

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

Call to Order: By Representative Quilici, on March 20, 1989, at 8:01 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: All members were present.

Members Excused: None.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Judy Waldron, LFA
Lois Menzies, Legislative Council
Mary Liedle, secretary

Announcements/Discussion: Rep. Addy announced that the committee was meeting to hear HB 786, a compromise pay bill.

HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 786

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor: Rep. Addy opened the hearing on HB 786 by explaining how the bill came into existence. There were a couple different pay plan bills submitted. During the process of considering the legislation, a tentative agreement was reached between the State Labor Negotiator and unions that represent over 50% of state employees. HB 786 is an attempt to commemorate that tentative agreement. This is intended to put the agreement the parties reached into statutory form. The package provides for a minimum raise of \$560 per employee per year or 2.5% of salary, whichever is greater. The bill also increases the state's contribution to the health insurance program from \$115 per month per employee to \$130 per month in the first year and \$150 per month in the second year. The health insurance for contract faculty at the university system is included in this bill. The 6% and 6% increase for contract faculty is in HB 100. For support staff in the university system there is a 4% and 4% increase in HB 100 for plant support. Instructional support is based upon an FTE driven formula so that their raise would be between 3.8% and 12.6%. For support program personnel, the raise would be between .5% and 6% per year. The pay plan study proposed by Rep. Cobb has been put into HB 786.

This bill does not provide a wildly generous raise, but it is a raise and it's a raise in difficult times. This bill

is about where the state will end up on the pay plan anyway.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Rod Sunsted, State Labor Negotiator
Carrol Krause, Commissioner of Higher Education
Tom Schneider, Montana Public Employees Association
Nadine Jensen, AFCSME
Rep. Vicki Cocchiarella
Gene Fenderson, Laborers' Union
Jim Cook, President of University of Montana
Judy Holbrook, University of Montana
Janice Midyett, University of Montana
Mike Wolf, University of Montana
Dennis Reinig, University of Montana
Rob Apple, University of Montana
Lloyd Phillips, University of Montana
Bob Myles, University of Montana
Nancy Tripple, University of Montana
Sharon Leachman, University of Montana
Dave Lewis, State Budget Director
Rep. Mike Kadas
Bill Merwin, President of Northern Montana College
Rep. Jerry Driscoll
Phil Campbell, Montana Education Association

Proponent Testimony: (8A 5.51) Rod Sunsted urged the committee to support the bill. He said HB 786 does reflect the negotiations reached with 4400 of the 5600 organized branch executive employees. This bill addressed the issues the people were concerned about in previous testimonies, including health insurance and pay for lower grade employees.

(8A 7.58) Carrol Krause provided the committee a handout summarizing the 1990-1991 pay plan funding needs which was prepared by the Board of Regents. (See exhibit 1) Mr. Krause said there is real concern about this pay bill as there was a 6% and 6% increase included in HB 100 as an attempt to try to catch faculty up with surrounding peer institutions. This is not included in HB 786.

(8A 11.19) Tom Schneider said he has been assured that this bill will not cost any additional out of pocket expense for employee health insurance. For an employee at a grade 5, this package would be about 13.9%, which is far above what would be provided in HB 648. Mr. Schneider expressed his concern about the pay plan. He said the pay plan does not work anymore. Mr. Schneider pointed out that all persons who retire from this point on will receive 7% more in retirement benefits under HB 234. He asked the committee for support of HB 234 as part of this total package. This is the largest pay appropriation employees have received on

an overall basis except for 1981.

(8A 18.10) Nadine Jensen spoke in support of HB 786. She said, however, the bill needs to include money for the university system.

(8A 19.12) Rep. Vicki Cocchiarella said she supports the bill but she deeply resents the university system being left out of this bill. It's been proven that the money is not in HB 100. She asked the committee to put the money in the bill. The university employees are madder than they've ever been. This plan does approach some help in moving the people up from the bottom, trying to catch them up a little bit from where they've been, trying to get them off food stamps and energy assistance but it doesn't help many of the professional people at the top who are looking out of the state to see where they can get other jobs making \$12,000 to \$15,000 more a year. She said she does support the bill because it's better than the employees had hoped to get from some other settlements or other bills, particularly the Cobb bill. Rep. Cocchiarella said she stands in support of the bill as long as money for staff and faculty at the university system is included in the bill.

(8A 20.48) Gene Fenderson said he supports the agreement that has been reached with the executive branch.

(8A 21.24) Jim Cook said he supports the bill if it will include the university system. The University of Montana budget for 1990 will increase by about \$1 million above the 1989 appropriated level. However, just for staff and contract professional employees at the University of Montana, the pay plan plus insurance would cost about \$1.5 million. It is not realistic to think that the University of Montana could pay this. It is inappropriate not to include staff support in the pay bill.

(8A 22.41) Judy Holbrook said that the staff members at the University of Montana are very concerned with the development of the pay plan. There is no money out there for the university employees. These classified staff should not be treated any differently than other state employees. She asked the committee to amend the bill to include those employees who have not been included.

(8A 23.57) Janice Midyett told the committee she would support HB 786 if it was amended to include university system support staff.

(8A 24.18) Mike Wolf spoke in support of HB 786 as long as there is an amendment to include university staff.

(8A 24.32) Dennis Reinig approves of HB 786 with an amendment to include university staff.

(8A 24.18) Rob Apple also rose in support of HB 786 as long as it would be amended to include all state employees.

(8A 24.56) Lloyd Phillips told the committee that the university employees are concerned and more upset than they were before. However, if HB 786 was amended, the employees at the universities would feel better about the proposal.

(8A 25.33) Bob Myles said he would support HB 786 if it was amended to include the university staff.

(8A 25.59) Nancy Tripple said she supports the plan as long as everyone is included.

(8A 26.08) Sharon Leachman spoke in favor of HB 786 if it is amended to include all state employees.

(8A 26.31) Dave Lewis said the money is available in the university system budget to include staff at the universities if that is what the Board of Regents wants to do. Mr. Lewis said he regrets the tone of newspaper articles that indicate the administration is opposed to the university system.

(8A 27.44) Rep. Mike Kadas said the subcommittee on education was never under the impression that increases for university staff were to come out of the formula included in HB 100. The only salary increases included in HB 100 are the 6% and 6% for faculty as per the negotiated agreement with the Board of Regents. This was an attempt to help catch up faculty. The faculty at the University of Montana are the worst paid of all doctoral granting universities in the nation. It is absolutely clear that the committee recognize that there is no money in HB 100 for staff increases or faculty increases above the 6% and 6%.

(8A 31.11) Bill Merwin told the committee the only place Northern Montana College can reduce the administrative budget is to cut faculty. Everything that can be cut has been.

(8A 33.20) Rep. Jerry Driscoll expressed his concern about no funding for university classified employees. He said if language is not put in the bill, no money will ever reach the classified employees.

(8A 34.19) Phil Campbell provided sample matrices to show teacher compensation at Pine Hills and Mountain View schools with and without insurance. (See exhibits 2 and 3) Mr. Campbell said the MEA was not involved in the negotiations that reached this agreement. The teachers at Pine Hills and Mountain View have been frozen on steps since 1983. Mr. Campbell urged the committee to give consideration and amend the bill to make salaries at the institutions comparable to their counterparts.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent:

Rep. Bob Ream

Rep. Red Menahan

Jim McGarvey, Montana Federation of Teachers and Montana
Federation of State Employees

Colleen Rogers, state employee

Ron Erickson, state employee

Opponent Testimony: (8A 39.19) Rep. Bob Ream provided the committee with a handout of economic indicators (exhibit 4) and a portion of the collective bargaining agreement made with the University Teachers Union (exhibit 5). Rep. Ream said HB 786 is a cruel hoax because it treats some state employees different than others. This bill would give state employees an average of 3.02% increase at a time when inflation is higher than 12%. Rep. Ream said the committee should endorse increases for classified employees at the universities. He also supports larger increases for lower grade employees. People at the lower grade levels have lagged far behind the cost of living increases. At this time other states are providing increases equal to or above the increases in the University Teachers' Union agreement. Therefore, even this attempt to catch up will not help.

(8A 45.50) Rep. William "Red" Menahan said his big objection is that someone who makes \$25,000 will get the biggest raise. He told the committee that while this bill will probably pass, he is not happy with it. Rep. Menahan said he hopes that before this bill is acted on some of the areas of concern will be addressed so there isn't a work stoppage by oversight.

(8B .28) Jim McGarvey said this committee offers an increase of \$47 per month. That is an outrage. Mr. McGarvey also pointed out that 4400 is a very small minority of total state employees, whether represented or not. This agreement goes back to the worst kind of thing that can happen, which is utilizing vacancy savings. Mr. McGarvey said he supports a retirement bill but not as a buffer for a \$47 a month salary increase. He said this bill represents an agreement that was negotiated for 4000 employees, was funded for 9000 employees and directly impacts 14000 state employees. Most employees feel they are entitled to more than \$47 a month and the increase must be funded.

(8B 8.26) Colleen Rogers spoke in opposition to HB 786. She said that Rep. Menahan worked hard to address the needs of the employees. The employees worked hard to let the committee know how they feel. Yet, the committee responded to all of this effort by completely cutting Rep. Menahan out of the negotiations. This bill is not sufficient to meet

the needs of the employees.

(8B 9.49) Ron Erickson said the important point about this bill is that the money isn't there unless staff is cut. Yet, the two year study that was just completed shows a need for more faculty and more staff if the state is ever to get close to its peers.

Questions From Committee Members: (8B 13.16) Rep. Spaeth: I note that HB 786 includes an insurance increase for university faculty but it doesn't include insurance for classified staff. Why would we not include it for classified employees?

Dave Lewis said that as they went through the negotiations they were looking at the faculty issue. He said the administration tried to make a good faith effort to include what was needed.

(8B 17.19) Rep. Spaeth: Can't you make the same statement for the classified employees?

Dave Lewis said at this point he regrets including the faculty.

(8B 18.24) Rep. Spaeth: According to Rep. Kadas, there is money included in HB 100 for contract faculty increases of 6% each year. The money for classified employees is not included in HB 100. What is your position on HB 100?

Dave Lewis said the administration's position is that there is money there if the Board of Regents chooses to allocate the money for those purposes.

(8B 21.42) Rep. Spaeth: My question is where can they reallocate?

Dave Lewis said they can reallocate the pay plan and insurance if they wish.

(8B 22.38) Rep. Spaeth: From what areas can they take the money?

Dave Lewis responded that they can take the money from any areas that are currently funded.

(8B 23.05) Rep. Spaeth: How much can they get from vacancy savings?

Dave Lewis said about 4%.

(8B 23.47) Rep. Spaeth: How much is that dollarwise for the university system?

Dave Lewis said he didn't know off the top of his head.

(8B 24.14) Rep. Addy: Looking at the first page of the Regents handout, you seem to believe there are some issues which weren't included in HB 100. Which ones?

Rep. Kadas said none of the issues were included in HB 100.

(8B 25.56) Rep. Addy: Rod, would you respond to the statement that these figures are not included in HB 100?

Rod Sunsted said he would think if you have an increase in how you fund, it would work across all three areas.

(8B 26.11) Rep. Addy: Judy Rippingale, could you respond?

Judy Rippingale said the relationship of HB 100 and the pay plan bill does not include money for anything but insurance for contract faculty.

(8B 30.08) Rep. Addy: How much money is in HB 786 for the universities?

Judy Waldron said there's \$3.5 million appropriated for the universities in HB 786.

(8B 30147) Rep. Quilici: Is that all insurance?

Judy Waldron responded that it includes insurance, salaries and benefits.

Closing by Sponsor: Rep. Addy closed.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 786

Motion: Rep. Kasten moved Do Pass.

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: Rep. Swysgood moved amendments hb078601.alm (exhibit 6). The motion to approve the amendments PASSED unanimously.

Rep. Iverson moved amendments hb078602.alm (exhibit 7).

Discussion: Rep. Quilici said he concurs with the amendment except he still is not certain the money is included in HB 100 to fund the raises for support staff. He said he doesn't want to have to cut the university budgets in other areas to pay for the raises. Rep. Spaeth said if the money for non-faculty staff was included in this bill there would be no question as to whether the funds could be diverted elsewhere. He will oppose the amendment because the money is not included in HB 786. Rep. Iverson said the problem is that no one is entirely sure what is in HB 100. Rep. Quilici said he doesn't know how the committee is going to get the right numbers to plug into this bill if the figures

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

March 20, 1989

Page 8 of 8

on the Board of Regents handout are not correct.

The motion to approve amendment hb078602.alm PASSED on a 4-2 vote with Rep. Addy and Rep. Spaeth voting nay.

Rep. Quilici moved to add \$10,217,000 to HB 786.
Rep. Spaeth made a substitute motion to add \$4,950,582 which represents the university classified employee increases.

Rep. Spaeth's substitute motion FAILED on a 3-3 tie.
Rep. Quilici's motion FAILED 4-2.

The original motion to recommend HB 786 Do Pass PASSED with Rep. Quilici and Rep. Spaeth voting nay.

Recommendation and Vote: Do Pass 4-2.

Motion: Rep. Spaeth moved to table all other pay bills.

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: The motion PASSED with Rep. Quilici voting nay.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 9:53 a.m.



REP. KELLY ADDY, Chairman

KA/ml

6422scec.min

BOARD OF REGENTS
 1990-1991 Pay Plan Funding Needs

	Needed for 1990-91	Included in HB 786†	Balance Needed
University System Contract Faculty			
Salaries*	\$ 5,266,842	no	\$ 5,266,842
Insurance	\$ 925,063	yes	
University System Classified/Professional			
Salaries*	\$ 3,907,356	no	\$ 3,907,356
Insurance	\$ 1,043,226	no	\$ 1,043,226
Vocational-Technical Employees			
Salaries*	\$ 724,346	yes	
Insurance	\$ 159,042	yes	
TOTAL PAY PLAN FUNDING NEEDED	\$12,025,875		\$10,217,424

† Based on informal discussion with Budget Office.

* Assumes 3% Average Increases.

500f
 SR/kkf

**BOARD OF REGENTS
1990-1991 Pay Plan Funding Needs
(General Fund Only)**

	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>UNIVERSITY SYSTEM</u>			
Contract Faculty Employees			
2.5% Salary Increases	\$1,421,660	\$2,961,215	\$4,382,875
3.0% Salary Increases	\$1,705,991	\$3,560,851	\$5,266,842
\$15/\$20 Insurance Increases	\$ 273,280	\$ 647,544	925,063
Classified/Professional Employees			
2.5% Salary Increases	\$1,067,675	\$2,184,258	\$3,251,933
3.0% Salary Increases	\$1,280,527	\$2,626,829	\$3,907,356
\$15/\$20 Insurance Increases	\$ 312,968	\$ 730,258	\$1,043,226
<u>VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTERS</u>			
All Employees			
2.5% Salary Increases	\$ 199,215	\$ 403,410	\$ 602,625
3.0% Salary Increases	\$ 239,058	\$ 485,288	\$ 724,346
\$15/\$20 Insurance Increases	\$ 47,713	\$ 111,329	\$ 159,042

500f
SR/kkf

EXHIBIT dx
 DATE 3-20-89
 SUBMIT NO. 786
 MAN. SECT.

FY91 MATRIX (FY90 + 2.5%
 NINE MONTH, NO INSURANCE

STEP	BA	BA+1	BA+2	BA+3	MA	MA+1
1	\$15,451	\$15,933	\$16,427	\$16,668	\$16,910	\$17,404
2	\$16,017	\$16,554	\$17,092	\$17,361	\$17,631	\$18,168
3	\$16,583	\$17,176	\$17,757	\$18,056	\$18,352	\$18,933
4	\$17,151	\$17,801	\$18,422	\$18,749	\$19,074	\$19,697
5	\$17,715	\$18,422	\$19,087	\$19,441	\$19,796	\$20,463
6	\$18,283	\$19,047	\$19,755	\$20,136	\$20,518	\$21,228
7	\$18,846	\$19,667	\$20,418	\$20,829	\$21,239	\$21,990
8	\$19,414	\$20,291	\$21,086	\$21,524	\$21,963	\$22,754
9	\$19,980	\$20,913	\$21,751	\$22,217	\$22,685	\$23,533
10	\$20,546	\$21,537	\$22,416	\$22,910	\$23,417	\$24,338
11	\$21,113	\$22,139	\$23,082	\$23,622	\$24,174	\$25,138
12	\$21,113	\$22,139	\$23,082	\$23,622	\$24,174	\$25,138
13	\$21,113	\$22,139	\$23,082	\$23,622	\$24,174	\$25,138

FY90 MATRIX (FY89+2.5% BUT NO LESS THAN \$560)
 NINE MONTH, NO INSURANCE

STEP	BA	BA+1	BA+2	BA+3	MA	MA+1
1	\$14,891	\$15,373	\$15,867	\$16,108	\$16,350	\$16,844
2	\$15,457	\$15,994	\$16,532	\$16,801	\$17,071	\$17,608
3	\$16,023	\$16,616	\$17,197	\$17,496	\$17,792	\$18,373
4	\$16,591	\$17,241	\$17,862	\$18,189	\$18,514	\$19,137
5	\$17,155	\$17,862	\$18,527	\$18,881	\$19,236	\$19,903
6	\$17,723	\$18,487	\$19,195	\$19,576	\$19,958	\$20,668
7	\$18,286	\$19,107	\$19,858	\$20,269	\$20,679	\$21,430
8	\$18,854	\$19,731	\$20,526	\$20,964	\$21,403	\$22,194
9	\$19,420	\$20,353	\$21,191	\$21,657	\$22,125	\$22,959
10	\$19,986	\$20,977	\$21,856	\$22,350	\$22,846	\$23,744
11	\$20,553	\$21,579	\$22,519	\$23,046	\$23,584	\$24,525
12	\$20,553	\$21,579	\$22,519	\$23,046	\$23,584	\$24,525
13	\$20,553	\$21,579	\$22,519	\$23,046	\$23,584	\$24,525

FY91 MATRIX WITH \$1800 INSURANCE
 NINE MONTH

\$17,251	\$17,733	\$18,227	\$18,468	\$18,710	\$19,204
\$17,817	\$18,354	\$18,892	\$19,161	\$19,431	\$19,968
\$18,383	\$18,976	\$19,557	\$19,856	\$20,152	\$20,733
\$18,951	\$19,601	\$20,222	\$20,549	\$20,874	\$21,497
\$19,515	\$20,222	\$20,887	\$21,241	\$21,596	\$22,263
\$20,083	\$20,847	\$21,555	\$21,936	\$22,318	\$23,028
\$20,646	\$21,467	\$22,218	\$22,629	\$23,039	\$23,790
\$21,214	\$22,091	\$22,886	\$23,324	\$23,763	\$24,554
\$21,780	\$22,713	\$23,551	\$24,017	\$24,485	\$25,333
\$22,346	\$23,337	\$24,216	\$24,710	\$25,217	\$26,138
\$22,913	\$23,939	\$24,882	\$25,422	\$25,974	\$26,938
\$22,913	\$23,939	\$24,882	\$25,422	\$25,974	\$26,938

FY90 MATRIX WITH \$1560 INSURANCE
 NINE MONTH

\$16,451	\$16,933	\$17,427	\$17,668	\$17,910	\$18,404
\$17,017	\$17,554	\$18,092	\$18,361	\$18,631	\$19,168
\$17,583	\$18,176	\$18,757	\$19,056	\$19,352	\$19,933
\$18,151	\$18,801	\$19,422	\$19,749	\$20,074	\$20,697
\$18,715	\$19,422	\$20,087	\$20,441	\$20,796	\$21,463
\$19,283	\$20,047	\$20,755	\$21,136	\$21,518	\$22,228
\$19,846	\$20,667	\$21,418	\$21,829	\$22,239	\$22,990
\$20,414	\$21,291	\$22,086	\$22,524	\$22,963	\$23,754
\$20,980	\$21,913	\$22,751	\$23,217	\$23,685	\$24,519
\$21,546	\$22,537	\$23,416	\$23,910	\$24,406	\$25,304
\$22,113	\$23,139	\$24,079	\$24,606	\$25,144	\$26,085
\$22,113	\$23,139	\$24,079	\$24,606	\$25,144	\$26,085
\$22,113	\$23,139	\$24,079	\$24,606	\$25,144	\$26,085

3
 EXHIBIT 3
 DATE 3-20-89
 HB 786

LANES: 6
 STEPS: 11

MONTANA
 MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL (STATE)
 EFFECTIVE 7/88

STEP	BA 1	BA+15 2	BA+30 3	BA+45 4	MA 5	MA+15 6
1	14,331	14,813	15,307	15,548	15,790	16,284
2	14,897	15,434	15,972	16,241	16,511	17,048
3	15,463	16,056	16,637	16,936	17,232	17,813
4	16,031	16,681	17,302	17,629	17,954	18,577
5	16,595	17,302	17,967	18,321	18,676	19,343
6	17,163	17,927	18,635	19,016	19,398	20,108
7	17,726	18,547	19,298	19,709	20,119	20,870
8	18,294	19,171	19,966	20,404	20,843	21,634
9	18,860	19,793	20,631	21,097	21,565	22,399
10	19,426	20,417	21,296	21,790	22,286	23,165
11	19,993	21,019	21,959	22,484	23,008	23,927

STATEWIDE 1988-89

COMPOSITE SCHEDULE QUARTER HOURS

NO.	BA	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	MA	MA+15
1	15,810	134	134	76	130	71
2	16,407	16,341	16,880	17,337	17,642	18,274
3	17,000	16,983	17,560	18,036	18,380	19,066
4	17,617	17,621	18,237	18,727	19,118	19,873
5	18,229	18,287	18,945	19,463	19,891	20,701
6	18,821	18,952	19,651	20,193	20,663	21,533
7	19,408	19,609	20,352	20,926	21,429	22,371
8	19,972	20,245	21,044	21,647	22,193	23,217
9	20,506	20,870	21,712	22,339	22,935	24,020
10	21,000	21,498	22,379	23,022	23,666	24,819
11	21,466	22,102	23,051	23,710	24,400	25,632
12	21,650	22,662	23,702	24,400	25,130	26,441
13	21,745	23,149	24,306	25,022	25,835	27,232
14	21,802	23,393	24,842	25,632	26,508	28,014
15	21,830	23,508	25,120	26,187	27,114	28,740
16	21,854	23,562	25,278	26,560	27,640	29,408
17	21,864	23,593	25,357	26,827	28,054	29,931
18	21,874	23,603	25,386	26,911	28,196	30,154
19	21,884	23,614	25,407	26,943	28,270	30,245
20	21,892	23,624	25,422	26,964	28,293	30,259
21	21,899	23,632	25,430	26,973	28,308	30,261
22	21,901	23,640	25,438	26,981	28,317	30,263
23	21,902	23,641	25,439	26,984	28,318	30,266
24	21,903	23,642	25,441	26,986	28,319	30,268
25	21,904	23,643	25,442	26,988	28,320	30,270
		23,645	25,443	26,990	28,322	30,272

Dollar Comparisons

CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF SALARY SCHEDULES
FOR SCHOOL DIST. MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL (STATE) 1988-89 Schedule
AND SCHOOL DIST. COMPOSITE (Statewide 1988-89)
(COMPUTATION WAS MADE ON THE SAME STEP LEVEL OF TWO SCHEDULES.)

STEP	BA	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	MA	MA+15
1	-1,479	-1,528	-1,573	-1,789	-1,852	-1,990
2	-1,510	-1,549	-1,588	-1,795	-1,869	-2,018
3	-1,537	-1,565	-1,600	-1,791	-1,886	-2,060
4	-1,586	-1,606	-1,643	-1,834	-1,937	-2,124
5	-1,634	-1,650	-1,684	-1,872	-1,987	-2,190
6	-1,658	-1,682	-1,717	-1,910	-2,031	-2,263
7	-1,682	-1,698	-1,746	-1,938	-2,074	-2,347
8	-1,678	-1,699	-1,746	-1,935	-2,092	-2,386
9	-1,646	-1,705	-1,748	-1,925	-2,101	-2,420
10	-1,574	-1,685	-1,755	-1,920	-2,114	-2,467
11	-1,473	-1,643	-1,743	-1,916	-2,122	-2,514

Percent Comparisons

PERCENT CHANGES OF SALARY SCHEDULES
FOR SCHOOL DIST. MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL (STATE) 1988-89 Schedule
AND SCHOOL DIST. COMPOSITE (Statewide 1988-89)
(COMPUTATION WAS MADE ON THE SAME STEP LEVEL OF TWO SCHEDULES.)

STEP	BA	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	MA	MA+15
1	-9.4	-9.4	-9.3	-10.3	-10.5	-10.9
2	-9.2	-9.1	-9.0	-10.0	-10.2	-10.6
3	-9.0	-8.9	-8.8	-9.6	-9.9	-10.4
4	-9.0	-8.8	-8.7	-9.4	-9.7	-10.3
5	-9.0	-8.7	-8.6	-9.3	-9.6	-10.2
6	-8.8	-8.6	-8.4	-9.1	-9.5	-10.1
7	-8.7	-8.4	-8.3	-9.0	-9.3	-10.1
8	-8.4	-8.1	-8.0	-8.7	-9.1	-9.9
9	-8.0	-7.9	-7.8	-8.4	-8.9	-9.8
10	-7.5	-7.6	-7.6	-8.1	-8.7	-9.6
11	-6.9	-7.3	-7.4	-7.9	-8.4	-9.5

LANES: 6
STEPS: 11

MONTANA
HB 770 PROPOSAL

STEP	BA 1	BA+15 2	BA+30 3	BA+45 4	MA 5	MA+15 6
1	15,334	15,849	16,378	16,636	16,895	17,424
2	15,940	16,515	17,090	17,378	17,666	18,242
3	16,546	17,180	17,801	18,122	18,438	19,060
4	17,153	17,849	18,513	18,863	19,211	19,878
5	17,757	18,513	19,224	19,603	19,983	20,697
6	18,364	19,182	19,939	20,347	20,756	21,515
7	18,967	19,845	20,649	21,089	21,528	22,331
8	19,574	20,513	21,364	21,833	22,302	23,148
9	20,180	21,178	22,075	22,573	23,075	23,967
10	20,785	21,847	22,787	23,316	23,846	24,786
11	21,393	22,491	23,497	24,058	24,619	25,602

Dollar Comparison

CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF SALARY SCHEDULES
FOR SCHOOL DIST. HB 770 PROPOSAL
AND SCHOOL DIST. COMPOSITE (*STATEWIDE 1988-89*)
(COMPUTATION WAS MADE ON THE SAME STEP LEVEL OF TWO SCHEDULES.)

STEP	BA	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	MA	MA+15
1	-476	-492	-502	-701	-747	-850
2	-467	-468	-470	-658	-714	-824
3	-454	-441	-436	-605	-680	-813
4	-464	-438	-432	-600	-680	-823
5	-472	-439	-427	-590	-680	-836
6	-457	-427	-413	-579	-673	-856
7	-441	-400	-395	-558	-665	-886
8	-398	-357	-348	-506	-633	-872
9	-326	-320	-304	-449	-591	-852
10	-215	-255	-264	-394	-554	-846
11	-73	-171	-205	-342	-511	-839

Percent Comparison

PERCENT CHANGES OF SALARY SCHEDULES
FOR SCHOOL DIST. HB 770 PROPOSAL
AND SCHOOL DIST. COMPOSITE
(COMPUTATION WAS MADE ON THE SAME STEP LEVEL OF TWO SCHEDULES.)

STEP	BA	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	MA	MA+15
1	-3.0	-3.0	-3.0	-4.0	-4.2	-4.7
2	-2.8	-2.8	-2.7	-3.6	-3.9	-4.3
3	-2.7	-2.5	-2.4	-3.2	-3.6	-4.1
4	-2.6	-2.4	-2.3	-3.1	-3.4	-4.0
5	-2.6	-2.3	-2.2	-2.9	-3.3	-3.9
6	-2.4	-2.2	-2.0	-2.8	-3.1	-3.8
7	-2.3	-2.0	-1.9	-2.6	-3.0	-3.8
8	-2.0	-1.7	-1.6	-2.3	-2.8	-3.6
9	-1.6	-1.5	-1.4	-2.0	-2.5	-3.4
10	-1.0	-1.2	-1.1	-1.7	-2.3	-3.3
11	-0.3	-0.8	-0.9	-1.4	-2.0	-3.2

SELECTED ECONOMIC INDICATORS

4
EXHIBIT 4
DATE 3-20-89
HB 786

MONTANA

PERCENT CHANGE 1970 - 1987

<u>INDICATOR</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
State govt. genl. rev. *	383
Total personal income	296
Expend. on higher ed.	253
Per capita pers. income	247
Consumer prices	189
Avg. faculty salary all ranks	<u>138</u>
<i>Avg. state employee</i> ** #	177

* percent change is for the period 1970-1986
#excludes instruction

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS UNION
UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

3.220 NORMAL INCREASE

- . 1987-88 - The salaries of all full-time equivalent faculty members for the 1987-88 academic year shall be 0 percent.
- . 1988-89 - The salaries of all full-time equivalent faculty members for the 1988-89 academic year shall be 0 percent.
- . 1989-90 - The normal increase of all full-time equivalent faculty members for the 1989-90 academic year shall be equivalent to the average statewide classification pay schedule increase appropriated by the 51st Legislature.
- . 1990-91 - The normal increase of all full-time equivalent faculty members for the 1990-91 academic year shall be equivalent to the average statewide classification pay schedule increase appropriated by the 51st Legislature.

6
EXHIBIT 6
DATE 3-20-89
HB 786

Amendments to House Bill No. 786
First Reading Copy

For the Select Committee on Employee Compensation

Prepared by Lois Menzies
March 18, 1989

1. Page 14, line 13.
Strike: "9.25"
Insert: "9.30"
2. Page 14, line 14.
Strike: "9.65"
Insert: "9.70"
3. Page 14, line 15.
Strike: "10.05"
Insert: "10.10"
4. Page 14, line 16.
Strike: "10.45"
Insert: "10.50"
5. Page 14, line 17.
Strike: "10.85"
Insert: "10.90"
6. Page 14, line 18.
Strike: "11.25"
Insert: "11.30"
7. Page 14, line 19.
Strike: "11.65"
Insert: "11.70"
8. Page 14, line 20.
Strike: "12.05"
Insert: "12.10"
9. Page 14, line 21.
Strike: "12.45"
Insert: "12.50"
10. Page 14, line 22.
Strike: "12.85"
Insert: "12.90"
11. Page 14, line 23.
Strike: "13.25"
Insert: "13.30"
12. Page 14, line 24.
Strike: "13.65"
Insert: "13.70"

13. Page 17.

Following: line 24

Insert: "(5) There is appropriated \$90,000 from the general fund to the department of administration for the biennium ending June 30, 1991, for use by the committee on state employee compensation provided for in [section 11]. These funds may be used for contracted services, salary and benefits for temporary staff, compensation for committee members, and other necessary expenses incurred by the committee in performing its duties as provided in [section 11]."

7
EXHIBIT 7
DATE 3-20-89
HB 786

Amendments to House Bill No. 786
First Reading Copy

Requested by Rep. Dennis Iverson
For the Select Committee on Employee Compensation

Prepared by Lois Menzies
March 20, 1989

1. Page 17, line 24.

Following: "."

Insert: "It is the intent of the legislature that a portion of the money appropriated to the Montana university system in House Bill No. 100 be used to fund increases in salaries for contract faculty and increases in salaries and group benefits for support staff and instructional support staff comparable to the increases provided in [this act] for other state employees."