

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

April 5, 1977

The thirty-fifth meeting of the Senate Education Committee was called to order by Senator Ed Smith, Acting Chairman, on the above date, in Room 402 of the State Capitol Building, at 11:00 o'clock A. M.

ROLL CALL: All members of the Committee were present.

Senator Smith announced he would act as Chairman to allow Senator Blaylock to present his Bill.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL No. 448: An act to revise Title 82, Chapter 31, R.C.M. 1947, regarding surplus property to incorporate changes in federal law, to transfer the surplus property function from the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Department of Administration, and to change the deposit of surplus property income from the federal and private grant clearance fund to the revolving fund.

Senator Chet Blaylock, District 35, Billings, Mont., sponsor of the Bill, was called on to present his testimony. The purpose of this Bill would be to move the donable surplus property from the OSPI where it has been since the 1940's because most of it was federal property and largely federally oriented, to the State Administration Department. HEW is now phasing out this program which presently has about 500 potential donees; if this is passed, there would be an increase to about 2,500 donees; in addition to federal property, there would be State property that would come in.

Proponents of the Bill included:

Bob Stockton, OSPI, who explained the federal law had been changed dealing with donable property which requires a new State plan in order to comply with federal regulations and also expands donees and those it serves. In the past, it hasn't cost the State any money and has been run well. We worked out the budget for up-front money needed for the initial staff increase and so the operation could be implemented, but believe in about 4 years, this could be repaid back to the State on a sustaining basis. Our office's concern is not in ownership but in having enough money to get it in operating order; it is agreeable that the State Department handle this.

Doyle Saxby, Director of State Department of Administration, felt this legislation would be good government; he has looked at the

facilities and the Administration Department will try to continue the program as well as the OSPI has handled it in the past. This spring, the Liquor Warehouse will be available to move this surplus donated property into, and although he had some concern for the safety of certain sensitive files and records, they had also anticipated moving, this has been worked out and we will now be able to make the total transfer rather than a double move.

Joan Uda, staff attorney, office of Budget & Planning, reiterated this was a good government Bill and provided the mechanics for continuing the program with the increases from the federal and changes in the State organization.

Glen Drake, League of Cities & Towns, who stated previously cities and towns have not been able to participate in this program and this Bill will allow them that privilege.

There was no opposition to the Bill.

Acting Chairman Smith opened the hearing to questions.

To Senator Mathers questions regarding the financial aspect of implementing the change of departments to administer this, Mr. Saxby replied that although the budget had not been completely worked out, it would take approximately a 7% increase in funds to initiate the program; and Mr. Stockton replied there might be an OSPI staff FTE reduction associated with the change.

In reply to Senator McCallum's inquiry, Mr. Stockton explained the property came from all over the world and they cooperated with several surrounding states to save shipping costs; this Bill would also bring in additional property and equipment they haven't been able to handle before.

Senator Boylan commented he would like to see this program moved back to Bozeman where it started for Veterans right after the war.

Senator Dunkle questioned the OSPI continuing to handle this even with expansion, to which Superintendent Rice replied it did not matter to the OSPI if the program was changed as long as it continued to be well run; school districts are eligible to purchase this property, but the kinds of things they can get and the competition will preclude the heavy educational use there is now. Mr. Saxby added he felt there would be a savings in the program by handling all property through one outlet.

Senator McCallum inquired about those eligible to participate; Mr. Saxby mentioned all state and local government agencies and

tax entities. Mr. Stockton explained the OSPI had been dealing mainly with schools and hospitals; this beings in all local and state governments and subdivisions such as a city park department whether or not the city itself goes into it.

To Senator Warden's inquiry, Mr. Stockton answered they get a listing of what property is available; it is a competative bidding process; at times, they find out certain property is available and then they look for a customer, such as an airplane for the Vo Tech. Center.

Acting Chairman Smith closed the hearing on Senate Bill 448.

Senator Mathers moved that Senate Bill No. 448 DO PASS; motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

Acting Chairman Smith then turned the meeting over to Chairman Blaylock who announced a meeting set up for Wednesday evening, April 6th, at 7:00 P. M., in the Governor's Reception Room, on the school foundation program to exchange information for the benefit of all departments, legislators and schools concerned. The Chairman also announced the tentative committee lunch for Thursday, April 7th, at 11:30 at Jorgenson's.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL No. 69:

Senate Education Committee Meeting

April 5, 1977

RE: HOUSE BILL No. 69

Chairman Blaylock announced HB 69 was back before the Committee as requests had been received to bring it up; it was still on the table and he questioned what procedure should be taken. He then stated the members of the Board of Public Education had a proposal to make and asked if there would be any objections from the Committee. Without objections, they were asked to proceed.

Harriet Meloy: The Board of Education believes 69 would serve students well for vocational education in the State, but since there was a question about postsecondary education being taken out of the Superintendent's office, they have considered leaving secondary with the Superintendent, but feel strongly responsible for postsecondary and ask that it be moved to the Board's jurisdiction. The Board handed out copies of rewritten HB 69.

Enid O'Leary: There are many new requirements for serving the schools which will require on-site surveillance; we have been told the OSPI finds it hard to get around to all schools each year and feel on-site inspections would be very desirable.

Dick Bennett: I recognize the political matters involved. The Superintendent has at her disposal much money from tax dollars and can get action and response; that is a political fact of life. I think you should look into the depth of what is going on in each of your districts. I suggest the consequences of what will happen if you don't do something; if you do not pass this, you will have the most unmitigated hell for the next two years. I don't think education can stand the kind of trouble that will result without making this law. We listened to what was said in 566 last session, but as a result, we were faced with an inbetween thing. Leaving this the way it is makes it unrealistic and urge your consideration of this amendment and give the whole Senate the opportunity to look at the matter. You are asking a board to function with no staff. With the situation left the way it is presently, it will be very bad for education in the State.

Marjorie King: I have felt we came up with a reasonable compromise when we said we would contract with the OSPI in the amendment to 69. I found the majority of opposition centered on secondary education in going through my notes from the March 12th hearing and very few comments on postsecondary; and with that compromise, we will be willing to go with the idea of leaving secondary where it is but ask consideration of moving the responsibility for postsecondary to the Board; we still feel definite obligations for postsecondary

April 5, 1977

but would leave secondary alone.

Georgia R. Rice: If I understand the new Bill, it would essentially do some things you should consider. It shows a total split between postsecondary and secondary for the vo ed in the local centers which are handled by the local districts. You are looking at a dual system and should consider if Mont. can afford this which means additional staff and increased costs. The last consideration is there is the HJR 100 which addresses itself to a study of vo ed.

Senator McCallum questioned page 1, line 18 where the Board was substituted the sole agency for vocational education, would this include secondary as well?

M. King: Don't believe there is any problem with that language, but there should be a sole agency and the Board would continue the same kinds of duties they now have and have the sole responsibility for this.

McCallum: Doesn't the federal government recognize now that the OSPI is the sole agency?

King: I think it says either a board or an agency and perhaps one agency; the Board has the responsibility of doing the state planning.

Boylan: Why not put it under the Board of Regents?

King: I think this was considered seriously, but there was a hassle there and still it would be split; federal requirements have been a constant hang-up; the 14 member board didn't have the authority to act under the federal requirements.

Sen. Blaylock: Suppose we amended this and passed it like you suggest, what would the Board do in the 5 local districts more effectively?

King: We would demand an entirely different kind of evaluation of postsecondary education; I see a vast difference in vo ed centers from high schools. I think the vo ed in high schools is not a job-oriented thing. We would be looking for programs to put persons on the job market rather than mickey mouse kinds of programs.

Blaylock: You would not do this yourself, but rely on someone else?

King: Yes, we would ask to have staff people and coordinators --- 23 FTE for all vo education; the point is, evaluations should be taking place now in the administration of the vo ed programs; it is not now broken down and we would like to see a good evaluation of postsecondary.

Dunkle: Has it been determined that the Constitution gives broad powers to the Board or does the Consitution give them to the Superintendent or is that done by us?

April 5, 1977

Blaylock: The legislature.

Dunkle: Neither the Superintendent nor the Board has any powers?

Murray: The new Constitution says the Board has powers to generally supervise and others as given by law; they can establish guide lines or policy for some other office to administer.

Dunkle: How does this language then comply with the Constitution - board or agency (reading from Bill).

Murray: I think you have to consider the definition of those phrases; in the context, governing board could be considered as a sole agency, but a sole agency does not fit within the language.

McCallum: I'm bothered about the federal designation: do they recognize the OSPI at present:

Rice: Yes; it states it will go to the sole agency or board and we now receive the federal money but can't spend it without the Board's approval.

King: I think you will find that as the executive office for state education, they are eligible to receive it, but her as the executive officer for the Board of Education, not the office as such; receiving the funds for the Board in her capacity as executive officer.

McCallum: If 69 passed, we would no longer have this executive officer?

King: For secondary, yes; not postsecondary.

Smith: I understand presently the federal money appropriated to postsecondary, but not secondary, is in limbo?

Stockton: Yes, as the budget now stands.

Smith: Who made the decision, the Board or Superintendent?

Stockton: I believe the appropriation committee or perhaps the subcommittee on education.

Smith: Is there a possibility that after we leave, some of the money can be diverted over to postsecondary; with 48% cut from appropriations to postsecondary schools, there could be trouble with the federal moneys.

Stockton: We do have trouble with cuts and acceptance of our state plan; but we have been meeting with Rep. South and are working on a meeting with people from Denver who are to help.

Smith: What do you mean by if this legislature doesn't pass this

time there will be trouble?

Bennett: We see no reason why the situation will improve; we question the credibility of the staff we are required to work with. We have to approve the spending of these moneys and that appears difficult to do. If you want to make a division between postcondary and secondary, then we could work with postsecondary and do evaluations.

Fasbender: I think it best to wait until after the meeting between South and the people from Denver; things could be cleared up by this. In preparing my legislation, I spent considerable time going through this. The OSPI has no powers given by the Consitution - such duties as provided by law. It is strictly in the prerogative of the legislature what duties are assigned to the OSPI or to the Board of Ed, not based on any Constitutional authority.

McCallum: You don't have any confidence in the OSPI?

Bennett: Regarding statements made by Rep. Moore and Rep. Bardanouve --- I am saying any presentation made before the committees were not hard facts and were misleading.

Murray: There has been allusions intended to sway us to make changes and I don't know what they are talking about -- what lack of credentials for instance are you talking about?

King: Misleading information and incomplete data is a reflection on the Board and I don't like it. No evaluations were made available, and we had no staff people I could turn to; connotation was that the Board was not doing its job.

Murray: If information was not properly included in the budget and this reflects on your Board, who dropped the bomb?

Bennett: There is only one executive officer for the Board.

Murray: Who?

Bennett: The Superintendent.

King: I think we should have someone with excellent training in education, especially in postsecondary education, not just secondary; we need someone with excellent background to do these evaluations.

Murray: Mrs. Rice, do you have someone in your department that would meet these qualifications Mrs. King described?

Rice: All the Vo Ed staff is approved and confirmed by the Board; they are a highly qualified staff.

Murray: Have you had any criticism as to what sort of person you should get to fill the position Mrs. King described?

Page 8

Rice: No.

Sen. Mathers: Did the Board at any time in the past have any criticism relating to the OSPI?

King: Yes, we have had trouble in the past 2 years. We felt we could hire a coordinator and train this person to work for us. It is a very nasty kind of thing. The Board felt it impossible to do interviews with prospective personnel under the conditions which exist. We had considered an executive, but that person said it was an impossible situation to work in and answer to the Board. I presume the Board could get deeply involved in hiring staff, but we couldn't hire the executive officer necessary and that is the key position.

Blaylock: Your quotation of John LaFaver's opinion and criticism of Gordon Warner that the OSPI would not have all the material available to work out budgets, but the same thing goes on in the university systems.

Sen. Fasbender: The situation is different in the university system; it would be like comparing apples and oranges.

Blaylock: Would you have fired Warner when he did not have the evaluation material available.

King: We have the same problem each year, and we have seen staff come and go and have been promised reports that do not appear. But the Board does not have authority to step in and insist on anything.

McCallum: You bring up that you have no quarrel with the present Superintendent; don't you think it best to cooperate with the present Superintendent and see if it can't work out?

King: The Blue Ribbon Committee which studied the matter and did go over the problem came up with the recommendation the Board should hire its own executive officer, but, yes, we should cooperate. We believe the main problem lies with structure. What is going to establish whether the Board has authority or is only an advisory board, and I think the Constitution makes us more than an advisory board. - - - I understand certain programs have been cut in vo ed. If we approve or recommend a program for appropriation, can we be assured that before the program started, there would be a needs assessment; many times no evaluation or needs assessment is ever done.

Stockton: I think it should be mentioned that the federal government has cited the OSPI for its exemplary evaluations. Regarding needs assessment for programs that had not been started, the legislature could appropriate the money if the need was real.

Page 9

Fasbender: I heard that comment about the OSPI, but what is the basis? Evaluations you did or just plans on paper?

Stockton: That would have to be checked out; I'm not sure.

Fasbender: Then it could be just plans you developed and have not carried out.

McCallum: Didn't the government take the criteria of the plans you developed and incorporate them into the federal plans?

Fasbender: That is my point; I have great plans to do certain things, but the results are not the same.

McCallum: Mrs. Rice, have you used this criteria or just plans on paper?

Rice: It is partly initiated and will continue to be implemented, so both are correct.

Mathers: Has it been implementd in the past, in any part of the plan or is it just now beginning to come out.

Rice: That is the evaluation plan, and part of it has been implemented in previous months and a part of it will in the near future as it is a continuing thing.

McCallum: Why is it taking so long; there has been these programs since 1968.

Rice: I can't give you an answer from previous years.

Sen. Warden: I believe one of the things that has been a problem from the beginning is because of the federal money and the regulations they impose. I don't think any improvement was done in the 2 years available from the last session even though my Bill went through and then was declared declared unconstitutional; but they could have done something in the interim.

Sen. Boylan: I think it gets back to the basic facts of whether the Board of the OSPI can go back to the local school district and tell them how to run things. How is anyone going to get a handle on it if it is a local problem regardless of who has get the authority; what are you going to do when the local district is run by local elected people.

Warden: Only 1 mil goes into vo ed on postsecondary education and most money comes from the state and federal; I think on only 1 mil's worth of dollar input, there is not as much impact.

Blaylock: Trying to shut down a high school turned out to be a very hot point; but I do think if they try to deal with local boards, they get into trouble.

King: If it were specified the Board shall have total control over the budget and with proper authority, they could cut any program and the local boards would have no say. The local boards do not actively come to the Board and campaign for individual programs. We have total control over postsecondary programs.

The Chairman then asked if anyone would like to make a motion to take 69 off the table.

Senator Warden moved that House Bill 69 be taken from the table. On roll call vote, the motion failed, with Senators Smith, McCallum, Murray, Dunkle and Boylan voting "no".

Senator Fasbender: With the previous action done, I think there was an agreement to leave this on the table, but I think now the situation is changed. I don't think the 18 months is enough time to do an adequate study and it should be discussed in open debate now.

Senator Smith: The Board also asked for an executive staff which they got and now they come back and ask for more.

Senator Fasbender: I would like to make a motion on the floor to bring the Bill out of the Committee so we can debate it on the floor.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 P. M.


Chet Blaylock, Chairman

NAME: :

DATE: _____

ADDRESS :

PHONE: :

REPRESENTING WHOM?

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:

DO YOU:

SUPPORT?

AMEND?

OPPOSE?

COMMENTS :

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME :

DATE: _____

ADDRESS :

PHONE :

REPRESENTING WHOM?

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:

DO YOU :

SUPPORT?

X

AMEND?

OPPOSE?

COMMENTS :

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME:

El Estou

DATE:

April

ADDRESS:

OBPP

PHONE:

449-3084

REPRESENTING WHOM?

Budget Office

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:

SB 448

DO YOU:

SUPPORT?

☒

AMEND?

☐

OPPOSE?

☐

COMMENTS:

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME:

Ellen Drake

DATE:

4/5/77

ADDRESS:

Albany

PHONE:

442 - 0230

REPRESENTING WHOM?

League of Cities & Towns

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL

SB 448

DO YOU:

SUPPORT?

☒

AMEND?

OPPOSE?

COMMENTS:

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Doyle Sarby DATE: 4-5-77

ADDRESS: Dept. of Adm.

PHONE: 9-2032

REPRESENTING WHOM? Dept. of Adm.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 5 448

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Bob Stockton DATE: 4/5/77

ADDRESS: OPI

PHONE: 449-3167

REPRESENTING WHOM? OPI

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB-448

DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: Concur in the bill as written -

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

THE BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

(Serving Montana)

RESEARCH PROJECT

A Revised Governance Structure for Vocational Education in Montana

Superintendent
Larry C. Key, Ed. D.
418 West Sixth Ave., Room 1
Helena, Montana 59601
(406) 443-2797

Board of Public Education
Earl J. Barlow, Browning
Richard C. Bennett, Great Falls
Carolyn M. Frogen, Missoula
Allen Gauderson, Billings
Marjorie W. King, Winnett
Harriett C. Meloy, Helena
Enid O'Leary, Havre

Senator Larry Fasbender:

After reviewing a copy of the "Postsecondary Program Evaluation" furnished to the Senate Education Committee by Gordon Warner, Assistant Superintendent for Vocational Education, I feel compelled to make the following comments:

1. Mr. Warner's statement--"Enclosed are the formal postsecondary vocational-technical center evaluations that have taken place in the last year and a half."

After reviewing the material, I have found only three program reviews and two program profiles that have been completed in the last year and a half at the Vo-Tech Centers.

Program Reviews:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. Allied Health | January 8, 1976 | Billings Vo-Tech |
| 2. Health Occupations | September 15, 1976 | Billings Vo-Tech |
| 3. Health Aide | October 1, 1976 | Missoula Vo-Tech |

Program Profiles:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Practical Nursing | Great Falls Vo-Tech |
| 2. Trade and Industrial | Great Falls Vo-Tech |

According to the information I have received from the five Vo-Tech Centers, there are currently 78 vocational programs being offered at the centers. If there have been more programs evaluated by the state staff in the last year and a half, the Board of Public Education would like to get copies so they could furnish them to the Joint Appropriation Committee before the funding level for the Vo-Tech Centers are established for the next biennium.

2. Ross Wagner, Manager of the Program Development, OSPI, statement-- "The Department of Vocational and Occupational Services has performed 50 secondary and 14 postsecondary formal vocational education program evaluations from the period of July 1, 1975, to date."

This statement has no real meaning unless you are aware of the number of secondary and postsecondary programs there are in the schools of Montana.

I am advised that there are approximately 650 secondary vocational programs and 114 postsecondary programs being offered in the schools

HOUSE BILL NO. 69

INTRODUCED BY GUNDERSON, SOUTH

PALMER, MOORE, BARNETT, METCALP, PAGE

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT AMENDING SECTIONS 75-5704, 75-5707, 75-7303, 75-7702, 75-7703, 75-7707, 75-7710, AND 75-7714, R.C.M. 1947, TO AUTHORIZE THE BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION TO EMPLOY AN ~~EXECUTIVE~~ ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND STAFF TO ADMINISTER POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA AND TO ASSIGN SUPERVISION OF SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA:

Section 1. Section 75-7702, R.C.M. 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"75-7702. Duties of board of public education. (1) The board of public education shall be the governing body sole agency of the state of Montana for vocational education.

(2) The board of public education shall adopt policies to effect the orderly development of a system of vocational education that is adaptable to changing needs, controlled to prevent unnecessary ~~duplication~~ or ~~program~~ duplication, ~~coordinated~~ with federal guidelines and requirements for vocational education, and funded to ensure

Proposed by Board of Ed 4-5-77.

1 growth and quality programming. In order to accomplish the
2 orderly development of a system of vocational education, the
3 board of public education policies shall include:
4 ~~that~~ a state plan for such development;
5 ~~that~~ standards for vocational education courses and
6 programs;
7 ~~that~~ instructor qualifications for vocational
8 education courses and programs;
9 ~~that~~ criteria for approval of vocational education
10 courses and programs which are to receive financial
11 assistance;
12 ~~that~~ a basis for apportionment of all moneys
13 appropriated ~~by the legislature~~ for vocational education in
14 accordance with the intent of the legislature as reflected
15 in the terms of the appropriation;
16 ~~that~~ a basis for apportionment of all moneys
17 received by the state of Montana for vocational education
18 from the federal government in accordance with the ~~acts~~ acts
19 of ~~congress~~ congress;
20 ~~that~~ a system of evaluation of vocational education
21 which allows for consideration of the current and projected
22 manpower needs and job opportunities; and
23 ~~that~~ any other policy not inconsistent with public
24 law and which is necessary for the proper operation of a
25 system of vocational education.

SENATE COMMITTEE EDUCATION

Date April 5, 1977 SENATE Bill No. 448 Time 10:16

NAME	YES	NO
Senator Chet Blaylock, Chairman	✓	
Senator Ed Smith, Vice Chairman	✓	
Senator George McCallum	✓	
Senator Bill Mathers	✓	
Senator William E. Murray	✓	
Senator Frank Dunkle	✓	
Senator Paul Boylan	✓	
Senator Larry Fasbender	✓	
Senator Bill Thomas	✓	
Senator Margaret Warden	✓	

Jennie Lind
Secretary

Chet Blaylock
Chairman

Motion: Senator Bill Mathers moved that Senate Bill No. 448

DO PASS; metion was seconded and carried unanimously.

(include enough information on motion--put with yellow copy of committee report.)

SENATE COMMITTEE EDUCATION

Date April 5 77 House Bill No. 69 Time 10:00 A.M. H 69 40 f

NAME	YES	NO
Senator Chet Blaylock, Chairman	✓	
Senator Ed Smith, Vice Chairman		✓
Senator George McCallum		✓
Senator Bill Mathers	✓	
Senator William E. Murray		✓
Senator Frank Dunkle		✓
Senator Paul Boylan		✓
Senator Larry Fasbender	✓	
Senator Bill Thomas	✓	
Senator Margaret Warden	✓	

Jennie Lind
Secretary

Chet Blaylock
Chairman

Motion: Senator Margaret Warden moved that House Bill No. 69 BE
TAKEN FROM THE TABLE; motion failed with Senators E. Smith,
McCallum, Murray, Dunkle and Boylan voting "no".

(include enough information on motion--put with yellow copy of committee report.)



The Big Sky Country

MONTANA STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REP. ANN MARY DUSSAULT
DISTRICT NO. 95
RT. 2 MULLAN ROAD
MISSOULA, MONTANA 59801

COMMITTEES:
EDUCATION, CHAIRPERSON
JUDICIARY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
MONTANA WATER

April 4, 1977

TO: House Majority and Minority Leadership
Senate Leadership
House Education Committee
Senate Education Committee
Chairman - House Appropriations Committee
Chairman - Senate Finance and Claims Committee
Joint Appropriations Subcommittee on Education

FROM: Ann Mary Dussault, Chairperson, House Education Committee *AM*

RE: Foundation Program Schedules

On Wednesday, April 6, at 7 p.m., in the Governor's Reception Room, there will be a meeting with various persons interested in the School Foundation Schedules. The following groups will be represented:

Montana Education Association (MEA)
Montana Federation of Teachers (AFT)
Montana School Boards Association
Montana School Administrators

In addition, I have requested the attendance of school administrators who represent a cross-section of large and small school districts.

The purpose of the meeting is twofold:

- (1) to allow these persons to respond to the Foundation Schedules as passed by the House; and
- (2) to allow these persons to defend and document the need for further increases in those schedules.

I hope that you will be able to attend.

Wednesday, April 6, 1977, 7 p.m.
Governor's Reception Room