	5,210	5,749	5,814

	Headcount Enrollments (Fall Semester)								
	1971-72 Actual	1972-73 Actual	1973-74 Actual	1974-75 Actual	1975-76 Actual	1976-77 Actual	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual
Clark County Community College	541	1,580	3,249	6,011	7,040	7,273	7,893	8,825	9,121
Northern Nevada Community College	494	336	610	872	925	1,076	1,199	1,300	1,433
Western Nevada Community College** South Campus	0	0	0	0	0	2,165	2,543	2,752	2,542
Western Nevada Community College** North Campus	705	2,095	4,717	4,760	6,246	3,885	4,721	5,627	5,959
Community College Totals	1,740	4,011	8,576	11,643	14,211	14,399	16,356	18,504	19,455

* Official data from Chancellor's Office, Reno, NV.

** Prior to the 1976-77 academic year, WNCC enrollments were reported as only one campus.

Our Mission

Since 1965, community college mission statements have reflected the enormous demand of communities for programs and services, extremely rapid growth, and a strong commitment to equality of opportunity for all citizens. The 1970s, however, placed significant strain on these generally-worded, well-intended statements of purpose. The Viet Nam war, economic uncertainty, collective bargaining, public demands for accountability, and the rapidly changing job market all placed pressure upon ongoing commitment to bring education to as many people as possible. While community colleges should and will remain committed to an open door policy with service primarily in the areas of occupational education, general education (liberal arts/university parallel), and community service, the major challenge for our institutions in the next ten years will be to adequately define mission statements in order to serve carefully identified constituencies. National indications reflect increasing minority, female, and elderly enrollment within our institutions. National trends point to increased cooperative efforts with business, industry, government agencies, high schools, and four-year institutions. The community college is rapidly ceasing to function as a preparatory agency and increasing its function as a "partnership" agency as individuals identify, refine, and change careers and personal life styles. The effect of these trends on southern Nevada and the Las Vegas area will be the focus of this paper. Clark County is expected to double its population by the year 2000. We anticipate significant new job opportunities available in fields such as construction, health services, public services, energy development, and computer technology. National trends point to major growth in aerospace and airlines, television broadcasting, home electronics, aluminum, telephone and telegraph, computers and calculators, and health care industries.⁴

We expect to feel the impact of women and minorities moving into areas of technical training and making personal lifestyle changes which require educational services. As our population continues to grow, the demand for service from community colleges is likely to increase. Administrators and the state government will be faced with the fundamental question of determining the relative importance of direct instructional undertakings as distinct from service undertakings such as a Displaced Homemakers Center and Career Planning and Placement efforts.

The mission statement of Clark County Community College is intended to reflect not only a commitment to accessibility of educational opportunity for all individuals but also a careful analysis of the needs and desires of the residents of the district in which the college resides.⁵ It reflects unique local characteristics, yet functions as a statement of educational philosophy. The primary focus of community college education is the community it serves. Mission statements of the community colleges within the state should reflect differences derived from the varying characteristics of their respective service areas. While we emphasize the mission of our colleges in terms of appropriate reaction to community need and desire, we should not lose sight of a strong need for an educational leadership role in our communities. Our commitment to the value of education and an educated society can manifest itself constructively in assisting those constituencies which comprise the "educationally neglected" to view education as a valued activity in their society. As Edmund Gleazer has stated:

*Is the college role limited to response or reaction to community needs, pressures, and requests? Or are there not more sophisticated services appropriate to the identification and analysis and proposed solutions? And further, should not the community college play a part in forecasting the shape of the society to come, and leading the community to understand the coming changes, making provisions for coping with them, and providing services to meet them?*⁶

In order to develop mission statements which incorporate these elements of educational commitment and response to unique community needs, each of our institutions within the state must have access to adequate information concerning the needs and desires of its community. This requires effective institutional studies support for each of our colleges. The 1980s will demand that special effort be put forth by the community colleges and their governing board to carefully identify and thoroughly assess the educational requirements of the people of the state of Nevada. There has been limited attention devoted to long-range academic planning at the community college level within the state. With the shift of the community colleges from a division structure to autonomous institutions, it will be desirable to undertake institutional research efforts at a local level in order that information required for our institutions to meaningfully program in the 1980s is available within our specific service areas.⁷ Thus while we may continue state-wide coordination of community colleges, we will need to focus increasingly on local efforts to meet local needs. We will need to pay less

attention to comparisons of programs, funding, and organizational structure to arrive at sameness and more attention to differences based upon carefully documented need. While costly limited-enrollment programs such as Dental Hygiene should be coordinated at a state level, it is entirely appropriate that each community college "duplicate" each other's efforts in the offering of programs in areas such as automotive technology.

Articulated statements of purpose for community colleges remain somewhat meaningless unless they are brought to fruition by the efforts of professional staff, particularly management. Goals and objectives associated with our statements of purpose require careful attention to management, accountability, and structure. The 1980s should bring increased attention to sophisticated management techniques, management development, and a clarification of appropriate organizational structures for community colleges. The community colleges in the state of Nevada reflect to some extent the university structure rather than careful functional analysis of unique community college services to be delivered. The ability of community colleges to achieve their respective missions is further complicated by lack of clarification of what constitutes management within our institutions. While we may be pleased with the academic professionalism and collegiality reflected in the hiring of all staff as "faculty," we nonetheless have an obligation to specifically identify those with management roles within the institution and not confuse these obligations and responsibilities with teaching duties and other academic priorities. It is certainly valuable for administrators to teach, but their primary obligation is one of management.

Finance

The current method of funding community colleges within the state of Nevada is on an FTE formula basis with all public revenue deriving from the state legislature. While this approach to the funding of our institutions has provided for major success in the growth and development of our colleges, we have reached a critical point in size and complexity requiring major review of this fiscal approach. Clark County Community College in particular is suffering from the effects of rapid growth in the context of this funding approach. The present FTE formula funding approach does not adequately take into account the increasing numbers of part-time students enrolling in our institutions. It does not reflect that five students taking one class demand five times more service in areas such as admissions, registration, library, counseling, and career planning as one student taking fifteen credit hours. FTE formula funding does not provide for recognition of the unique characteristics of the student population of community colleges, but derives instead from a model relying essentially on full-time student enrollments. It is likely that the trend in part-time student enrollments will continue to effect both the community colleges and the universities with the state. Thus, a review of our funding approach seems appropriate.

Various states have employed alternatives to the Nevada approach. Some states employ a student credit hour (SCH) method of compensation for community colleges. They look at total student credit hours generated by all enrollments in a given term and provide payment of a

dollar amount per student credit hour as compared to FTE. This provides a fuller remuneration for actual needs deriving from enrollments of our institutions. Yet other states employ a form of differential funding whereby they recognize differences in costs among community college programs. Throughout the country, health occupation programs (Dental Hygiene, Associate Degree Nursing, Respiratory Therapy) are the most expensive to offer. These are followed by limited-enrollment programs in the heavy technologies, such as automotive technology, which require specialized and expensive space. Many programs in business as well as many general education offerings do not require specialized space and can comfortably accommodate higher enrollments. Thus, costs in these areas are somewhat less. A number of states have developed funding categories such as "vocational" and "general," or have more specifically broken down vocational funding to reflect health, business, and technology areas. It would be of great value to Nevada to study the funding efforts of other states to develop an alternative to our current funding approach. Some combination of enrollment-driven funding with attention to headcount and program costs would serve the state well.

The current budgetary approach of developing the instructional budget based on formula funding and the rest of an institutional budget on an as-needed basis is complex and militates against successful efforts of funding non-instructional areas such as student services. There appears to be a perception of the formula funding approach as more worthy of fiscal attention while the "as-needed" approach is viewed with some skepticism. It would do well for our community colleges to budget on a model which reflects direct instructional costs and total institutional costs as well as taking into account all enrollments and the varying cost of instruction. This model will need to account for "nontraditional" program areas which also cannot be formula-funded. Examples of such programs are special contract programs with business and industry such as CCC's Apprenticeship Training Program and our projected Air Frame/Power Plant Training.

Whether described as headcount (HC), full-time equivalency (FTE), student credit hours (SCH), or Average Daily Attendance (ADA), enrollment-driven formulas for funding are producing serious limitations for community colleges around the country. They work against the kinds of programs and services currently demanded by our public: modular instruction, a competency-based orientation, variable-length curriculum, open entry-open exit programs, independent study, experience-based learning, programmed learning, and on-the-job training. Nevada can take a leadership role in community colleges by developing a funding model which reflects:

- agreement between the state government, Board of Regents, and the community college about the legitimate role and purpose of these colleges
- separation and identification of fixed and variable costs
- sound program cost information which is need-based
- incentives for cost effectiveness, community cooperation, and creative use of existing resources
- the ongoing impact of inflation

Our community colleges will continue to be primary vehicles for occupational training — but in modes and for

clientele previously considered unusual. We are lifelong learning centers for the state, serving a diverse population with a strong convenience orientation and specific skill needs. CCCC enrolled 9,121 state-recognized credit students in Fall, 1979 for an FTE of 3,162 at a cost of \$274 per student. This appears to be a modest state investment in community college education or "... to aid those in the community who want to learn how to secure certain basic necessities. Among those are: learning, health, employment, food, and citizenship rights and responsibilities."

While many experts within the community college decry the failure of states to fund community service efforts, the dynamic quality of these programs and the rapidly changing clientele and offerings make it plausible that they remain self-sustaining. We should, in the 1980s, however, look to public funding of summer sessions at community colleges. It is the very nature of community college clientele to need services at any time during the year. The clientele is not adequately served in only a traditional Fall and Spring-semester academic mode. If we were to move in the direction of state support for summer offerings, it should be within the same fiscal model developed for the rest of the academic year.

In addition to major attention in the 1980s focusing on alternative approaches to funding at the state level, we in Nevada should concern ourselves with sources other than state revenues for community colleges. This may take the form of local funding, private subsidy (individual or corporate), or federal assistance. Fiscal health of our educational institutions is more likely to be retained if we have a diversity of revenue sources. Our current national economic picture suggests that federal funding sources will be increasingly limited. With the establishment of foundations at each of the community colleges, we are just beginning to tap private revenue sources within the community and the state. Community colleges should make a major thrust in the direction of corporate donations. Finally, community colleges should engage in a study of the feasibility of some form of local funding for our institutions. Given the essentially local focus of our program efforts, this may prove to be an effective alternative to offset some of the financial burden at the state level. While some increased tuition is likely to be necessary, it is important that we maintain our commitment to low-cost quality education.

Governance

Since the mid-1960s, there has been discussion within the state concerning the advisability of the community college functioning within the structure of the University of Nevada System governed by the Board of Regents. Although efficient and practical, the current arrangement is viewed by some as having created a "stepchild" which, although the fastest-growing segment within the system, cannot adequately make its needs known within the state. The period of "childhood" may be over and a fresh look at the structure of our community colleges may be needed. There are several state models which may be studied in the event that Nevada would wish to consider some alternative to its present governance structure for institutions.

A popular model of governance and funding for com-

munity colleges is that of a local governing board whose members are appointed or elected from the district in which the college resides. These boards are accountable to the community for fiscal, integrity, program development, and institutional growth. Funds are available from property tax or sales tax, which usually constitute anywhere from 20 percent to 50 percent of a college budget.

A second model employed by a number of states retains a local board of control and also provides for a State Community College Board. This board provides an essential coordinating function, oversees long-range state planning, and assists in the determination of state dollars to be made available to community colleges. In states where such boards do not exist, community college requests for state funds and their accountability for those funds is handled by either through the State Board of Education or a state governing board for universities such as a Board of Regents. Some states provide for local advisory boards as well as a state board for community colleges with all revenue deriving from the state.

The Nevada plan is similar to that of Alaska, Colorado, functions with a state community college board/local advisory board model with no local funding. With the elimination of the community college division in Nevada, the time is appropriate to review the governance structure for our community colleges to see if that structure meets the needs of the community and the state. One might consider the creation of two sub-boards within the framework of the Board of Regents: one board would serve the university, the other board would serve the community colleges. The Board of Regents would remain as the single governing board for all educational higher institutions within the state. We might consider the creation of a State Community College Board answerable to the legislature. However, this could create expense and produce some confusion within the state organizational structure. Finally, we might consider the creation of local boards with appropriate authority to oversee the fiscal and program development of our institutions; such local boards may be appointed or elected. While this alternative might provide our institutions with much-needed local direction and influence, it raises serious questions about appropriate financing of our community colleges.

Clark County Community College and Southern Nevada: The Future

CCCC serves the most populous district in the state and includes Clark, Nye, Lincoln, and Esmeralda Counties in its service area. Approximately 400,000 of the 450,000 people in this service area live in Clark County and are concentrated in the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and Boulder City. The college currently operates from a single main campus with approximately seventy additional locations. Henderson is the major satellite operation with approximately 1,562 (HC) students enrolled during 1979-80.

In attempting to assess needs in the 1980s, the college conducted an Institutional Needs Assessment during Fall, 1979. 114,000 individual residences were contacted in Clark County during this time period. The major results of this study were:

1) that more locations for course offerings are

needed. 54.5 percent of respondents preferred a location closer to home.

- 2) that more variation in times of offerings be available. For example, 68.5 percent of respondents prefer evening classes.
- 3) that more courses of study be available. 17.1 percent-28 percent of respondents showed interest in study in Operating Your Own Business, Interior Decorating, Carpentry, Small Appliance Engine Repair, Landscape Technology, Home Management, and Health and Recreation.
- 4) that more convenience be provided in programs and services. 43.5 percent of respondents were interested in mail registration.
- 5) that more emphasis be placed on community education (as distinct from traditional degree programs). 73.6 percent of respondents prefer taking classes to pursue their own interests; 62.0 percent would prefer more short courses.

If there is a single theme deriving from the results of this survey, it is access. The community wants an institution with maximum flexibility to meet its purpose, time, location, and special service needs. Based upon this survey, as well as national trends in community college education, the changing job market, and lifestyle shifts in southern Nevada, we may look to a future significantly altered as compared with the institution which opened its doors in 1971. Clark County Community College in the 1980s will be based upon an educational master plan calling for:

- 1) an increased commitment to *community-based education* to meet the location needs of our clientele. The first phase of a Henderson Campus will open in Fall, 1981. There has been discussion concerning a campus on West Charleston. Outreach centers are being increased in number and scope of offerings.

- 2) a shift to a *community education model* for delivery of educational programs and services. While retaining traditional courses and degree programs, CCC will respond to the new program and time demands of the community by emphasizing a variety of time frames for courses, variable ways of earning credit, certificate recognition for training (as distinct from credit), short courses, on-site instruction, and "mini programs" of several courses specifically tailored to meet student needs.

- 3) emphasis on *consulting and cooperation*. The community college will work with business, industry, and other educational agencies to provide educational opportunity to all persons within the community. We can "broker" educational services, provide training on a contract basis, and assist business and industry in retraining, upgrading, and improving skills of employees.

- 4) increased reliance on *communication technology*, reflected in telecourses for credit, video tie-in with other educational institutions, and reliance on computer technology.

- 5) increased emphasis on *articulation with public education and the university* by means of efforts such as our "Early Studies Program" with the Clark County School District and the development of our first transfer guide with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

The college is likely to continue its trend of significant growth in occupational programs. This will need to be augmented by maintenance of academic standards, a commitment to integration of appropriate humanities education in career programs, and the strengthening of developmental programs within the institution. A strong staff development program will be needed in order that faculty can effectively undertake new program development, initiate new instructional methodology, and make changes in the structure whereby our programs and services are available. Management training, a strong data base, and long-range planning will be essential to success in the next decade. Much depends upon the stability of funds, possible changes in governance structure, and the state's commitment to its community colleges as a critical, viable source of educational opportunity for all citizens.

There is a strong need to stabilize utilization of part-time staff and to address the issue of professional salaries in the context of present inflation. If we fail to respond to faculty needs and reasonable requests, the state may be faced with a movement toward collective bargaining which may not be in the best interests of our higher education efforts for the students of the state. This concern will provide a major challenge to system officials and state government alike. The current economic recession, uncertainty about the state budget surplus, and growing personnel and agency needs within the state mandate creative solutions. Quality education is ultimately dependent upon quality staff. This requires a healthy collegial environment, adequate remuneration to offset anxiety interfering with work, and a strong enough salary base to attract vital and creative professionals.

Finally, the future will be exciting. Our colleges are at a critical stage of growth and change.¹⁰ The 1980s will see a major refocusing of energy and effort. We have gone beyond the point of virtually automatic enrollment growth; we have significant clientele changes to anticipate, heretofore unprecedented demands will be made upon our facilities and staff. Nevada has much to prize in its community colleges. They are strong, effective, dedicated community education agencies. Citizens, legislators, and state executives can point with pride to the opportunity for quality education available to so many people.

Footnotes

- ¹John A. Caserta, *A History of the Community College Movement in Nevada*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1979.
- ²University of Nevada System, Chancellor's Office, Credit enrollment only.
- ³Data supplied by American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *Fact Sheet on Two-Year Colleges*, March, 1980.
- ⁴U.S. News and World Report, *Challenges of the 80's*, Special section, October 15, 1979, pp. 45-80.
- ⁵One undated planning document from the early 1970s for Clark County Community College prepared by the firm of Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall states: "The division of the comprehensive community college is basically five-fold: occupational, university parallel, community services, developmental, and counseling and guidance. The scope of these areas is as broad as necessary to accomplish the educational goals of the communities served." (p. 4). "Enrollment goal: 60 percent occupational, 20 percent university parallel, 10 percent community service, and 10 percent developmental education are identified" (p. 5). These goals are sometimes considered to be enrollment requirements.
- ⁶Edmund J. Gleazer, *The Community College: Values, Vision, & Viability*, Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1980, p. 7.
- ⁷The University of Nevada System Code was revised in December, 1979 eliminating the Community College Division and establishing each of the four community colleges within the state as autonomous institutions.
- ⁸Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. *The Community College: Values, Vision, & Viability*, p. 20.
- ⁹As of Fall, 1979 CCCC has provided credit instruction to a cumulative total of 72,812 registrants in our eight-year history.
- ¹⁰Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.



Judith S. Eaton became President of Clark County Community College in 1979. Her B.A. and M.A. are from the University of Michigan. She earned a Ph.D. in curriculum development from Wayne State University.

HB 375: Section-by-section analysis

Sec. 1: Makes community college system a separate component of university, under jurisdiction of Board of Regents.

Sec. 2: At least one member of the Board of Regents is a student. This section requires the student regent to be a community college student every other term. In other words, a university center student would serve on the Board for a two year term, then a community college student would serve for the next two year term, and the student regent position would continue to alternate in this fashion as long as this section of the law is in effect.

Sec. 3: Requires Regents to appoint community college system president, and allows the president of the community college system as well as the president of the university centers to attend meetings of the Regents.

Sec. 4: Requires Regents to fix the salary of the community college president.

Sec. 5: Technical.

Sec. 6: Requires Regents to approve and regulate academic courses taught at community colleges, with advice of local campus presidents and policy committees.

Sec. 7: Technical.

Sec. 8: Technical.

Sec. 9: Technical.

Sec. 10: Gives community college system president the power to: (1) give general supervision to community colleges, with approval of Regents; (2) appoint local campus executive officers, subject to the approval of policy committees; (3) direct and supervise local campus executive officers (4) submit academic programs, approved by policy committees, to Regents for their consideration; (5) submit local campus budget request to Regents for their consideration.

Sec. 11: Gives community college system president the authority to suspend or expel community college students.

Sec. 12: Technical.

Sec. 13: Technical.

Sec. 14: Establishes a comptroller for the community college system.

Sec. 15: Technical.

Sec. 16: Allows municipalities to establish and operate community colleges jointly with the University.

Sec. 17: Clarifies Board of Regents' ultimate authority over community colleges that are run jointly with a municipality.

Sec. 18: Provides minimum criteria for the establishment of a new community college. Criteria include: (1) the college must be functioning as an extension center at the time it applies for full college status; (2) its service area must include at least 12,000 residents; (3) the college must provide academic transfer, vocational, student services, community service, and ABE programs; (4) a certain number of full and part time instructors in each major discipline area. Application procedures are spelled out; procedures include a detailed feasibility study that must be submitted to the Board of Regents. All decisions on applications must be made within two years.

Sec. 19: Technical.

Sec. 20: Establishes an executive officer, approved by the policy committee and the Regents but appointed by the community college system president, for each local campus.

Sec. 21: Further specifies Regents' authority over academic curriculum, and establishes municipality's authority over nondegree activities and personnel.

Sec. 22: Technical.

Sec. 23: Establishes policy committees for each community college (policy committees would take the place of the currently existing policy advisory councils). Committees must have not less than five nor more than eleven members, and members must be broadly representative of the community; and would be appointed to serve three year terms. Committees will coordinate college activities with local school district activities. Committees have the power to approve the appointment of the local campus executive officer, the annual budget request, new academic programs, and nondegree programs, before they are offered to the Regents or to the municipality for final consideration.

Sec. 24: The effect of this section is to "grandfather" all colleges in existence at the time the bill goes into effect.

Sec. 25: Definitions.

Sec. 26: Technical.

Sec. 27: Same effect as section 24.

Sec. 28: Effective date: July 1, 1981.

HB 375: Sponsors' suggested amendments

PAGE 4, line 12: amend to read, "(3) submit the annual budget request approved by the policy committee for each community. . ."

PAGE 13, line 8: delete "Members [SHALL BE APPOINTED FROM PERSONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OR MUNICIPALITY AND] shall reside within the area served by the community college."

(LC: 3/29/81)

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
TWELFTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. HB 375
 Title University of Alaska Community College System
 Requested by House HESS Date April 1, 1981

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Education
 Program Category Affected University of Alaska
 BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Statewide Administration
 (Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
100 PERSONAL SERVICES		79.3	84.1	89.1	94.4	100.1
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.						
TOTAL	N.A.	79.3	84.1	89.1	94.4	100.1

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
GENERAL FUND	N.A.	79.3	84.1	89.1	94.4	100.1
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
FULL TIME	N.A.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

(a.) Bill has essentially three parts; sections 1-17, 19-22, 24-27 (two presidents), section 18 (establishment criteria), and section 23 (policy councils). The only concept with an immediate fiscal impact is the two president approach to administration.

(b.) The cost of creating a second president is an estimate based upon the following assumptions:

1. The existing community college central staff positions serve as positions for a president.
2. The two presidents would be paid equivalent amounts (6.1).
3. Comptrollers would be paid equivalent amounts (Section 14) (73.2).
4. The community college president would not function sufficiently different than the existing chancellor except in relationship to the board. Hence, costs would be essentially equivalent.

IV. DATE April 1, 1981 PREPARED BY Kerry D. Rosenberg
 AGENCY Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education
 PHONE 465-2854
 Original: Legislative Finance
 cc: Budget and Management
 Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

4.3.81

HB 218
375

Romerberg ← post 2nd Com on Educ.
Advisory Bd of CC
Interim Com. - 1980

Committee
Document of 735 -

opposed to part I

~~opposed~~ " II, III

Q for Romerberg:

① Fiscal note.

② Some say Div. of CC as is meant. does what Bill calls for.
So what really is accomplished.

③ Why would Regents oppose - what are reasons?