

## **MINUTES**

### **MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION**

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION & CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Call to Order:** By **CHAIRMAN PECK**, on January 24, 1991, at 8:00 am

#### **ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:**

Rep. Ray Peck, Chairman (D)  
Sen. Greg Jergeson, Vice Chairman (D)  
Sen. Don Bianchi (D)  
Rep. Larry Grinde (R)  
Sen. H.W. Hammond (R)  
Rep. Mike Kadas (D)

**Staff Present:** Pam Joehler, Senior Fiscal Analyst (LFA)  
Skip Culver, Associate Fiscal Analyst (LFA)  
Doug Schmitz, Budget Analyst (OBPP)  
Mary Ann Wellbank, Budget Analyst (OBPP)  
Melissa Boyles, Secretary

**Please Note:** These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

#### **EXECUTIVE ACTION ON VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTERS**

**Tape No. 1**

**CHAIRMAN PECK** stated that during Executive Action no one in attendance is allowed to participate in the meeting unless a member of the subcommittee asks them to do so. What the subcommittee does in this meeting is only a recommendation to the Full Committee. **CHAIRMAN PECK** stated that the subcommittee needs to decide whether they want to go with Incremental or Formula funding. If done incrementally it would be more of a stability situation and cannot approach the pay equities, a formula base will give a better step towards equality.

**CHAIRMAN PECK** asked the staff which approach they wanted to take. **REP. KADAS** said that he asked Pam Joehler to run numbers on the formula that was worked out over the interim and said he would like to talk about them.

Ms. Joehler distributed a handout on the Vo-Tech System Funding Formula. EXHIBIT 1

068

SEN. BIANCHI asked Ms. Joehler what the student faculty ratio is. Ms. Joehler said the faculty ratio is 13.5 for contact hour. The student faculty ratio converted to the credit hour base is 17.96.

REP. KADAS asked how Ms. Joehler got the institutional support rate. Ms. Joehler referred to page six of EXHIBIT 1

137

CHAIRMAN PECK stated that the Governor's recommendation is about \$11.2 million annually. What does the Governor have in terms of MODS that the LFA is not showing. Ms. Joehler said that the Governor did not recommend any budget modification. CHAIRMAN PECK asked Ms. Joehler if the Governor put the \$807,000 back in Perkins money. Ms. Joehler said no. REP. KADAS asked if that position had changed. Doug Schmitz said yes, the OBPP would go along with the change to restrict it.

154

Ms. Joehler stated that the Governor's budget was based on FY90 actual student faculty ratios and budgeted appropriations. Because the enrollment had gone down and staff had not decreased measurably to the enrollment reduction they are actually offering a richer student faculty ratio than what the formula used. The budgeted student FTE is higher than the FY90 actual because they have been on a downward slide. If you use the FY89 and FY90 actual to calculate a two-year average, the average is actually higher than FY90 actual enrollment.

REP. KADAS asked Ms. Joehler to explain Option 3. Ms. Joehler stated that formula option 3 uses the same formula factors as included on table 7, page 43 of the LFA CL Budget Analysis EXHIBIT 2 Ms. Joehler reviewed calculations for formula option 3 on page 4 of EXHIBIT 1

CHAIRMAN PECK asked if you use center specific number three versus number two, would you be moving closer towards equity under two than you are three. Ms. Joehler said that on a system wide basis you would be. REP. KADAS asked what is driving number three, experience or educational level. Ms. Joehler said the difference in number two and three is the uniqueness of the faculty at each campus as it exists now. REP. KADAS asked if number three more closely replicates the changes proposed in the systems equity proposal. Ms. Joehler said it would at each center. CHAIRMAN PECK asked Ms. Joehler if she took the average throughout the system on number two and used the center average on number three. Ms. Joehler said yes. CHAIRMAN PECK said that he was trying to determine which one would move the system closer to a system salary schedule. Under two it looks like Great Falls being the lowest is gaining more under two than three so this must be moving them towards the single salary proposal. Ms.

Joehler said the specific average equity base salary is \$26,819 versus the system wide at \$29,636. If the goal is to reach the system wide average salary formula two would get you there faster than three.

247

SEN. JERGESON asked if option four addresses the equity issue. Ms. Joehler said it does not. Option four includes the salary that was included in table 7 EXHIBIT 2 which is half way between the average equity base.

REP. GRINDE asked how many MODS there would be if the subcommittee goes with the formula driven funding. CHAIRMAN PECK said there would be no MODS. Any MODS would be above and beyond and would have to be considered separately.

REP. KADAS stated that option two gives an average base across the board that does not take into account experience or educational level. Option three takes into account those two factors which were two of the main driving forces in the Commissioners negotiated equity plan. The negotiated equity plan does not contemplate a system average, it contemplates averages that have educational and seniority components built into the units average faculty salary. Ms. Joehler said yes, if your trying to arrive at the average equity base salary for each campus. REP. KADAS said if option two were used rather than option three we would be rewarding Great Falls to a greater extent than the equity proposal that was worked out. In a sense by rewarding Great Falls we would be damaging everyone else by that much more. Ms. Joehler agreed with REP. KADAS.

390

CHAIRMAN PECK asked why there is a difference in the acceleration of the trend in Butte versus that in Missoula. REP. KADAS said it would be the make up of the faculty at the two different institutions. Ms. Joehler said the difference between the Butte specific equity \$31,600 versus the average \$29,600 is a \$2,000 difference versus Missoula at \$30,000 versus the average \$29,600 is only a \$400 difference. So the magnitude between two and three would be greater in Butte than Missoula because of the difference in center specific equity salary versus the system equity salary. REP. KADAS stated that what is driving Buttes \$31,600 is that they have a more senior faculty and possibly more Masters Degrees in the faculty then all other institutions except Helena. REP. KADAS said he is more comfortable going with three, but is concerned with some of the impacts that will be forced onto some of the campuses.

476

CHAIRMAN PECK said that he was going to depart from normal committee rules and asked Laurie Neils if she has any comments or observation. Laurie Neils referred the question to Jack Noble. Jack Noble stated that he agrees with REP. KADAS. He feels the third option is what they would be looking at. Equity in terms

of faculty should take into consideration educational degrees and experience. It is similar to the State Classification Pay Plan. The average agency may be a grade 10 but you don't fund the agency on a grade 10. Some agencies have more 14 and some have predominately grade 8. The same situation would be with the faculty and the faculty signed off on it and by doing so are saying this would treat them fair. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked if option three would be beneficial to the proposed agreement that the Commissioner of Higher Education laid out for the subcommittee. **Mr. Noble** said yes.

485

**REP. KADAS** asked the Commissioners Office what their general attitude is about moving from incremental to formula. **Mr. Noble** said it is hard to refute formula budgeting. The question is how you step into it. The salary equity is an important step and the other thing that would need to be considered would be the student faculty ratios that have been applied system wide and change to an across the board student faculty ratio. We can not discard the faculty we have in those Vo-Techs this spring. The Vo-Techs need some time to go to an across the board student faculty ratio where all Vo-Techs are given the identical ratio. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked **Mr. Noble** if he was saying that they need individual ratios the first year of the biennium and then go to the system the second year. **Mr. Noble** said yes.

**SEN. BIANCHI** asked if the subcommittee had the individual faculty ratios. **Ms. Joehler** said it was done based on the actual number of faculty that are budgeted in the LFA CL Budget for instruction and compared that to the budgeted enrollment using 89-90. The FTE faculty reflect their request, Billings 15.77, Butte 16.30, Great Falls 16.03, Helena 15.05, Missoula 15.35, with a system average of 15.64. This generates 164.35 faculty FTE. **REP. KADAS** asked why it is different from the 17.96. **Ms. Joehler** said it was because they had more faculty than the formula was generated with. When the faculty ratio was set it was based on FY88 actual student faculty ratio and the enrollments were higher at that time. The enrollment has gone down and applying the same student faculty ratio would result in a lower number of faculty being budgeted with the formula. Because the budgets were based incremental they are really based on FY88 actual operating levels. **Doug Schmitz** asked **Ms. Joehler** what the actual FTE attendance for FY89 and FY90 were. **Ms. Joehler** said it was based on a 180 day contact hour. **Mr. Schmitz** said that he used those same numbers and he finds a significant difference between **Ms. Joehler's** numbers and his own. **Ms. Joehler** stated that the Vo-Techs used to operate on different days. They didn't have all the standard number of days to operate on and it was closer to 180 days in the past. Some of the Centers operated at 165 days. So historically the data has been collected and converted to 180 days. **Ms. Joehler** stated that the contract has been changed to 162 days, so she went back and converted all the 180 contact hour reports to 162 days.

615

**SEN. JERGESON** asked if it could be changed in the first year of the biennium to a formula. **CHAIRMAN PECK** said it is up to the subcommittee what they are going to recommend. **SEN. JERGESON** asked how the transition would be handled to change to formula budgeting. **Ms. Joehler** said if the subcommittee wants to go with the Commissioners recommendation using actual student faculty ratios in the first year of the biennium you would just use that. This would generate a higher budget than if you used a higher student faculty ratio. **CHAIRMAN PECK** stated that faculty adjustments could not be made in the first year. The Commissioners Office would like to stay with the individual average in the first year and go to the system average in the second year. **SEN. JERGESON** said if the transition were to be made would it be based on the 15.64 in the first year. **CHAIRMAN PECK** said he thought the Commissioners Office wants it done individually by centers.

**CHAIRMAN PECK** said that he feels the discussion is indicating that the subcommittee wants to go with the formula approach unless he is wrong the discussion should center on that. Otherwise the **CHAIR** will assume the subcommittee is going with formula funding. There being no disagreement from the subcommittee **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked the subcommittee to deal with the specifics of the formula.

668

**REP. KADAS** said he would like to see what using the existing campus student faculty ratios and the campus specific faculty salaries that are used in Option 3, **EXHIBIT 1** This would ease into the change and in the future use a system average on student faculty ratio. **REP. KADAS** said he is concerned with doing all of it in the next two years. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked why he wants to postpone for two years when the system is saying they want to change in the second year of the biennium. **REP. KADAS** said he is concerned on the dollar impact on specific campuses. **SEN. HAMMOND** said the jump is going to be there. **REP. KADAS** said he would like to take two small jumps rather than one big jump.

709

**SEN. BIANCHI** asked how the 17.96 compares to the peer institutions. **Ms. Joehler** said Montana compared favorably to surrounding institutions. Using the 13.5 ratio (developed with contact data) North Dakota was 17/1, South Dakota 15/1, Washington 20/1. The NACUBO reports for Vo-Techs was 15/1, and the NACUBO report for two year institutions with enrollment less than 1,000 was 14/1.

**SEN. BIANCHI** said he agrees with **REP. KADAS** and would like to take a look at his suggestion before he makes any decisions. **CHAIRMAN PECK** said he feels movement should be made before FY93. The process is going to be painful but it needs to be made.

**CHAIRMAN PECK** called a fifteen minute recess.

**SEN. JERGESON** opened the meeting in absence of **CHAIRMAN PECK**.

**Ms. Joehler** distributed and reviewed a handout on Formula Option number 5 and 6. **EXHIBIT 3**

822

**SEN. BIANCHI** asked where it would put us if the subcommittee used 16.5 in the second year of the biennium, instead of the 17.9.

**Ms. Joehler** said if it was at a system wide basis at 16.5 FTE it would be \$10,752,000 instead of \$10,522,000. **REP. KADAS** said he would like to see something like what was done with the University System last year. Move 25% in the first year and 25% in the second year. **SEN. JERGESON** asked where the transition from the center to system wide would be made. **REP. KADAS** said it would be a three year phase in.

Tape No. 2

**SEN. BIANCHI** said that the centers have contracts with faculty and will have to give one years notice before they can lay anyone off. If they do have to lay off faculty this will affect the students that are in two year programs now. **SEN. BIANCHI** said he would like to give them time to adjust.

004

**REP. KADAS** said that he thought that going from the system average to the Great Falls specific average on FTE would reduce Great Falls total appropriation. Instead it has increased it. **SEN. JERGESON** said that there is an increase in option five for all the centers. The actual student faculty ratios for each of the centers is dramatically lower than the 17.96.

**SEN. JERGESON** asked Jack Noble what the provisions on notice to the faculty. **Mr. Noble** said it is one year. **Mr. Noble** said that for the student and faculties sake, time would be needed to adjust.

**SEN. HAMMOND** asked Mr. Noble how going 1/3 of the way would alleviate the problems with two year contracts. **Mr. Noble** said they would have to commence immediately in order to meet those deadlines. **REP. KADAS** asked Mr. Noble if going 1/3 of the way on student faculty ratio in the first year would work. **Mr. Noble** said the Commissioners Office would like to stay at the current ratio in the first year.

070

**SEN. JERGESON** stated that if the option suggested by **REP. KADAS** 1/3, 1/3, and 1/3 were used the dollar figures would end up less than what is shown. But, if in the first year the particular dollar figures difference be allocated to the BOR to be used at whatever center is more critical. Would this make it any easier. **Mr. Noble** said that putting it into one barrel is not going to make the task any less difficult.

**Ms. Joehler** stated that **REP. KADAS** asked her to look at the Carl Perkins issue. The LFA CL does include \$805,044 per year in the Current Level Budget for Carl Perkins. There is a request by the BOR to replace that with General Fund. The Legislative Auditor recommended that the funds be placed in the current restricted fund rather than the current unrestricted fund. He did note that any indirect cost that could be recovered from the restricted funds should be deposited to the current unrestricted fund. Under the Carl Perkins Act the subcommittee is not supposed to know what the Vo-Techs might be getting. However, we do know that each one is entitled to at least a minimum of \$50,000. The indirect cost rate that is allowed to be collected is 5%. This would be \$12,500 for the system. The impact of replacing the \$805,000 is to free up Federal Funds to be used by other PostSecondary Institutions or by the Vo-Tech Centers for other programs.

**SEN. HAMMOND** asked **Ms. Joehler** if there is a minimum of \$50,000 and depending on the program the schools may get more. **Ms. Joehler** said that is what she understood from what **Sib Clack** said at the Carl Perkins Review Hearing on January 23, 1991. **REP. KADAS** asked **Sib Clack** if the \$492,146 is what is going to be available for all of PostSecondary Education. **Ms. Clack** said the \$492,146 is not the formula allocated amount, it is the split dollars that were estimated in the competitive grant awards. The total amount that would go to the five Vo-Techs, 3 Community Colleges and three of the seven tribal Community Colleges is 1.106 million. **REP. KADAS** asked if this was an annual figure. **Ms. Clack** said yes.

**SEN. HAMMOND** asked what entitles the schools to the \$50,000. **Ms. Clack** said the formula required by federal law is to take the number of Pell grant and BIA assistance recipients, role in Vocational Technical Education in each of the institutions. Then you compare this to the total number of pell grant and BIA assistants in all the institutions which gives you your ratio. The ratio is applied times the pot of 35% that was set aside for postsecondary. **SEN. HAMMOND** asked **Ms. Clack** if she had some idea of who was going to qualify. **Ms. Clack** said that all five of the Vo-Techs will receive at least \$50,000. The total number for the Vo-Techs is \$527,396, 5% of that is \$26,700 for indirect cost recovery. **REP. KADAS** asked if all twelve of the Institutions compete on equal footing. **Ms. Clack** said they all compete equally.

**REP. KADAS** stated that he feels all of the Carl Perkins Funds except for the indirect cost, should be taken out of the current unrestricted. If we don't, we may lose it and cause the current unrestricted to go below current level for some of the Vo-Techs. Unless we do that we run the risk of losing it altogether. **REP. BARDANOUVE** said that we have never lost any Carl Perkins Funds in the past ten years.

**SEN. JERGESON** asked **Mr. Noble** if a center had to reduce faculty

that are budgeted for if formula is used, however, it is all paid for by General Fund. If the center were to get the Carl Perkins Grants that were applied for would some of the faculty transfer over when grants came in. **Mr. Noble** said it could be a possibility. The intent of the Carl Perkins Act is to add to not to take out.

**Mr. Noble** stated that the Commissioners Office provided a schedule that worked in cooperation with the Governor and the Governor's Budget Office of where the Governor's Executive recommendation incorporates part of the Carl Perkins Funding in the amount of \$570,000 per year. **REP. KADAS** asked if that was in the original Executive Budget. **Mr. Noble** said yes. It is an allocation of a portion of the \$8,000,000 that was given to the Regents to address their priorities. **REP. KADAS** asked if it was the BOR position that there is \$800,000 per year of Carl Perkins money all of that is going to be taken out of current unrestricted and put in an additional \$570,000,000 general fund so overall it will still be \$250,000 short.

**Mr. Hutchinson, Commissioner of Higher Education**, said that the money that is used for the Carl Perkins Funding would be used for the programs that have the largest number of disadvantaged students. Some faculty being reduced could be picked up on Carl Perkins Funds. However, it would not be a very easily planned adjustment.

**REP. KADAS** asked what would happen if a formula were used and put a half million dollars per year of Carl Perkins were added as a revenue source for distribution to the formula. **Mr. Noble** said that Carl Perkins money can not be appropriated to the formula.

536

**REP. KADAS** said he would like to see the dollar amounts on an institutional basis. He would like to find a system formula that works and doesn't cause too much damage in the time that it takes to work.

**CHAIRMAN PECK** called a twenty minute recess so **Ms. Joehler** could run the numbers for **REP. KADAS**. **Ms. Joehler** distributed a worksheet on Formula Options. **EXHIBIT 4**

**REP. KADAS** asked if the Carl Perkins funds were removed and replaced with General Fund what the cost would be for Option 7. **Ms. Joehler** said it would be approximately \$1,222,000 in FY92 and \$990,400 in FY93. **SEN. JERGESON** asked if that would be in addition to the General Fund amounts on F33. **Ms. Joehler** said yes. **SEN. JERGESON** said the appropriated amount he came up with is \$700,000 less than the Governor's appropriated amount. **SEN. JERGESON** said that the 2.1 million dollar increase puts approximately \$700,000 over the Executive Budget in General Fund.

**Ms. Joehler** distributed and reviewed a handout on General Fund



Impact. **EXHIBIT 5**

726

**REP. KADAS** asked which number is the right one in regards to millage. **Ms. Joehler** stated that she talked to Terry Johnson and he said the difference comes in the area of how the two offices reallocated the non tax revenues. This will be clarified when the revenue resolution is worked on and will be better addressed later in the session when it is worked out to one number.

**Doug Schmitz, OBPP**, said the two major differences is in tax increment financing districts which the OBPP excluded and the vehicle fees which come in. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked Mr. Schmitz if the OBPP is going to come up. **Mr. Schmitz** said he didn't know that they would come up but the revenues may change. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked Mr. Schmitz if they were moving more in the direction of the LFAs estimate of millage. **Mr. Schmitz** said he believes the difference is in the way that it was calculated.

798

**REP. KADAS** said the Commissioners Office asked to be able to come back with some recommendations. **REP. KADAS** stated that the subcommittee is trying to keep the General Fund down and at the same time not damage the campuses too much. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked Mr. Noble what the Commissioners Office would need additional to be helpful. **Mr. Noble** said he would like some idea of the bottom line parameters, what amount of Carl Perkins would be in there, what the General Fund targets are. **Mr. Noble** stated that the Commissioners Office would like the opportunity to give the environmental impact statement. This would show the issues and consequences of cutting back.

878

**SEN. BIANCHI** asked if the subcommittee needs to tell the Commissioners Office what the subcommittee wants in order for them to be able to come back with their recommendations. **REP. KADAS** said his low end is an additional \$570,000 per year General Fund and \$2,000,000 on the high end. **CHAIRMAN PECK** stated that he would not vote to support anything in excess of the Governor. **Mr. Noble** asked if they could use the Executive Branch recommendation and incorporate the \$570,000 general fund backfill for Carl Perkins and give the subcommittee a proposal on that. **REP. KADAS** asked if that were \$570,000 per year or biennium. **Mr. Noble** said it is \$570,000 per year. **CHAIRMAN PECK** said he would be interested in seeing that.

**CHAIRMAN PECK** asked Mr. Noble what kind of time frame the Commissioners Office would need to put their recommendations together. **Mr. Noble** said they could have the parameters ready by Tuesday January 29, 1990.

REP. GRINDE asked if the Commissioners Office could get the analysis to Pam Joehler as soon as possible so the subcommittee would have time to look at it before Tuesday. CHAIRMAN PECK asked Mr. Noble to do what they could to get it to Ms. Joehler.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 10:47 a.m.

  
REPRESENTATIVE RAY PECK, Chair

  
MELISSA J. BOYLES, Secretary

RP/mjb

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE

1-24-91

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. RAY PECK, CHAIRMAN	✓		
SEN. GREG JERGESON	✓		
REP. LARRY GRINDE	✓		
SEN. DON BIANCHI	✓		
REP. MIKE KADAS	✓		
SEN. H.W. "SWEDE" HAMMOND	✓		

23-Jan-91

EXHIBIT 1DATE 1-24-91HB Ed. & Curr. Dev. Sub.

VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SYSTEM FUNDING FORMULA  
SUMMARY WORKSHEET--LFA CL VS. FORMULA OPTIONS

FISCAL 1992	Billings	Butte	Gt. Falls	Helena	Missoula	System
LFA CL	\$1,782,680	\$1,663,302	\$1,998,797	\$2,457,884	\$2,661,682	\$10,564,345
Formula Option 1	\$1,684,974	\$1,565,706	\$2,390,336	\$2,231,073	\$2,431,000	\$10,303,089
Change from LFA CL	(\$97,706)	(\$97,596)	\$391,539	(\$226,811)	(\$230,682)	(\$261,256)
Formula Option 2	\$1,721,749	\$1,599,531	\$2,445,145	\$2,281,234	\$2,484,911	\$10,532,570
Change from LFA CL	(\$60,931)	(\$63,771)	\$446,348	(\$176,650)	(\$176,771)	(\$31,775)
Formula Option 3	\$1,682,791	\$1,644,683	\$2,317,841	\$2,377,775	\$2,491,476	\$10,514,566
Change from LFA CL	(\$99,889)	(\$18,619)	\$319,044	(\$80,109)	(\$170,206)	(\$49,779)
Formula Option 4	\$1,768,937	\$1,643,050	\$2,515,410	\$2,345,695	\$2,554,332	\$10,827,424
Change from LFA CL	(\$13,743)	(\$20,252)	\$516,613	(\$112,189)	(\$107,350)	\$263,079
FISCAL 1993						
LFA CL	\$1,780,249	\$1,660,157	\$1,994,525	\$2,453,073	\$2,658,065	\$10,546,069
Formula Option 1	\$1,686,833	\$1,566,771	\$2,391,566	\$2,232,167	\$2,433,939	\$10,311,276
Change from LFA CL	(\$93,416)	(\$93,386)	\$397,041	(\$220,906)	(\$224,126)	(\$234,793)
Formula Option 2	\$1,723,608	\$1,600,596	\$2,446,375	\$2,282,328	\$2,487,850	\$10,540,757
Change from LFA CL	(\$56,641)	(\$59,561)	\$451,850	(\$170,745)	(\$170,215)	(\$5,312)
Formula Option 3	\$1,684,650	\$1,645,748	\$2,319,071	\$2,378,869	\$2,494,415	\$10,522,753
Change from LFA CL	(\$95,599)	(\$14,409)	\$324,546	(\$74,204)	(\$163,650)	(\$23,316)
Formula Option 4	\$1,770,796	\$1,644,115	\$2,516,640	\$2,346,789	\$2,557,271	\$10,835,611
Change from LFA CL	(\$9,453)	(\$16,042)	\$522,115	(\$106,284)	(\$100,794)	\$289,542

OPTION #1: Formula with LFA formula factors in "Issue" section of the Budget Analysis adjusted for credit hour student FTE

OPTION #2: Same as #1, but with system average salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #3: Same as #1, but with center-specific salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #4: Same as #1, but with student faculty ratio reduced from 17.96 to 16.25.  
This results in increasing budgeted faculty FTE.

FORMULA CALCULATIONS:

FORMULA OPTION

ITEM	BILLINGS	BUTTE	GT FALLS	HELENA	MISSOULA	SYSTEM
INSTRUCTION PROGRAM						
S-FTE	412	379	614	562	604	2571
S/F Ratio	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96
# Faculty	22.94	21.10	34.19	31.29	33.63	143.15
Avg Fac Salary	28557	28557	28557	28557	28557	28557
Avg Fac Benefits	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
Faculty Comp	\$799,219	\$735,114	\$1,191,164	\$1,090,129	\$1,171,654	\$4,987,280
Inst Support Rate	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199
Inst Supp \$\$	\$81,988	\$75,421	\$122,186	\$111,838	\$120,196	\$511,629
TOTAL INST. COST	\$881,207	\$810,535	\$1,313,350	\$1,201,967	\$1,291,850	\$5,498,909
SUPPORT PROGRAM						
Support Rate	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095
Support \$\$	\$451,140	\$415,005	\$672,330	\$615,390	\$661,380	\$2,815,245
Audit	\$13,496	\$12,785	\$12,785	\$13,496	\$11,364	\$63,926
TOTAL SUPPORT COST	\$464,636	\$427,790	\$685,115	\$628,886	\$672,744	\$2,879,171
EQUIPMENT						
Minor Eq Rate	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56
Minor Eq \$\$	\$23,072	\$21,224	\$34,384	\$31,472	\$33,824	\$143,976
Capital EQ \$\$	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$420,190
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	\$107,110	\$105,262	\$118,422	\$115,510	\$117,862	\$564,166
TOTAL FORMULA COSTS	\$1,452,953	\$1,343,587	\$2,116,887	\$1,946,363	\$2,082,456	\$8,942,246
FY 92 CL PLANT O&M	\$232,021	222119	273449	284710	348544	\$1,360,843
FY 93 CL PLANT O&M	\$233,880	223184	274679	285804	351483	\$1,369,030
TOTAL COSTS FY 92	\$1,684,974	\$1,565,706	\$2,390,336	\$2,231,073	\$2,431,000	\$10,303,089
TOTAL COSTS FY 93	\$1,686,833	\$1,566,771	\$2,391,566	\$2,232,167	\$2,433,939	\$10,311,276

EXHIBIT 1DATE 1-24-91HB Ed + Aur. Res. Div.

## FORMULA CALCULATIONS:

## FORMULA OPTION #2

ITEM	BILLINGS	BUTTE	GT FALLS	HELENA	MISSOULA	SYSTEM
INSTRUCTION PROGRAM						
S-FTE	412	379	614	562	604	2571
S/F Ratio	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96
# Faculty	22.94	21.10	34.19	31.29	33.63	143.15
Avg Fac Salary	29871	29871	29871	29871	29871	
Avg Fac Benefits	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	
Faculty Comp	\$835,994	\$768,939	\$1,245,973	\$1,140,290	\$1,225,565	\$5,216,761
Inst Support Rate	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199
Inst Supp \$\$	\$81,988	\$75,421	\$122,186	\$111,838	\$120,196	\$511,629
TOTAL INST. COST	\$917,982	\$844,360	\$1,368,159	\$1,252,128	\$1,345,761	\$5,728,390
SUPPORT PROGRAM						
Support Rate	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095
Support \$\$	\$451,140	\$415,005	\$672,330	\$615,390	\$661,380	\$2,815,245
Audit	\$13,496	\$12,785	\$12,785	\$13,496	\$11,364	\$63,926
TOTAL SUPPORT COST	\$464,636	\$427,790	\$685,115	\$628,886	\$672,744	\$2,879,171
EQUIPMENT						
Minor Eq Rate	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	
Minor Eq \$\$	\$23,072	\$21,224	\$34,384	\$31,472	\$33,824	\$143,976
Capital EQ \$\$	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$420,190
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	\$107,110	\$105,262	\$118,422	\$115,510	\$117,862	\$564,166
TOTAL FORMULA COSTS	\$1,489,728	\$1,377,412	\$2,171,696	\$1,996,524	\$2,136,367	\$9,171,727
FY 92 CL PLANT O&M	\$232,021	222119	273449	284710	348544	\$1,360,843
FY 93 CL PLANT O&M	\$233,880	223184	274679	285804	351483	\$1,369,030
TOTAL COSTS FY 92	\$1,721,749	\$1,599,531	\$2,445,145	\$2,281,234	\$2,484,911	\$10,532,570
TOTAL COSTS FY 93	\$1,723,608	\$1,600,596	\$2,446,375	\$2,282,328	\$2,487,850	\$10,540,757

## FORMULA CALCULATIONS:

## FORMULA OPTION #3

ITEM	BILLINGS	BUTTE	GT FALLS	HELENA	MISSOULA	SYSTEM
INSTRUCTION PROGRAM						
S-FTE	412	379	614	562	604	2571
S/F Ratio	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96
# Faculty	22.94	21.10	34.19	31.29	33.63	143.15
Avg Fac Salary	28479	31625	26819	32400	30031	
Avg Fac Benefits	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	
Faculty Comp	\$797,036	\$814,091	\$1,118,669	\$1,236,831	\$1,232,130	\$5,198,757
Inst Support Rate	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199
Inst Supp \$\$	\$81,988	\$75,421	\$122,186	\$111,838	\$120,196	\$511,629
TOTAL INST. COST	\$879,024	\$889,512	\$1,240,855	\$1,348,669	\$1,352,326	\$5,710,386
SUPPORT PROGRAM						
Support Rate	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095
Support \$\$	\$451,140	\$415,005	\$672,330	\$615,390	\$661,380	\$2,815,245
Audit	\$13,496	\$12,785	\$12,785	\$13,496	\$11,364	\$63,926
TOTAL SUPPORT COST	\$464,636	\$427,790	\$685,115	\$628,886	\$672,744	\$2,879,171
EQUIPMENT						
Minor Eq Rate	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	
Minor Eq \$\$	\$23,072	\$21,224	\$34,384	\$31,472	\$33,824	\$143,976
Capital EQ \$\$	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$420,190
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	\$107,110	\$105,262	\$118,422	\$115,510	\$117,862	\$564,166
TOTAL FORMULA COSTS	\$1,450,770	\$1,422,564	\$2,044,392	\$2,093,065	\$2,142,932	\$9,153,723
FY 92 CL PLANT O&M	\$232,021	222119	273449	284710	348544	\$1,360,843
FY 93 CL PLANT O&M	\$233,880	223184	274679	285804	351483	\$1,369,030
TOTAL COSTS FY 92	\$1,682,791	\$1,644,683	\$2,317,841	\$2,377,775	\$2,491,476	\$10,514,566
TOTAL COSTS FY 93	\$1,684,650	\$1,645,748	\$2,319,071	\$2,378,869	\$2,494,415	\$10,522,753

23-Jan-91

EXHIBIT 1DATE 1-24-91HB Ed. & Cur. Div. SW

## FORMULA CALCULATIONS:

## FORMULA OPTION 4

ITEM	BILLINGS	BUTTE	GT FALLS	HELENA	MISSOULA	SYSTEM
INSTRUCTION PROGRAM						
5-FTE	412	379	614	562	604	2571
S/F Ratio	16.25	16.25	16.25	16.25	16.25	16.25
# Faculty	25.35	23.32	37.78	34.58	37.17	158.2
Avg Fac Salary	28,557	28,557	28,557	28,557	28,557	
Avg Fac Benefits	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	
Faculty Comp	\$883,182	\$812,458	\$1,316,238	\$1,204,751	\$1,294,986	\$5,511,615
Inst Support Rate	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$199
Inst Supp \$\$	\$81,988	\$75,421	\$122,186	\$111,838	\$120,196	\$511,629
TOTAL INST. COST	\$965,170	\$887,879	\$1,438,424	\$1,316,589	\$1,415,182	\$6,023,244
SUPPORT PROGRAM						
Support Rate	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095	\$1,095
Support \$\$	\$451,140	\$415,005	\$672,330	\$615,390	\$661,380	\$2,815,245
Audit	\$13,496	\$12,785	\$12,785	\$13,496	\$11,364	\$63,926
TOTAL SUPPORT COST	\$464,636	\$427,790	\$685,115	\$628,886	\$672,744	\$2,879,171
EQUIPMENT						
Minor Eq Rate	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	
Minor Eq \$\$	\$23,072	\$21,224	\$34,384	\$31,472	\$33,824	\$143,976
Capital EQ \$\$	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$84,038	\$420,190
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	\$107,110	\$105,262	\$118,422	\$115,510	\$117,862	\$564,166
TOTAL FORMULA COSTS	\$1,536,916	\$1,420,931	\$2,241,961	\$2,060,985	\$2,205,788	\$9,466,581
FY 92 CL PLANT O&M	\$232,021	222,119	273,449	284,710	348,544	\$1,360,843
FY 93 CL PLANT O&M	\$233,880	223,184	274,679	285,804	351,483	\$1,369,030
TOTAL COSTS FY 92	\$1,768,937	\$1,643,050	\$2,515,410	\$2,345,695	\$2,554,332	\$10,827,424
TOTAL COSTS FY 93	\$1,770,796	\$1,644,115	\$2,516,640	\$2,346,789	\$2,557,271	\$10,835,611



**MONTANA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SYSTEM**  
**COMPARISON OF CONTACT HOUR FTE AND CREDIT HOUR FTE**  
**FISCAL YEARS 1986 THROUGH 1990**

**Contact Hour FTE-Converted to 162 days**

	86	87	88	89	90	%Change 86-90	Cr Hr 90	Ratio of CrHr/CoHr FTE
Billings	440	401	358	320	301	-31.6%	426	1.42
Butte	373	357	356	319	252	-32.4%	375	1.49
Gt. Falls	352	375	426	473	453	28.7%	591	1.30
Helena	582	522	519	455	392	-32.6%	518	1.32
Missoula	567	498	478	473	438	-22.8%	525	1.20
Total	2,314	2,153	2,137	2,040	1,836	-20.7%	2,435	1.33

**Credit Hour FTE (using system conversion factor from contact hour to credit hour)**

	86	87	88	89	90	%Change 86-90
Billings	584	532	475	424	399	-31.7%
Butte	495	473	472	423	334	-32.5%
Gt. Falls	467	497	565	627	601	28.7%
Helena	772	692	688	603	520	-32.6%
Missoula	752	660	634	627	581	-22.7%
Total	3,070	2,854	2,834	2,704	2,435	-20.7%

## VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTERS

Table 7  
 PESC Recommended Funding and Mechanism  
 1993 Biennium

<u>Program Determination</u>	<u>Formula</u>	<u>Formula Factors</u>
-----INSTRUCTION-----		
	(Enrollment/student faculty ratio)	(1,938/13.5)
	x	x
Faculty Compensation	Faculty Compensation	\$34,840
+	+	
Operating Expenses	Enrollment	1,938
=	x	x
Total Instruction	Rate Per Student	\$265
	=	
	Total Instruction	
-----SUPPORT-----		
	Enrollment	1,938
	x	x
	Rate Per Student	\$1,457
	=	
	Total Support	
-----EQUIPMENT-----		
Minor Equipment	Enrollment	1,938
+	x	x
Capital Equipment	Rate Per Student	\$75
=	+	+
Total Equipment	Uniform Appropriation Per Center	\$84,038 Per Center
	=	
	Total Equipment	
-----PLANT AND MAINTENANCE-----		
	Individual Center Funded Incrementally	

The committee recommends that enrollment be based upon the average of the previous two years' actual enrollment to maintain stability and to conform with the method used to determine enrollment for budgeting purposes at the university units and the community colleges. In the 1993 biennium, enrollment would be based upon actual fiscal 1989 and 1990 enrollments.

Instruction would be based upon a uniform, enrollment-based formula. Average faculty salary, student/faculty

ratios, and operating expenses are based upon prior years' actual experience at all centers, with inflationary adjustments.

Support would be based upon a uniform, enrollment-based formula. The support rate per student is based upon fiscal 1989 actual support expenditures, the estimated value of in-kind services provided by the local school districts now the responsibility of the state, and an inflationary increase.

24-Jan-91

EXHIBIT 3  
DATE 1/24/91  
HB El Centro, CA, 92540

VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SYSTEM FUNDING FORMULA  
SUMMARY WORKSHEET--LFA CL VS. FORMULA OPTIONS

FISCAL 1992	Billings	Butte	Gt. Falls	Helena	Missoula	System
LFA CL	\$1,782,680	\$1,663,302	\$1,998,797	\$2,457,884	\$2,661,682	\$10,564,345
Formula Option 1	\$1,684,974	\$1,565,706	\$2,390,336	\$2,231,073	\$2,431,000	\$10,303,089
Change from LFA CL	(\$97,706)	(\$97,596)	\$391,539	(\$226,811)	(\$230,682)	(\$261,256)
Formula Option 2	\$1,721,749	\$1,599,531	\$2,445,145	\$2,281,234	\$2,484,911	\$10,532,570
Change from LFA CL	(\$60,931)	(\$63,771)	\$446,348	(\$176,650)	(\$176,771)	(\$31,775)
Formula Option 3	\$1,682,791	\$1,644,683	\$2,317,841	\$2,377,775	\$2,491,476	\$10,514,566
Change from LFA CL	(\$99,889)	(\$18,619)	\$319,044	(\$80,109)	(\$170,206)	(\$49,779)
Formula Option 4	\$1,768,937	\$1,643,050	\$2,515,410	\$2,345,695	\$2,554,332	\$10,827,424
Change from LFA CL	(\$13,743)	(\$20,252)	\$516,613	(\$112,189)	(\$107,350)	\$263,079
Formula Option 5	\$1,793,626	\$1,727,635	\$2,452,317	\$2,616,920	\$2,701,044	\$11,291,542
Change from LFA CL	\$10,946	\$64,333	\$453,520	\$159,036	\$39,362	\$727,197
Formula Option 6	\$1,793,626	\$1,727,635	\$2,452,317	\$2,616,920	\$2,701,044	\$11,291,542
Change from LFA CL	\$10,946	\$64,333	\$453,520	\$159,036	\$39,362	\$727,197
FISCAL 1993						
LFA CL	\$1,780,249	\$1,660,157	\$1,994,525	\$2,453,073	\$2,658,065	\$10,546,069
Formula Option 1	\$1,686,833	\$1,566,771	\$2,391,566	\$2,232,167	\$2,433,939	\$10,311,276
Change from LFA CL	(\$93,416)	(\$93,386)	\$397,041	(\$220,906)	(\$224,126)	(\$234,793)
Formula Option 2	\$1,723,608	\$1,600,596	\$2,446,375	\$2,282,328	\$2,487,850	\$10,540,757
Change from LFA CL	(\$56,641)	(\$59,561)	\$451,850	(\$170,745)	(\$170,215)	(\$5,312)
Formula Option 3	\$1,684,650	\$1,645,748	\$2,319,071	\$2,378,869	\$2,494,415	\$10,522,753
Change from LFA CL	(\$95,599)	(\$14,409)	\$324,546	(\$74,204)	(\$163,650)	(\$23,316)
Formula Option 4	\$1,770,796	\$1,644,115	\$2,516,640	\$2,346,789	\$2,557,271	\$10,835,611
Change from LFA CL	(\$9,453)	(\$16,042)	\$522,115	(\$106,284)	(\$100,794)	\$289,542
Formula Option 5	\$1,795,485	\$1,728,700	\$2,453,547	\$2,618,014	\$2,703,983	\$11,299,729
Change from LFA CL	\$15,236	\$68,543	\$459,022	\$164,941	\$45,918	\$753,660
Formula Option 6	\$1,684,650	\$1,645,748	\$2,319,071	\$2,378,869	\$2,494,415	\$10,522,753
Change from LFA CL	(\$95,599)	(\$14,409)	\$324,546	(\$74,204)	(\$163,650)	(\$23,316)

OPTION #1: Formula with LFA formula factors in "Issue" section of the Budget Analysis adjusted for credit hour student FTE

OPTION #2: Same as #1, but with system average salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #3: Same as #1, but with center-specific salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #4: Same as #1, but with student faculty ratio reduced from 17.96 to 16.25. This results in increasing budgeted faculty FTE.

OPTION #5: Same as #1, but with actual student faculty ratios (based on LFA CL budgeted FTE faculty and budgeted Student FTE) and center-specific salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #6: Same as #5, but with systemwide student faculty ratio (17.96) in fiscal 93.

24-Jan-91

EXHIBIT

4

DATE

1-24-91

HB

Edw. D. D. D. D. D.

VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SYSTEM FUNDING FORMULA  
SUMMARY WORKSHEET--LFA CL VS. FORMULA OPTIONS

FISCAL 1992	Billings	Butte	Gt. Falls	Helena	Missoula	System
LFA CL	\$1,782,680	\$1,663,302	\$1,998,797	\$2,457,884	\$2,661,682	\$10,564,345
Formula Option 1	\$1,684,974	\$1,565,706	\$2,390,336	\$2,231,073	\$2,431,000	\$10,303,089
Change from LFA CL	(\$97,706)	(\$97,596)	\$391,539	(\$226,811)	(\$230,682)	(\$261,256)
Formula Option 2	\$1,721,749	\$1,599,531	\$2,445,145	\$2,281,234	\$2,484,911	\$10,532,570
Change from LFA CL	(\$60,931)	(\$63,771)	\$446,348	(\$176,650)	(\$176,771)	(\$31,775)
Formula Option 3	\$1,682,791	\$1,644,683	\$2,317,841	\$2,377,775	\$2,491,476	\$10,514,566
Change from LFA CL	(\$99,889)	(\$18,619)	\$319,044	(\$80,109)	(\$170,206)	(\$49,779)
Formula Option 4	\$1,768,937	\$1,643,050	\$2,515,410	\$2,345,695	\$2,554,332	\$10,827,424
Change from LFA CL	(\$13,743)	(\$20,252)	\$516,613	(\$112,189)	(\$107,350)	\$263,079
Formula Option 5	\$1,793,626	\$1,727,635	\$2,452,317	\$2,616,920	\$2,701,044	\$11,291,542
Change from LFA CL	\$10,946	\$64,333	\$453,520	\$159,036	\$39,362	\$727,197
Formula Option 6	\$1,793,626	\$1,727,635	\$2,452,317	\$2,616,920	\$2,701,044	\$11,291,542
Change from LFA CL	\$10,946	\$64,333	\$453,520	\$159,036	\$39,362	\$727,197
Formula Option 7	\$1,753,322	\$1,698,312	\$2,404,219	\$2,527,586	\$2,623,738	\$11,007,177
Change from LFA CL	(\$29,358)	35,010	405,422	69,702	(37,944)	442,832
FISCAL 1993						
LFA CL	\$1,780,249	\$1,660,157	\$1,994,525	\$2,453,073	\$2,658,065	\$10,546,069
Formula Option 1	\$1,686,833	\$1,566,771	\$2,391,566	\$2,232,167	\$2,433,939	\$10,311,276
Change from LFA CL	(\$93,416)	(\$93,386)	\$397,041	(\$220,906)	(\$224,126)	(\$234,793)
Formula Option 2	\$1,723,608	\$1,600,596	\$2,446,375	\$2,282,328	\$2,487,850	\$10,540,757
Change from LFA CL	(\$56,641)	(\$59,561)	\$451,850	(\$170,745)	(\$170,215)	(\$5,312)
Formula Option 3	\$1,684,650	\$1,645,748	\$2,319,071	\$2,378,869	\$2,494,415	\$10,522,753
Change from LFA CL	(\$95,599)	(\$14,409)	\$324,546	(\$74,204)	(\$163,650)	(\$23,316)
Formula Option 4	\$1,770,796	\$1,644,115	\$2,516,640	\$2,346,789	\$2,557,271	\$10,835,611
Change from LFA CL	(\$9,453)	(\$16,042)	\$522,115	(\$106,284)	(\$100,794)	\$289,542
Formula Option 5	\$1,795,485	\$1,728,700	\$2,453,547	\$2,618,014	\$2,703,983	\$11,299,729
Change from LFA CL	\$15,236	\$68,543	\$459,022	\$164,941	\$45,918	\$753,660
Formula Option 6	\$1,684,650	\$1,645,748	\$2,319,071	\$2,378,869	\$2,494,415	\$10,522,753
Change from LFA CL	(\$95,599)	(\$14,409)	\$324,546	(\$74,204)	(\$163,650)	(\$23,316)
Formula Option 7	\$1,718,352	\$1,671,598	\$2,360,624	\$2,449,624	\$2,557,066	\$10,757,264
Change from LFA CL	(\$61,897)	\$11,441	\$366,099	(\$3,449)	(\$100,999)	\$211,195

OPTION #1: Formula with LFA formula factors in "Issue" section of the Budget Analysis adjusted for credit hour student FTE

OPTION #2: Same as #1, but with system average salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #3: Same as #1, but with center-specific salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #4: Same as #1, but with student faculty ratio reduced from 17.96 to 16.25. This results in increasing budgeted faculty FTE.

OPTION #5: Same as #1, but with actual student faculty ratios (based on LFA CL budgeted FTE faculty and budgeted Student FTE) and center-specific salary equity for faculty.

OPTION #6: Same as #5, but with systemwide student faculty ratio (17.96) in fiscal 93.

OPTION #7: Same as #3, but moving student faculty ratio 1/3 distance from actual to system average (17.96) each year.

24-Jan-91

FORMULA FACTORS:

	Billings	Butte	Gt. Falls	Helena	Missoula	System
Enrollment*						
-----						
FY 89	424	423	627	603	627	2,704
FY 90	399	334	601	520	581	2,435
AVG	412	379	614	562	604	2,570

\*Credit Hour FTE

Student Faculty Ratios

-----						
FY 88*	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	17.96	
92/93 LFA	15.77	16.30	16.03	15.05	15.35	
DIFF	2.19	1.66	1.93	2.91	2.61	
1/3 INCREM	0.73	0.55	0.64	0.97	0.87	
FY 92	16.50	16.85	16.67	16.02	16.22	
FY 93	17.23	17.41	17.32	16.99	17.09	

\*System average originally based on contact hours; converted to credit hours

Average Faculty Salary

-----

FY89 avg salary w/2.5%  
added annually through

FY 91	28,557	28,557	28,557	28,557	28,557	
-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--

FY 91 avg salary (from CHE)

w/o equity	27,034	28,663	23,552	30,954	28,748	27,790
equity	28,479	31,625	26,819	32,400	30,031	29,871

Average Faculty Benefits

-----

SC study	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
CHE	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22

(rounded to  
2 digits)

Instructional Support Rate\*\*

\$199

Support Rate (per S-FTE)\*\*

\$1,095

Audit Costs (90% of Exec Rates)

-----

Exec @100%	14,995	14,206	14,206	14,995	12,627	
Exec @90%	13,496	12,785	12,785	13,496	11,364	

Minor Equipment (per S-FTE)\*\*

\$56

Capital Equipment (per center)

84,038

EXHIBIT

DATE

HB

## GENERAL FUND IMPACT TO LFA CL USING VARIOUS FORMULA AND REVENUE OPTIONS

	-----FY 92-----		-----FY 93-----	
	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS
	TOTAL		TOTAL	
LFA CL	\$7,018,306	\$3,546,039	\$10,564,345	\$6,983,555
				\$3,562,514
				\$10,546,069
1. Adopt Formula budget	(157,391)	157,391	\$0	(157,391)
2. Adopt Formula Option 1	(261,256)		(\$261,256)	(234,793)
3. Adopt Formula Option 2	(31,775)		(\$31,775)	(5,312)
4. Adopt Formula Option 3	(49,779)		(\$49,779)	(23,316)
5. Adopt Formula Option 4	263,079		\$263,079	289,542
6. Replace Carl Perkins	805,544	(805,544)	\$0	(805,544)
6a. Assume IDC on Restricted CDP	(12,500)	12,500	\$0	12,500
7. Adopt Exec Recomm. Millage	166,330	(166,330)	\$0	(163,372)
				\$0

NOTE: THE OPTIONS LISTED ABOVE ARE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE, AND ARE THEREFORE NON-ADDITIVE.

## Education

DATE 1-24-91

## Industrial Technical Centers

\_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT  
IF YOU HAVE WRITTEN COMMENTS PLEASE GIVE A COPY TO THE SECRETARY.