

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATION SUBCOMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION

February 14, 1981

The Executive Session meeting of the Joint Appropriation Sub-Committee was called to order at 7:05 a.m. on Saturday, February 14, 1981 by Chairman Donaldson in Room 104, Capitol Bldg., Helena Montana.

All members were present including Curt Nichols and Bruce Shively, Fiscal Analysts.

GLEN LEAVITT gave the Executive recommendation for instruction. He said the Governor is not recommending peer salary adjustment. We feel that giving salary catch up to one section of state employees, and the university professors are state employees, is not fair unless we treat all state employees with some kind of catch up. The difference with the peer adjustment is \$3,200,000 for the biennium.

MR. LEAVITT stated that the contingency fund is \$1,000,000 for the first year. With the contingency fund in the second year only they would be better off than in the past. That would save about \$1,000,000 in the first year.

MR. LEAVITT commented that in terms of instructional support, this is different than the other institutional support. The formula used productivity ratios and generated a fuller faculty but there are other costs in the instruction program such as: supplies, travel, non faculty instruction personnel. (EXHIBIT A) He explained the handout with the comparisons for the Instructional Program.

CHAIRMAN DONALDSON asked if there has been any studies made to indicate that state employees in general positions were lagging their peers.

GLEN LEAVITT stated that two years ago there was a study done that indicated that at the professional level when the state compared to a professional in another state we were comparable. But when you look at the actual salaries that were being paid the professional level in Montana was lower.

PRESIDENT BOWERS stated that a contingency fund is a good idea if they use conservative enrollment estimates.

COMMISSIONER RICHARDSON stated that looking at the study by WICHE you can see a decline in graduating high school seniors. There is a decline from 1980 to 1986 or 87 by about 22% to 24%. But it is important to know that it starts up again for a couple of years and goes down again.

Discussion was held in regard to the Instructional Program.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Appropriation Subcommittee
on Education

PAGE 2

February 14, 1981

CURT NICHOLS explained the Instructional Support Costs. (EXHIBIT B)

CHAIRMAN DONALDSON stated that the supplemental instance is a poor use of money because it is coming after the fact.

COMMISSIONER RICHARDSON stated that he would argue that for the first year the enrollment projections need to be less conservative if we have a contingency for the second year. We should provide that the second year contingency fund, if the enrollment is over that projected, would be released in the preceding spring. We would take fall 81 and winter 82 actual enrollment and project those into 83.

Discussion was held in regard to new programs.

REP. MOORE stated that when you start a new program you take a little from each program to start the new program. Then what happens, the Legislature comes back into session and you have additional programs, but you still have the other programs too. So therefore, everything comes up and you have to fund all the programs. It has happened year after year, you have expanded and expanded.

CHAIRMAN DONALDSON stated that you have x number of students and you have an x number of programs, we expect that as times change new programs have to be brought on line and old programs no longer serve the needs. In that process there is some inefficiency.

COMMISSIONER RICHARDSON discussed programs that were cut in the past. He stated that they do look at programs and terminate them.

Discussion was held in regard to what the committee wanted the LFA to come back with. Chairman Donaldson stated that he would like to look at it program by program.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 a.m.



REP. GENE DONALDSON, Chairman

pb

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM (with OUT PAY INCREASE)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Actual Fiscal 80			REGENTS	Erec		Formula OVER EXEC		Formula EXEC	Formula OVER EXEC
1	12728732			14676420	13846588		14597660		13581530	14787626
2		N' VM					4714674	4706177	4728884	4907538
3	EWC	3942615					1327814	1274417	1349381	1292449
4	WMC	918162					15123678	18185206	17828514	18255727
5	MSU						1817239	2561272	2917141	2622471
6	KUST						1727833	2883927	2216380	2710175
7	NMC						36258266	44349263	42821357	43483613
8										43331004
9										43806754
10		PerAdj	-0-		1953826	-0-	1601493	1930506	-0-	1599617
11				36258266	46303089	42821357	45045106	46416963	43331004	45406391
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										

(475750)

14797819
4624688
1069702
18185206
17860689
2561272
2883927
44349263
42821357
1953826

4728884

1349381

18071703

303402

2374382

109018

10566034

440251

13581530

2670959

11006285

609018

96%

FY 83

10566034

440251

Instructional Support Costs at 100% peer Average (Included Above)

10150303

94% FY 92
if come up in steps:
SAVINGS

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034

440251

10566034</

Physical Plants (with out any increases)

Fiscal Year 1980 Actual		Fiscal Year 1982 Budget		Fiscal Year 1983 Budget	
		Programs	Executive Formula	Programs	Executive Formula
MSU	2515895	3473256	3265557	3142133	3832123
UM	2639943	3497571	3490307	3432221	3816671
EMC	1077438	1319087	1314737	1507297	1411886
NMC	446117	576022	57587	568263	618590
WMC	377870	469168	470054	428957	515313
MCHST	632490	866464	86760	959470	933426
Sub Total	7689753	10194488	9984142	10038341	10913998
Maintenance - Cn/cb up				10115232	11041174
MSU - Maintenance				750000	1090000
UM - Maintenance					1090000
EMC - Bloncher Deptt / Floor Surface					150000
WMC - Vehicle Maintenance / Bus Driver					16000
NMC - Custodial Services					10821
MSU - Energy Conservation					204850
Sub Total				1184174	750000
Total				11375659	10734142
					128616
					1148845
					1663998
					1900018

Scholarships and Fellowships

For budgeting purposes, the category of scholarships and fellowships refers exclusively to fee waivers. Table I compares the recommendation of the Board of Regents, the Executive, and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst.

Table I - Comparison of Scholarships & Fellowships FY's 82 & 83

College	1982			1983		
	Regents	Executive	LFA	Regents	Executive	LFA
MSU	\$700,000	\$625,000	\$739,757	\$850,000	\$750,000	\$785,210
UM	668,000	650,000	644,518	780,000	750,000	691,212
EMC	210,000	215,000	186,257	230,000	260,000	203,431
NMC	128,000	140,000	103,452	137,000	155,000	114,899
MCMST	175,000	170,000	127,459	198,000	190,000	140,632
WMC	50,000	50,000	33,655	57,000	57,000	35,524
Total Scholarships & Fellowships	\$1,931,000	\$1,850,000	\$1,833,098*	\$2,252,000	\$2,162,000	\$1,970,908*

*Includes mandatory fee waiver allocation totaling \$440,000 in fiscal 1982 and \$500,000 in fiscal 1983.

The recommendations of the regents and the executive for scholarships and fellowships are based on fiscal 1980 levels of expenditure with adjustments for anticipated changes in enrollments and scheduled increases in tuition and fees. Neither recommendation distinguishes between mandatory and discretionary waivers. The LFA recommends appropriation of scholarships and fellowships according to type, treating mandatory and discretionary waivers separately.

The LFA recommends that the estimated statewide costs of the mandatory waivers be appropriated to the commissioner of higher education for distribution to the units based upon where qualifying students enroll. The LFA estimates the costs of mandatory waivers at \$440,000 in fiscal 1982 and \$500,000 in fiscal 1983. These amounts take into account scheduled increases in tuition and fees, but do not provide for any increases in the total number of waivers to be granted.

The LFA recommends that discretionary waivers be appropriated to the units as a percent of estimated tuition and fee collections. According to this proposal the units would be appropriated an amount equal to 18.45 percent of their estimated non-resident fees and 5.75 percent of the resident fees for discretionary fee waivers. These recommended percentages reflect system-wide experience in fiscal 1980. Table II demonstrates the effect of this recommendation.

Table II, Total Discretionary Waivers by College, FY 80, 82, 83

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
MSU	682.3	773.4	793.7
UM	689.3	744.1	729.0
EMC	265.8	222.8	211.0
NMC	119.3	85.1	81.5
MCMST	187.0	162.3	163.1
WMC	71.0	54.0	50.4
Total Waivers	2,014.7	2,041.7	2,028.7

The LFA recommendation results in a systemwide increase in total discretionary waivers over fiscal 1980. However, since the recommendation uniformly applies average percentages to determine the appropriation for scholarships and fellowships, the recommendation results in a significant redistribution of waivers among the colleges and universities. Basically, the universities increase the number of discretionary waivers they may grant, while the number of discretionary waivers at the colleges decreases.

Options

1. The committee may accept or reject the proposed formula generation of scholarships and fellowships.

Within the formula concept, the committee could,

1. Alter the percentages that apply to resident and non-resident fee waivers (i.e., increase/decrease the percent of resident waivers, increase/decrease the percent of non-resident waivers).
2. Establish separate percentages for the universities and colleges. For example, 16.3 and 5.1 for the universities and 34.5 and 7.3 for the colleges.
3. Make no distinction between resident and non-resident waivers--apply single percentage to tuition and fee collection for the units.

B:jn:q

Research

82

1 2 3 4 5 6

Pegnts

Executive

LFA

MSU	497888	(440990)	500122
UoFM	427883	(353936)	352956
EMC	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
WML	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
MCMST	- 0 -	- 0 -	39688
WML	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
TOTAL System	925771	794926	892760

83

MSU	500497	(443555)	502934
UoFM	438652	(364745)	364580
EMC	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
WML	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
MCMST	- 0 -	- 0 -	43586
WML	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
TOTAL System	939189	808344	911100

Public Service

82

1

2

4

5

6

Regions

Executive

ISA

X

MSU	9063	33429	8728		1
WFM	161360	161803	161769		2
EMC	226666	22755	34862		3
NML	9435	9463	8981		4
McMST	- o -	- o -	- o -		5
WNL	- o -	- o -	- o -		6
Total System	202524	227447	214340		7

83

MSU	9347	33713	8640		10
WFM	167677	168117	167978		11
EMC	23054	23143	35495		12
NML	9779	9807	9233		13
McMST	- o -	- o -	- o -		14
WNL	- o -	- o -	- o -		15
Total System	209857	234780	221346		16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

Support Costs (without Pay Increases)

Support Costs (without Pay Increases)

Neelvin L
Fiscus L
1980

mcmsT
Computer
Automatic Powder-
Library Acquisitions
Branch, 2,600 Network

Fisch L 1982 6
Executive Form u/n

Region	Expenditure	Forwards
1	1896346	1
2	17000	-
3	1367429	1
4	1367429	1
5	17000	-
6	155000	1
7	188000	1
8	94000	1
9	1617449	1
10	1617449	1

Delegates	Executive Formulas	Formula
18	1400948	1696245
320000		
		94000
		15600

Executive Formula 11/400948 11/946245

OPTIONS FOR DETERMINING SUPPORT EXPENDITURES

- ① Pick one of Executive, Regulators, or formula current levels and individually consider modifications proposed.
- ② Provide for a "phase-in" of formula support rates perhaps 90% of peer level in 1982 and 95% in 1983
- ③ Set the level of support at a percentage of the peers this could be a reduced percentage like 95% or an increased percentage like 105%
 - ④ As enrollment "panks" in fiscal 1981 through 1983 the committee could use 1983 projected amounts for calculating support cost thus not risking support to lower than after construction with any of the above
 - ⑤ Approve modifications selected by perhaps fund 90% of the \$1000 level as in ③ and fund the Library expenses
 - ⑥ Request further information to make selective additions or reductions
- These are only a few of the possible choices