

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
January 19, 1983

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Education met at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, January 19, 1983 in Room 104 of the State Capitol. With Chairman Rep. Esther G. Bengtson presiding, all members were present.

Work on the School for the Deaf and Blind's budget was completed.

Program 03 - Student Services. Personal Services. Ms. Pam Joehler (LFA) distributed an explanation of the issues involved; see Exhibit "A." OBPP figures include the position at Grade 14, Step 11; therefore, higher figures than those listed on p. 1 of Exhibit "A" would have to be deducted from that office's total level.

Mr. Frances Olson (OBPP) pointed out that although the position had remained vacant during 1981 and 1982, probably this FTE was used in 1983 and should continue, because of the new cottages coming on line. Taking this out could possibly encourage administrators to fill positions that aren't really needed. He added that OBPP had also included \$4,126 for a work-study position which the LFA hadn't. Ms. Joehler said it was an oversight on the part of the LFA that the work-study position wasn't included by that office.

Mr. Bob Deming, Superintendent, School for the Deaf and Blind, explained why they needed a cottage coordinator. The coordinator position which was vacant in 1981 and '82 was filled when the new cottage was moved into in the fall of 1982. It is being paid at Grade 14, Step 11, and this was in agreement with the Board of Education. Sen. Hammond questioned whether the person needed so much training to fill the position. Mr. Deming said they felt it was a professional level position because they are surrogate parents. Also, the coordinators provide in-service training for the houseparents. The coordinator will be supervising three sets of live-in houseparents, and the hourly workers and janitors that serve the cottage, in addition to forty-four students. The coordinators act as "shift-breakers" and fill in for the cottage supervisors who sometimes are no longer on duty by the time the children go to bed. The cottage supervisors report directly to the Dean of Students. The new LFA totals would be \$478,595 in 1984 and \$477,884 in 1985 if the upgrade to Grade 14 and the work-study position were included in Personal Services.

Ms. Joehler stated that there was a benefits adjustment which the agency wanted the Committee to consider. This was explained on p. 2 of Exhibit "A," and she went over the proposal with the Committee. There was also an adjustment in an aggregate position which the LFA made; see p. 2 of Exhibit "A." The computer picked up the wrong step on this position.

Sen. Haffey asked Mr. Deming what would happen if the Cottage Supervisor wasn't funded. He replied that the School would have no supervisor in one of the cottages, and parents would probably object to this.

Sen. Haffey moved to accept the LFA budget, but with adjustments made to include the aggregate position adjustment, the Cottage Supervisor, and the benefits adjustment. The new totals would be: \$490,765 in 1984 and \$489,994 in 1985. Further discussion took place. Mr. Olson explained that the reason the OBPP estimate was now lower than the LFA's was because the aggregate positions for the health insurance coverage was not picked up by his office. Their benefit rates are comparable to the LFA but don't reflect an increase in health insurance. OBPP's salary figures differ from the LFA's because the OBPP computes salaries differently. Ms. Joehler said that it was hard to say which office had the most accurate estimates because an employee's anniversary date was highly variable. The LFA computes anniversary date on July 1 and OBPP does this differently.

Sen. Haffey withdrew his motion. Discussion regarding which budget figures to use ensued. Rep. Bengtson rose in support of deducting the Coordinator position. Sen. Hammond asked Mr. Deming if he thought one Coordinator could take care of two cottages. Mr. Deming replied that there were three sets of houseparents who work five days a week, and this amounted to six days off per week. He felt that this constituted more than one FTE. There are fifteen children in each wing of a cottage. The days off by the houseparents have to be covered by Supervisors. They try to stagger the days so that they have two sets of houseparents continuously.

Sen. Haffey moved the OBPP figures for salaries, adding \$2,150 for employee benefits for each year of the biennium. This adjusts the total to \$479,636 in 1984 and \$478,627 in 1985. The motion failed with Reps. Bengtson and Peck and Sens. Hammond and Tveit opposed and Rep. Donaldson absent; see roll call vote.

Sen. Hammond asked Mr. Deming if they had considered hiring an additional houseparent. He replied that this had been considered but the cost difference hadn't been calculated. He submitted that by the fact that the motion failed, he was assuming the Committee was asking the School to take this approach. Rep. Peck rose in support of Sen. Hammond's suggestion. This is a direct student service position, and the Coordinator's isn't a position of this nature. Discussion took place regarding the cost of houseparents.

Sen. Hammond moved to delete the figures for the supervisor and put in the salary for houseparents at Grade 8, Step 4. Discussion took place regarding the definition of "houseparent." The position may involve more than one body. Mr. Olson said that his calculations for a .8 FTE at Grade 14, Step 11 would be \$19,439 for 1984 and \$19,365 in 1985. If houseparents were used for the position, this would be 2 FTE and would amount to \$13,186 for one and \$13,136 for the other in 1984. This figure would have to be multiplied by .8. It was brought out that only one FTE would be needed to fulfill the "shiftbreaker" position. Sen. Hammond explained the intent of his motion: the shiftbreaker would take the place of the houseparent that would not be available those six days between the three wings. The houseparent would report directly to the dean, in the cottage without the supervisor. Rep. Peck said he felt that the one coordinator position could take care of all the in-service training, etc. that would be required.

Mr. Olson said that the pay rate for a .8 Grade 8, Step 4 FTE would be \$10,548 in 1984 and \$10,508 in 1985. This would amount to more than a \$9,000 savings in each year between the Grade 8 and the Grade 14. The total OBPP level for Personal Services would be: \$490,184 in 1985 and \$489,135 in 1985.

The question was called for. Discussion took place. Mr. Olson stated that there was an error in his calculations in that the Grade 14 hadn't been subtracted out, and the new figures would be calculated. The understanding of the motion was that it would be less the Grade 14, Step 11 and adding the grade 8, step 4 and adding \$2,150 per year. Motion carried unanimously.

Program 04 - Education. Personal Services. Ms. Joehler explained the two major causes for the differences in FTE between LFA and OBPP were related to programs: in the Title VI-C Program, 1.46 FTE were taken out of current level, and an additional .4 FTE were taken out because the LFA felt that the agency had increased its FTE by this amount when it changed its way of calculating FTE. See Pp. 3 - 4 of Exhibit "A."

Mr. Miral Gamradt, Business Manager for the School, stated that the main reason position No. 360 was in question was due to the change in what constitutes an FTE. He and Mr. Olson and Ms. Joehler met three times and were still unable to agree as to what happened. He submitted that they had maintained the same actual level of staff as they had before the change.

The other issues involved in Personal Services were covered by Ms. Joehler, as outlined on P. 4 of Exhibit "A."

Ms. Joehler explained that OPI had received word that Title VI-C funding would no longer be allowed to be spent for direct services, which is what it had been called at the School. She added that it would be allocated on a competitive basis and would be allowed to be used for in-service training, model development, etc., and at this point there is no certainty that Montana will get an allocation.

Sen. Haffey moved approval of the OBPP figures of \$1,117,484 in 1984 and \$1,115,064 in 1985, which includes the differential pay benefits. Motion carried unanimously.

Operating Expenses. Ms. Joehler stated that the lease expenditure was included in the LFA current level budget. As a result of the Committee's approval of the purchase of a car, this amount needs to be subtracted from the budget. Ms. Joehler said the reduction would be \$3,771 in 1984 and \$3,997 in 1985. The difference in Supplies and Materials was explained by Ms. Joehler. The Governor's office included additional amounts each year for the purchase of textbooks.

Ms. Joehler said the total level in operating expenses would come to \$149,646 in 1984 and \$158,375 in 1985, with the lease amount deducted. She added that \$20,087 in 1984 and \$21,292 in 1985 had been allowed for the purchase of textbooks. She stated that her base figures were wrong, but this wouldn't make a change in the allowance. She stated that the total level figures would be: \$144,334 in 1984 and \$152,744 in 1985.

Sen. Haffey moved that the above figures be accepted; motion carried unanimously.

Equipment. Ms. Joehler explained what the LFA had allowed and what the OBPP had allowed. Discussion took place. It was brought up that whatever amount was approved for the budget, the School had the prerogative of spending this money however they wanted to.

Sen. Haffey moved the LFA figures for Equipment.

Ms. Joehler explained the differences between OBPP and LFA in the second year. The OBPP provided for an additional closed circuit TV and additional play equipment which the LFA did not. The question was called for; motion carried unanimously.

Interest and Income. Ms. Joehler said that the School had been directed by its most recent audit report to spend the interest and income money in 1983 and revert general fund money. This

is included in the budget amendment bill. Therefore, the LFA figures include carryover in the fund balance which is no longer available (because it is being spent) and the figures need to be revised.

Mr. Olson said that Jim Williams, Department of State Lands, had written OBPP and recommended that the Committee set the estimate for Interest and Income at \$185,000 per year because the prime interest rate and other factors may cause the amount to be reduced. However, the Governor's office wishes to stay with the \$200,000 estimate. Ms. Joehler explained that the agency's total spending authority hadn't changed.

Sen. Haffey stated that if the \$200,000 per year was approved by the Committee, the amount would affect what the general fund would have to pick up. He then moved to approve \$200,000 Interest and Income authority for each year. Motion carried unanimously.

Federal and Private Revenue. Ms. Joehler explained that this category was the estimate of Title I funding and also some library money. The agency anticipated that there would be a 15% reduction in 1985. She explained that the general fund would not have to pick up the difference. However, the agency had a request that the general fund pick it up, which is an issue in the LFA narrative.

Mr. Olson said that the Governor's office had estimated the level of Chapter I monies to be \$354,360 for the biennium. They also estimated a reduction in Title IV-C monies. The difference is picked up by the general fund under the OBPP recommendations. There is enough carryover in Title I funds plus what OBPP thinks will be appropriated to adequately fund their programs, with the exception of about \$4,000, in 1984. In 1985, they feel the state would have to pick up about \$24,000 in general fund.

Mr. Deming explained what was involved in the Chapter I project. If the monies weren't replaced, staff would be reduced and in turn services would be reduced.

Ms. Joehler stated that her office anticipated that the funds would be at 1982 level and they provide for current level. However, they make note and present to the Legislature the agency's estimate of what the federal funds would be and the difference of what the cost would be for the general fund replacement.

Sen. Haffey moved to accept the OBPP figures for Federal and Private revenue. Motion carried unanimously.

Sen. Jacobson moved that the general fund appropriation to be used for the teacher and aide for the five deaf and blind students be line-itemed and reverted back to general fund if it is not used. Motion carried unanimously.

The Committee took a five-minute recess.

Audiological services were then discussed. Judy Johnson, OPI, explained to the Committee what had been done in the past and what needed to be done. OPI two years previously had a minor change so that they could contract directly. If they could transfer the appropriation from OPI to the School for the Deaf and Blind, they would have much more comprehensive services than the Office of Public Instruction is able to render. Negotiations with the Department of Health broke down this year again because the Department wanted 10% for indirect costs. The School for the Deaf and Blind won't need any money off the top or any indirect money; they will do a contracting service much as OPI has done, but it will be tied in with the rest of their on-line programs.

She added that the LFA funding level was adequate but the way it is split will present a hardship on those who are contracting for services. She suggested that contracts should be funded on a two-year basis instead of on a yearly basis. She also recommended that the figures from two years ago be used, because doing the contracting for two years at a stretch would cut down on administrative costs. She recommended a figure of \$1,439,203 instead of the LFA figure of \$1,480,400. Both Ms. Joehler and Mr. Olson said that it would be possible to appropriate this money in a lump sum. Ms. Johnson said that the Board of Public Education approved the transfer and Superintendent of Public Instruction Argenbright also approved the transfer.

Questions were asked. 97,416 children were screened in 1982. Of that, 22,736 were re-screened, and 3,695 were evaluated by physicians. Pointing to the effectiveness of the program, there has been a 31% decrease from 1977 to 1983 in the number of children in special education. They are still hard-of-hearing, but this has been detected soon enough so that they have been able to avoid needing special education.

Sen. Jacobson moved to put the \$1,493,203 for the biennium into the budget for the School for the Deaf and Blind for audiological services. Motion carried unanimously.

The modification requests for the School for the Deaf and Blind were then considered. Ms. Joehler said that the LFA addressed one modified but it was addressed in current level. The rest weren't addressed by the LFA.

Sen. Haffey moved to approve the custodian addressed in the first modification request. Motion carried, with Rep. Bengtson opposed.

Modified No. 2 - Utility cost increases. Mr. Deming stated that this issue was now moot because this had been taken care of.

Modified No. 3 - Life attendants. Sen. Haffey submitted that one of the positions had been provided for already, because the Cottage supervisor had been replaced with a life attendant. No motion was made on Modified No. 3.

Mr. Olson brought up the fact that a half-time nurse's aide was requested by the agency, and the request for life attendants was for two in addition to the current level adjustments. Mr. Deming agreed with Mr. Olson. Health care services at present are in the old dormitory. This allows their night watch person to fulfill the role, unless there are more than two sick children. But it will no longer be possible to use this person as a quasi-nurse's aide, when the two cottages are moved into. The .5 FTE is requested to cover this change. Mr. Olson said that a half-time nurse's aide would cost \$5,886 in 1984 and \$5,863 in 1985.

Sen. Jacobson moved that the half-time nurse's aide be approved in the above amounts. Motion carried with Rep. Bengtson and Sens. Hammond and Tveit opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.



Rep. Esther G. Bengtson - Chairman

VISITORS' REGISTER

HOUSE Subcomm. ON EDUCATION COMMITTEE

BILL _____

Date 1/19/83

SPONSOR _____

NAME	RESIDENCE	REPRESENTING	SUP- PORT	OP- POSE
<i>Miss Gamaett</i>	<i>6 F</i>	<i>MSDB</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Pat Fairbanks</i>	<i>Helen</i>	<i>Mont. Federation of Teachers</i>		

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Montana School for the Deaf + Blind

Program 03 - STUDENT SERVICES

I Issue: Cottage Coordinator, .8 FTE

The issue was whether this position should be funded at grade 14/11 or grade 8/6. This position is intended as a Cottage Coordinator and supervisor of houseparents. Analysis shows this position was vacant for all of FY81 and FY82. The agency indicated this position was vacant because the services this position is proposed to provide were provided by other existing professional staff members in FY81 and FY82. From the information provided, the .8 FTE does not appear to be adding services.

The LFA submits this FTE should be removed from current level because it has remained unused for two years. (Option 1)

If the subcommittee chooses to maintain this FTE in current level, the appropriate grade/step is 14/11. (Option 2)

Change to LFA Current Level

— Personal Services —

	FTE	FY84	FY85
Option 1	(.8)	\$(13,618)	\$(13,566)
Option 2	-0-	13,749	13,747

Program 03- Student Services

II OTHER Personal Services Adjustments →

- A. Aggregate Position. The LFA used the incorrect salary step for an aggregate position of the cottage life attendants. The adjustment to the LFA current level personal services is \$14,146 in FY84 and \$14,086 in FY85.
- B. Benefits Adjustment. The computer systems utilized by OBPP and LFA do not recognize individuals in aggregate positions that work half time or more. Each employee who works more than half time is entitled to full health insurance. If the subcommittee provides this requested adjustment, it will cost an additional \$4300 in the 85 biennium.

Summary of Personal Services Adjustments
Program 03- Student Services

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	
	<u>LFA Current Level</u>	<u>Aggregate Position</u>	<u>Revised Current Level</u>	<u>Benefits Adjustment</u>	<u>- Cottage Coordinator -</u> <u>Option 1</u> <u>Option 2</u>	
FY 84	\$460,670	\$ 14,146	\$ 474,816	\$ 2150	\$ (13,618)	\$ 13,799
FY 85	460,011	14,086	474,097	2150	(13,566)	13,747

I FTE Differences

	FYE 82 Actual	FYE 82 Adjusted	85 Biennium Request
1. Admin/Clerical - 12 Month	8.0	8.0	7.0
2. General Funded 9-month Full Time Teacher/Professional	30.0	21.9	21.17
3. Federal Funded 9-month Full Time Teacher/Professional	6.39	6.57	5.84
4. Aggregate Positions	10.65	10.65	10.65
5. Remaining Part-time			
	.37	.37	.37
	.45	.33	.73
	.60	.44	.73
	.40	.40	.40
Sub-total	56.86	48.66	46.89

Less: Title VI-C FTE deleted by
the agency from 82 to 83:

TOTAL FTE

(2.46)

46.20

reduction reflected
in request

46.89

Difference = .69 FTE

II How The FTE Difference Affects Budgeted Salaries

Position	---FY82---	---FY84---	---FY85---	% Budgeted Salary
Number	FTE Budgeted	FTE Budgeted	FTE Budgeted	Increase FY82 to FY85
360	.45 \$ 7,224	.73 \$ 14,019	.73 \$ 13,966	94%
3113	.60 14,436	.73 15,805	.73 15,746	9%

III How The FTE Adjustment Was Calculated

	<u>In FY82 it was</u>	<u>In FY83, agency requested</u>	<u>current level adjustment</u>
Position # 360	.45 FTE	.73 FTE	$(1 - .45 \text{ FTE}) \times .73 \text{ FTE}$ <u>= .40 FTE reduction</u>

Program 04- Education

Other Issues —

IV Title VI-C Funding

Not available for use at MSDB in 85 Biennium. The issue remains as presented in the Budget Analysis.

V Motor Pool Vehicle Lease

The agency recorded its expenditure for its motor pool vehicle lease in program 04-Education in FY82. For nine months of use, the expenditure was \$3357. This expenditure is in current level with the LFA budget.

VI Differential Pay

The LFA and OBPP inadvertently omitted differential compensation in the education program for the 85 biennium. The agency requested \$8873 in both years. The differential pay is for extra duty days, additional years experience, and coaching.