

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
LEGISLATIVE SUB-COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR EDUCATION

February 14, 1979
8:20 A.M.
Room 104
State Capitol Building
Subject: Budget of Montana Tech

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Carroll South with the following members present:

Sen. Larry Fasbender
Sen. Harold Nelson
Rep. Oscar Kvaalen
Rep. Jack Moore
Rep. Esther Bengtson

Also present in the meeting were staff member, Judy Rippingale, Fiscal Analyst; Roy H. Turley, Fred W. DeMoney, and Vic Burt.
(See attached visitors' register for further people present)

(A handout was given to the committee members)
President of Montana Tech, Mr. DeMoney, expressed their major outline of debate concerning the budget for Montana Tech. One of the main topics was enrollment. He explained how important enrollment was in budgeting. He then went on to say that Tech is primarily an engineering and science school, as well as having three bachelor of arts programs. With regard to its problem areas, its main problem is of a fiscal nature; a new graduate from the school receives approximately the same salary as a faculty member at the institution and it is difficult to attract faculty for the salaries that can be offered. They are also having trouble getting enough resources for the type of equipment that is needed. He also talked about having a gym building being remodeled so academic space be expanded.

Mr. DeMoney stated that they did not have the time and the necessary manpower to answer every question that the Legislative Fiscal Analyst raised in the session. They selected those questions that are most paramount in our minds and which deal most pointedly with our operations. He pointed out that their main objective is to present facts that will lead to gaining your support for the Budget for Montana Tech. (A written testimony is exhibited)

In the area of enrollment and basic budget, Mr. Turely stated that although the Demographic data for the state of Montana shows a decrease in the college age group of 18-22 year olds over the next

biennium, we feel it is necessary to look at each institution on an individual basis to make accurate projections of enrollment.

He then gave factors which would indicate growth in enrollment at Tech.

1. The career oriented approach of the programs at Tech, appeals to students, parents, and employers. This is reflected in the steady increase in FY-FTE from 686 in 1972-74 to the present of 1141 students for an 11.0% average increase per year.

2. The enrollment of women into engineering. In past years, few women selected engineering as a career. Prior to engineering programs. This, even though the total pool of students of college age will decline, the entry of qualified women into the pool of potential engineering students will bring about a net increase in potential students at Tech.

3. The crisis in energy and mineral supplies. Energy and Mineral shortages throughout the world will continue to place demands for graduates of programs of the types offered at Tech. Which will increase the number of persons enrolling for careers in Mining and Mineral Resources.

4. The adult market, which must be considered when projecting enrollment for Montana Tech. More adults are entering regular college courses and working for degrees on a part-time basis. At Tech we are projecting 90 FTE from adult part-time students by 1985.

There is no doubt in my mind that Montana Tech will increase in enrollment over the term of the coming Biennium and through 1985. Because of the need of more faculty due to a large enrollment, there is also a lack of equipment.

Mr. Turley explained why engineering faculty was hard to attract and hire. Growing student enrollments requires expansion of engineering departments at a time when industrial salaries are rising rapidly. A study of 1978 graduates of the college placement council shows that beginning, B.S. Petroleum engineers averaged \$1,635/mo or \$19,836/year. Engineering faculty have become a critical commodity and they cannot be attracted by salaries which are only slightly higher than those received by their students with a B.S. degree and no experience.

Our staffing problem goes back to enrollment projections and funds to hire faculty. The student faculty ratio authorized by the board of regents and the Legislature is adequate to meet our needs. However, we do not have sufficient funds to hire the faculty authorized. Mr. Turley then summed up his presentation with saying that a simple way to handle these problems and to proceed with the method of projection which we understand the committee has agreed upon, would be to guarantee funding of some percentage, say 97% of the projected enrollment for each unit. This would assure that no unit would be overfunded. The funds generated by the pool of FY-FTE students between the 97% of projected and 100% of projected enrollment would then be distributed in the

fall of the basis of FY-FTE enrollments projected from actual fall term FTE enrollment. This procedure would guarantee equitable distribution of available funds on a per student basis and would force campus administration to a procedure and would reward results.

An overall summary:

1. We will grow.
2. We have problems in space, equipment and staff caused by our growth.
3. We need to have funding for all students.
(A testimony is exhibited)

Chairman South then asked why these particular schools (Colorado School of Mines and New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology and South Dakota School of Mines) were used in comparison in salaries to Montana Tech, and Mr. Turley answered saying that they felt these schools were closest in similar units with Montana Tech.

Chairman South followed with another question asking if it is an internal decision that you make on campus of full professorship. Mr. Turley explained that primarily the associate professor rank should be earned and not given. If a person has worked there for a few years then yes, he would earn his full professorship.

Chairman South then asked how does 21,400 compare with an associate professor in nonengineering field on campus; Mr. Turley said that there is a difference in the salaries between our engineering and nonengineering field.

Rep. Jack Moore stated that the equipment of the school shouldn't be poorly maintained because the students should be cleaning up after themselves, therefore, not having to hire someone to maintain this equipment. Mr. DeMoney agreed, but stated that in this day and age students won't do this for nothing.

Dr. DeMoney started talking about some of the capital equipment budget. Several features of the data that I would like to point out to you. First of all there is the extreme variability of the amount of money we budgeted on our capital. The average is about 74,000 a year including our computer purchase. Meanwhile, the engineering enrollment is increased with the same period of time from 298 in 1967 and 597 in 1978 for almost 100% increase in 12 years. Inflation has hit the equipment and institution very hard. This total list that we have here of needs was developed by a series of discussions from department heads achieving some sort of rational for the selection units to be put on list.


He gave the total amount of capital requests which include: Instruction, Academic support, Student services, Inst. Support, and Maintenance, came to a total of: \$1,071,656 - for 1979.

Vic Burt gave a talk on the history and underfunding. It was quite a brief presentation, but overall his point of view was that salaries have not been as high as they should have been over the past 10 years. This is caused by the problem of underfunding of the University System. They need more faculty to obtain the amount of classes needed to operate properly for the amount of students enrolled in Montana Tech. He also talked of a designated fund for a computer.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15.



CARROLL V. SOUTH, CHAIRMAN



Jeanne Glennon, Secretary