

DISCLAIMER

Electronic versions of the exhibits in these minutes may not be complete.

This information is supplied as an informational service only and should not be relied upon as an official record.

Original exhibits are on file at the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Library in Carson City.

Contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or library@lcb.state.nv.us.

Legislative Request - Class-size Reduction Funds Quick Survey

1. Would your district support legislation to provide flexibility for the class-size reduction (CSR) program to allow the funds to be used for a 22:1 student teacher ratio in grades K-6?
2. Would your school district consider implementing the 22:1 CSR program if authorized? If no, what would prohibit your district from considering the program?
3. What problems or challenges do you foresee in implementing the program?
4. What other problems do you foresee in implementing this plan that could be addressed through legislation this session? If so, briefly describe.

	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4
Carson City	Yes	Yes, but would "phase" over period of time.	Plan for portables, 3 years to phase in to it?	No, if "phased" in over reasonable time.
Churchill County	Yes	Yes.	None.	None.
Clark County	Yes, K-5	Yes, with funding allocations.	Team Teaching and facility space.	None.
Douglas County	Yes and other classes deemed beneficial.	Consider it, Yes.	Classroom space.	None.
Elko County	Yes Works Well	Very Much.	Individual plans that will work for individual district. May need to "phase" in to it.	Standardize statewide evaluation? Should collect same data from districts.
Esmeralda County	Yes	Classes not that large.	None.	Small districts should be allowed some of the CSR money.
Eureka County	Yes	Classes not that large.	School Districts should have the ability to adjust class size to fit needs.	Public awareness and comparison.
Humboldt County	Yes	Yes.	None.	None.
Lander County	Yes, keep K-3 15:1, 4-6 22:1 with funding	Yes, with funding allocations.	None.	Prefer to keep 15:1 in K-3 and 4-6 22:1.
Lincoln County	Yes, keep K-3 15:1, 4-6 22:1 with funding, otherwise No.	No, cannot presently pay for what we have, greater growth is achieved with lesser numbers in primary grades. Grade range increased with students, I feel that this would be a move in the wrong direction.	Classroom space, Funding (Would this be unfunded mandate?) and student numbers.	None.
Lyon County	Yes, flexible not mandated.	Possibly, classrooms and teachers would be problem, funding should be added.	Limited classrooms available, currently no team teaching, hiring teachers, funding issues.	May affect current program in grades 1 and 2 using a reading recovery teacher.
Mineral County	Yes	Yes.	None.	Easy to implement with declining enrollment. No problems.
Nye County	Yes, if financial assistance for additional classrooms, as well as textbooks and supplies.	Yes, if financial assistance for additional classrooms, as well as teacher salaries.	Classroom space and additional funding to maintain classrooms, teacher training for concept of team-teaching.	Additional funding for support services of custodial and maintenance personnel and additional utility usage.
Pershing County	Yes, flexible not mandated.	Consider it, Yes, no conclusions about implementing it.	Teacher complaints, giving up small class sizes in K-3. Facilities not a problem.	Not exactly 22:1 but in grades 1 through 3 19 or 20:1, grades 4 through 5 23 or 24:1.
Storey County	Yes	Yes	None.	None.
Washoe County	Yes	Yes	Adequate space. New schools primary classrooms are considerably smaller, important flexibility with 22:1.	Imperative that this legislation be cost neutral to individual school districts.
White Pine County	Yes	Yes, if fiscally possible.	Staffing 4-6 larger than 22:1, put demand on staffing in K-6.	Simply economic, classroom space OK to meet this goal.

2/20/03