

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 53rd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By Chairman Royal Johnson, on February 9, 1993,
at 8:10

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Royal Johnson, Chair (R)
Sen. Don Bianchi, Vice Chair (D)
Rep. Mike Kadas (D)
Sen. Dennis Nathe (R)
Rep. Ray Peck (D)
Sen. Chuck Swysgood (R)

Members Excused: none

Members Absent: none

Staff Present: Taryn Purdy, Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Skip Culver, Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Doug Schmitz, Office of Budget & Program Planning
Amy Carlson, Office of Budget & Program Planning
Curt Nichols, Office of Budget & Program Planning
Jacqueline Brehe, Committee Secretary

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

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing: NONE
Executive Action: HOUSE BILL 277; HOUSE BILL 113; SENATE
BILL 77; UNIVERSITY SYSTEM; VO-TECH
CENTERS; AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 277

Tape No. 1:A:32

Motion: REP. MIKE KADAS moved to amend the bill by removing the
secretarial position. The administrator and the travel funds
would be retained. **EXHIBIT 1**

Discussion: CHAIRMAN ROYAL JOHNSON noted the salary for the
secretary was \$14,600 annually. This amendment would result in a
saving of \$29,200 over the biennium plus the savings in benefits.
He added that the total program involved \$175,000 over the
biennium.

Vote: The motion **CARRIED** 5 to 1 with **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** opposed.

Motion: **REP. KADAS** moved a Do Pass for House Bill 277 as amended.

Discussion: **REP. KADAS** stated he was reluctant to fund the program because of the financial condition of the state. However, there was an evident need for resources to improve recruitment of Native Americans. **REP. RAY PECK** opposed the motion because of the need to reduce spending. He noted the presence of other programs aimed at the Native American population including Talent Search, a program encouraging Native American students and other economically deprived students to pursue higher education.

Vote: The motion **FAILED** 1 to 5 with **REP. KADAS** voting in favor.

Motion/Vote: **REP. KADAS** moved to table House Bill 277. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 113

Tape No. 1:A:165

Discussion: **SEN. CHUCK SWYSGOOD** noted that he believed there was a dental hygienist program at the Salish Kootenai College which would duplicate the program mentioned in the bill. **EXHIBIT 2 Brady Vardemann, Associate Commissioner Vocational Technical Education, OCHE,** explained that at this time the program being developed at Salish Kootenai College was a dental assistant program which was a one-year certificate program.

Motion/Vote: **REP. PECK** moved to table House Bill 113. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SENATE BILL 77

Tape No. 1:A:251

Discussion: **SEN. SWYSGOOD** noted that the Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education Policy and Budget mentioned in the bill was worthwhile. **EXHIBIT 3** He added that the cost was small at \$11,000. **REP. PECK** asked if **SEN SWYSGOOD** would be opposed to an amendment adding a student member to the committee. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** said he would be receptive to the suggestion.

Motion/Vote: **REP. PECK** moved to amend SB 77 by adding a student member to the committee by adding language on page 2 of the bill between lines 8 and 9. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

Motion: **REP. PECK** moved a do pass on SB 77 as amended.

Discussion: **SEN. DENNIS NATHE** asked if the committee mentioned in the bill looked at curriculum. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** replied affirmatively. **SEN. NATHE** stated his concern that students trained in psychology were not given the correct type of training

to work in the mental health clinics where the need is great for personnel. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** said the scope of the committee is broad enough to include the review of curricula.

Vote: The motion **CARRIED** 5 to 1 with **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** opposed.

REP. KADAS referred to the committee's previous day's executive action to accept the adjusted 1992 base. He stated his concern that it was based on an enrollment for 89-90. He argued that the base accepted by the committee should as accurately as possible reflect the current enrollment situation. The distribution of cuts should reflect the students presently on campus.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Tape No. 1:A:455

Motion: **REP. KADAS** moved that the level of reductions approved by the committee in executive action on the university base budget on 2/08/93 be distributed across the units based on FY91-92 enrollment figures.

Discussion: **REP. KADAS** noted the importance for future budget development to have the present budget based on an accurate enrollment figure. He added that this could be done if the same bottom line was used and cuts were distributed according to the new enrollment by reducing the instructional support by a given percentage and by increasing the student/faculty ratio by the same percentage. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** mentioned that the goal was legitimate but it could be accomplished by going back to the budgets and redistributing money where it was needed based on the latest enrollment figures. After talking to **Taryn Purdy, LFA**, **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** noted that 91-92 enrollment figures were used in the committee's executive action the previous day.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON referred to **Exhibit 5, Table C** and asked **Ms. Purdy** to explain the effect of **REP. KADAS'** motion which would be amended. **Ms. Purdy** pointed out that if the same percentage as in the expenditure/unit in the LFA current level were applied to the bottom line of approximately \$285 million, **Table 3, Exhibit 4** showed what each unit would receive as a percentage cut. **Table C of Exhibit 5** showed the original reductions by unit with MSU being cut by \$6.9 million and UofM being cut by \$12.2 million. Using the new methodology, **Table 3 of Exhibit 4** shows the percent of the total of the LFA current level for each unit. Those percentages were used to allocate the approximately \$285 million to the units. The results were that MSU would now be reduced \$8.52 million, UofM- \$7.76 million, Eastern-\$2.54 million, Northern-\$1.36 million, Western- \$810,000 and Montana Tech-\$1.74 million. Thus, the reduction for MSU, Northern and Western would have increased while the reductions for UofM and Montana Tech would have been reduced.

Ms. Purdy then explained that the reason for the difference in the reductions with the new methodology was that UofM and Montana

Tech had the largest increases in enrollment compared to the other units; consequently, they would have the largest increases in the LFA current level for 1995 and therefore less of a reduction when the new methodology was used.

Motion: **REP. KADAS** amended his original motion to say that the committee use the proportions of the LFA current level for 1995 to distribute a base of \$285,849,825 among the six university units.

Discussion: **REP. KADAS** noted this would distribute the cuts based on 1991-1992 enrollments. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** suggested getting the Regents' reaction to the possibility of lump sum funding to the individual university units based on both the 89-90 and 91-92 enrollments. **REP. KADAS** said he believed the Regents wanted a lump sum budget for the system as a whole, a situation he felt the legislature would probably not approve. What was possible was a compromise position that perhaps involved allowing them to shift additional tuition revenue among campuses in order to give them some flexibility.

Rod Sundsted, Associate Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs, OCHE, responded to **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON'S** suggestion saying that the present motion distributed the reductions in a more equitable way than basing them on the 89-90 enrollments. He added that the OCHE presentation to the Regents was going to deal with specific reductions which would impact each campus differently so that the OCHE may return requesting a change in the distribution of the cuts. **REP. PECK** spoke in favor of **REP. KADAS'** motion. He said it was fair and just to follow the enrollment principle. **SEN. NATHE** also spoke in favor of the motion and said that enrollment figures should be used for the sake of consistency.

Vote: The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON suggested that the committee next examine the vo-tech centers' budgets. **Ms. Purdy** referred to **Table C of Exhibit 5** and **Table 3 of Exhibit 4** in her explanation. She said that there was a slight adjustment in the 1995 biennium base due to a recalculation of the pay plan. The correct base to focus on was the \$23.7 million in **Table 3**, rather than the \$24.5 million in **Table C**. She used the percentages in the last column of **Table 3** to recalculate the distribution of the \$23.7 million. Billings went from an increase of \$187,000 to an increase of \$262,000. Butte went from an increase of \$747,000 to an increase of \$207,000. Great falls went from an increase of \$129,000 to an increase of \$307,000. Helena went from an increase of \$243,000 to an increase of \$348,000. Missoula went from an increase of \$196,000 to an increase of \$378,000.

REP. PECK pointed out the discrepancy in the level of support to the Great Falls Vo-Tech compared with the others. Great Falls gets \$1,046/student whereas the next lowest was Butte which received \$1,261/student. The highest support went to Missoula

which received \$1,581/student. The reason for the large difference was that in the past, the school district in Great Falls supplied a much higher level of support services. That level has now been eliminated, and he said it was time to make the state support levels more equitable. He added that in Great Falls, tuition was supplying 29% of the budget, while in the other vo-tech centers, tuition supplied 21-22% of the budget.

SEN. SWYSGOOD asked if Butte would receive \$207,000 more than the LFA current level. **Ms. Purdy** said yes and added that the bottom line increase for the vo-tech centers from the LFA current level to the new adjusted 1992 base was \$1.5 million. **REP. KADAS** noted that several adjustments needed to be made in the vo-tech budgets including the support level for Great Falls and enrollment changes in Butte.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON VO-TECH CENTERS

Tape No. 1:B:10

Motion: **REP. KADAS** moved the use of the 1991-92 enrollment figures to distribute the \$1.5 million in increased funding.

Discussion: **SEN. NATHE** asked for clarification on the difference between the LFA current level for 1995 of \$22.2 million and the adjusted actual base for FY 92 of \$23.7 million. **Table 3, Exhibit 4 Skip Culver, LFA**, noted that the LFA current level reflected a decrease in enrollments.

Vote: The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

DISCUSSION ON FUNDING METHODOLOGY FOR UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON pointed out to the committee that they now had a choice to either leave in place the present budget for the university units for the Regents to respond to, or the committee could return to the units or the vo-techs for further action.

REP. PECK suggested waiting for the response from the OCHE. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** agreed with **REP. PECK**. **REP. KADAS** agreed that the committee should not at this time examine programs within the university units; however, he suggested revisiting the various agencies such as CES, AES, FSTS, etc. because LFA current level base was adopted for all their budgets and reductions needed to be made. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** agreed that the course of action suggested by **REP. KADAS** was appropriate.

SEN. DON BIANCHI noted that to be fair to the Regents, a decision needed to be made regarding lump sum funding to units. **REP. KADAS** noted that the nursing budget modification was built into the base. He asked **Ms. Purdy** if it was true that the reductions at MSU were not nursing specific and it was up to the Regents to decide how to distribute cuts within a unit. **Ms. Purdy** explained that whatever MSU expended on the nursing mod in FY92 would be carried forward into the figures just voted on by the committee, unless the unit did not spend up to its appropriation

for 1992 or if it were given an increase over the 1992 level.

SEN. BIANCHI referred to FY93 items which were not in the base such as \$271,000 for the MSU nursing program and \$129,000 for Education at Eastern and said the Regents could make accommodations for these programs if lump sum funding were used.

REP. KADAS continued the discussion on lump sum funding. He said that what the committee has done thus far was to set total dollar appropriations for each of the units, but the committee has not set an incremental budget, a faculty budget, a support budget or an institutional budget. He noted that this was lump sum funding by unit and allows the unit to decide how to deal with the reduction. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** agreed with **REP. KADAS'** interpretation of the current status of committee actions.

REP. PECK said that if lump sum funding was the desire of the committee, language should be added to the bill as to the committee's intent. He said he did not see the need for it because the system has authority to transfer up to five percent of its funding and in the past has only used two percent. He felt that establishing the budgets creates more accountability. The present testimony indicated that there was no problem with the five percent limit and until there was, there was no need to consider lump sum appropriations to the units. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** noted that the units have never been subject to as much restriction in their budgets as they will be in this biennium.

REP. PECK said he would not disagree with the concept of lump sum funding if the committee wished to adopt it, as long as it was done by unit. However, he emphasized that to protect the legislative authority to appropriate, the legislature must appropriate.

REP. KADAS asked how the next budget would be driven off the present base. A number of assumptions were needed to use the formula again. He stressed that instructions would have to be given to the staff concerning the committee's intent as to how the next budget would be developed.

REP. PECK asked **Ms. Purdy** about the approach she would choose if the committee directed her, once the total allocation was set, to distribute funds to the categories of each unit's budget. **Ms. Purdy** replied that it would depend on the goals of the committee for the individual programs. For instance, would the emphasis be on instruction? Would the individual allocations be made by program based on other factors such as inflation? Also to be considered was the degree of flexibility for the units. **REP. PECK** asked **Curt Nichols, OBPP**, about the mechanism of dealing with lump sum funding since the OBPP was advocating lump sum funding. **Mr. Nichols** commented that in the Racicot budget the concern was that the level of funding in the support program was growing while the instruction program was suffering on many of the campuses. **REP. PECK** noted that there was a great deal of tension presently between faculty and administrators and between the OCHE and the OBPP over the level of funding in support. He

was concerned that lump sum funding would only exacerbate the situation.

Tape No 1:B:625

REP. KADAS again spoke to the issue of setting the basis for the next budget. He suggested setting a dollar amount for each student based on a percentage of the peers for in-state students and then multiplying it by the enrollment. An incremental adjustment would then be made for fixed costs. He stressed the need to develop instructions for the development of the next budget.

SEN. BIANCHI asked what would happen if the Regents chose to limit access in order to maintain quality. He suggested that they should have that option. **REP. KADAS** said that a clause could be added that prevented penalizing the units if they chose to limit access in order to increase the amount of funding per student.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON asked **Mr. Nichols** to comment on the type of budgeting process he would recommend in the future considering the consequences of the present OBPP recommended budget, if it were enacted. **Mr. Nichols** was not prepared to comment. **REP. KADAS** strongly emphasized the need for the OBPP to think about the process of generating future budgets because a clear and consistent signal needed to be given to the six university units to guide their decision making.

REP. PECK wondered whether another study group was needed to make recommendations concerning how to fund the university system. He noted that an option was for the committee to draft a resolution and submit it. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** suggested that if SB 77 passed, the Joint Committee for Postsecondary Education Policy and Budget would be the appropriate place for this issue to be worked out. **REP. KADAS** disagreed with the need to establish another study group and said that the subcommittee should consider the issues and make the decision as to the type of funding mechanism to be used.

SEN. NATHE noted that the formula which was used from 1981 to 1987 was 85% FTE driven. He asked if the same situation held now. **Ms. Purdy** said that about 85% of the present budget was FTE driven with the money in support, instruction and in scholarships and fellowships. **SEN. NATHE** asked if the 85% would hold constant for lump sum funding or any other type of funding that was being discussed. **Ms. Purdy** said that in lump sum funding, some type of mechanism had to be devised to handle the bottom line, in which case the 85% could still hold. **SEN. NATHE** said it seemed that a different mechanism was being discussed because there was a lack of funding. If there were enough money, there would be no need to devise a new funding methodology. He stressed that a new format was not going to solve the money problem.

SEN. SWYSGOOD pointed out that there was good reason to examine

the funding question because there were inequities which develop under formula funding. When enrollment expanded rapidly, using the average of the two previous years' enrollments was not adequate. **REP. PECK** said that he did not like formula funding because it contributed to poor academic emphasis. It encouraged the recruitment of students for the sake of increasing numbers on campus rather than focusing on quality students. He also added that he felt that the peer comparison was too heavily relied upon. **REP. KADAS** remarked that the value of a formula and of peer comparisons was that it gave the system an idea of where other institutions were. The problem with the formula was that presently enrollment was being used to "push it" which causes schools to go out and recruit which needed to be stopped. He felt that peer institutions should continue to be used as a gauge for funding levels per student, but in addition limits on enrollment would have to be established.

SEN. BIANCHI stated that to be fair the committee needed to determine a methodology and be consistent in applying it from biennium to biennium. He felt the committee should revisit the formula approach and devise a method for future use. **REP. PECK** stated that another limitation to the formula was that it did not take into account high cost programs. **SEN. NATHE** noted that it did not make a difference as to whether lump sum funding or formula funding was being used because the base would still be 85% FTE driven. He said that a reasonable approach was the concept of lump sum funding within a corridor to stop the encouragement of recruiting students. **REP. KADAS** offered to work with a small group to develop a framework which included corridor funding, which he explained as a type of enrollment limitation, and then return to the subcommittee with the draft. After discussion of the committee's schedule, **REP. KADAS** said he would try to have a draft by February 15.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Tape No. 2:A:000

Discussion: **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** spoke to the need to revisit the budget for the community colleges. He reminded the committee that when it had first examined this budget, it had accepted the LFA current level and worked from there. Because the committee had funded at a 55% level and with the increases in some enrollments, the result was that the budget was increased by \$1.2 million. He felt it was unfair to raise this budget while so many other budgets were being reduced. **REP. KADAS** asked what the cost was for adding back in the students who originally had been accidentally omitted. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** replied that it was about \$400,000 and was included in the \$1.2 million. **REP. KADAS** noted that the \$400,000 should have been in there to begin with.

REP. PECK asked what a percentage point was worth in terms of the general fund. **Ms. Purdy** said that one percentage point was worth \$130,000 to \$140,000 when the funding per student was set at \$4163/student. She added that it would include the students who

were originally omitted. **REP. KADAS** asked if approximately \$260,000 would be saved over the biennium if the committee chose to reduce the level to 50%. **Ms. Purdy** agreed.

Motion: **SEN. SWYSGOOD** moved to reconsider the budget of the community colleges.

Discussion: **REP. KADAS** said that the main item that was driving this budget was the increase in student numbers due to the relatively low cost of education at the community colleges and access limitations at the university units. Because community colleges were the most cost-effective way of educating students at this level, he expressed concern for reducing their funding. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** reminded the committee that the six units just took an enormous reduction. He said his intent, if this motion was successful, was to take the community colleges to a 49% level of state support.

Vote: The motion **CARRIED** 5 to 1 with **REP. KADAS** opposed.

Motion: **SEN. SWYSGOOD** moved to adopt a support level for the community colleges of 49%.

Discussion: **SEN. NATHE** asked if it was **SEN. SWYSGOOD'S** intent to set a 49% level or to cut \$500,000. **Ms. Purdy** explained that a 49% support level at \$4,163/student and including all the students now enrolled would yield \$4.2 million compared to \$4.4 million currently appropriated which was a \$400,000 reduction over the biennium.

Vote: The motion **CARRIED** 5 to 1 with **REP. KADAS** opposed.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ONOFFICE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Tape No. 2:A:300

WICHE AND WAMI PROGRAMS

Discussion: **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** asked the OCHE how many students graduated each biennium in the veterinary medicine program of WICHE. **Mr. Sundsted** said there were nine new slots each year and nine graduating from the program each year. The total in the program over four years was 63. In reply to a question from **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON, John Hutchinson, Commissioner of Higher Education**, said he was not sure of the placement figures for veterinarians in Montana, but would find out. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** asked for information on the dentistry program. **Mr. Sundsted** explained that there were 13 continuing students in the program. During the biennium four new slots would open up in each fiscal year. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** said he believed that the program was good but he wondered if it was training people who could return to Montana. He stated that the need in Montana was for family physicians, and that the WAMI students whom he talked to were entering specialty areas. He wondered if the money would be better spent on the dental hygienist program where the graduates would be almost guaranteed good-paying jobs within Montana.

Dr. Hutchinson noted that there was concern that the WAMI students were not returning to Montana and to address that problem, a Rural Physicians Incentive Program was started. In it a fee was charged each WAMI student and the fees were placed in a loan repayment fund. Graduated students who return to practice in a rural area of Montana can have a portion of their loans repaid through the fund. The longer they stay in the community, a larger portion of their loan can be repaid. He said that six doctors already have been placed in rural Montana communities.

Dr. Hutchinson explained that Montana has some obligation not just to educate Montanans for Montana, but also to provide educational opportunities for its students so that they can access the work force. In regards to the Dental Hygiene Program, he said it was a worthwhile program which could quickly get students into the work force because of its short duration.

SEN. NATHE informed the committee that he was one of the WICHI commissioners from Montana. He noted that it was harder to get into a school of veterinary medicine than it was to get into medical school. He believed about 90% of Montana veterinarians graduated from the western veterinary schools associated with WICHE. He emphasized the worthwhile nature of the program.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON asked how many veterinarians were in Montana and if there were openings for the nine graduates each year. He noted that according to the Department of Labor there were only two openings in Montana last year.

REP. PECK noted that there was probably a surplus of dentists in Montana since the state had more dentists per capita than any other state. He noted that a family practice residency program was being developed in Billings to help keep WAMI students in Montana and he believed this would be effective.

Dr. Hutchinson agreed with **REP. PECK** that the family practice residency would help draw physicians to the area and keep them here. **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON** asked how much the program cost and how it was funded. **REP. PECK** answered that he had received information that it would cost about \$200,000 per year.

REP. KADAS asked **Ms. Purdy** what the savings would be if the new slots for dentistry, veterinary medicine and optometry were cut in half. **Mr. Sundsted** stated that he had given the committee some erroneous information by picking up biennial totals and supplied the correct data. Under the WICHI dentistry program, there were two new slots in 1994 and a continuing number of seven for a total of nine. In the WICHI veterinary medicine program, there were nine new slots in 1994 and a continuing number of 32 for a total of 41. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** noted that to decrease the program, one would have to limit entering students. **Ms. Purdy** replied to an earlier question by **REP. KADAS**. She explained that cutting in half the entering student numbers in optometry, veterinary medicine and dentistry would save \$206,000 the first year. Because these students would not be continuing, in the

second year an additional amount of \$206,000 would be saved.

Motion/Vote: REP. KADAS moved to reduce by half the number of new students in the WICHE programs of dentistry, optometry and veterinary medicine. The motion CARRIED 5 to 1 with SEN. NATHE opposed.

Ms. Purdy asked for clarification on the motion. She asked REP. KADAS if he wished to make any adjustment to the continuing students in the second year for the number of students that were reduced in 1994. REP. KADAS said he assumed if they were reduced in 1994, they would stay reduced in 1995.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 11:00 a.m.



REP. ROYAL JOHNSON, Chair



JACQUELINE BREHE, Secretary

jb/

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EDUCATION

SUB-COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE

2-9-93

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN	✓		
SEN. DON BIANCHI, VICE CHAIRMAN	✓		
REP. MIKE KADAS	✓		
SEN. DENNIS NATHE	✓		
REP. RAY PECK	✓		
SEN. CHUCK SWYSGOOD	✓		

House BILL NO. 277

INTRODUCED BY

Stewart, Russell, Steve Johnson
Karey Aguirre, Chickadee Yellowtail

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT APPROPRIATING MONEY TO THE COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO FUND AMERICAN INDIAN/MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT."

WHEREAS, American Indians comprise approximately 6% of Montana's population; and

WHEREAS, less than 3% of American Indian students are enrolled in the Montana University System; and

WHEREAS, by the year 2000, a high school diploma will provide an opening to only 49% of the available jobs; and

WHEREAS, between 1993 and the year 2000, one-third of the new jobs created will be filled by college graduates; and

WHEREAS, Montana's economic future depends upon a well-educated work force.

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

NEW SECTION. **Section 1. Appropriation.** There is appropriated from the general fund to the commissioner of higher education \$175,648 for the biennium ending June 30, 1995, to fund the staff and operation of the director of American Indian/ minority achievement. The director shall:

- (1) use the money to improve the recruitment and retention of American Indians in higher education by:
 - (a) continuing the data collection and analysis begun by the Montana tracks program;
 - (b) serving as a consultant to the Montana university system campuses and vocational-technical centers to develop plans for recruitment and retention; and
 - (c) serving as a liaison between the Montana university system, tribal governments, and tribal colleges;
- (2) provide a report to the 55th legislature on the accomplishments of and data collected by the program during the 1995 biennium.

-End-

EXHIBIT /

DATE 2-9-93

INTRODUCED BY House BILL NO. 113
Amplifier

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT APPROPRIATING MONEY FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY THE GREAT FALLS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTER OF A 2-YEAR ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREE PROGRAM IN DENTAL HYGIENE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE."

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

NEW SECTION. **Section 1.** Appropriation. The following money is appropriated from the general fund to the board of regents of higher education to be used solely to implement at the Great Falls vocational-technical center a 2-year associate of applied science degree program in dental hygiene as approved by the board of regents:

Fiscal year 1993	\$89,641
Fiscal year 1994	\$192,770

NEW SECTION. **Section 2.** Effective date. [This act] is effective July 1, 1993.

-End-

EXHIBIT 2
 DATE 2-9-93
 CD _____

EXHIBIT 2
 DATE 2-9-93
 CD _____

1 SENATE BILL NO. 77

2 INTRODUCED BY SWYSGOOD

3 BY REQUEST OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY

4 EDUCATION POLICY AND BUDGET

5

6 A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT CONTINUING THE JOINT
7 COMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY AND BUDGET; AND
8 PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE AND A TERMINATION
9 DATE."
10

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

12 NEW SECTION. Section 1. Definitions. As used in
13 [sections 1 through 8], the following definitions apply:

14 (1) "Committee" means the joint committee on
15 postsecondary education policy and budget created in
16 [section 2].
17 (2) "University system" means those units listed in
18 20-25-201 and the vocational-technical centers designated in
19 20-16-106.

20 NEW SECTION. Section 2. Joint committee on
21 postsecondary education policy and budget -- appointment and
22 composition. (1) There is a joint committee on postsecondary
23 education policy and budget.

24 (2) The committee is composed of:

25 (a) two members of the senate, appointed by the

1 committee on committees on a bipartisan basis, and two
2 members of the house of representatives, appointed by the
3 speaker of the house on a bipartisan basis;

4 (b) two regents appointed by the chairman of the board
5 of regents;

6 (c) the commissioner of higher education; and

7 (d) a representative from the executive branch
8 appointed by the governor.

9 (3) Legislative appointments must be made before final
10 adjournment of a regular session.

11 (4) All other appointments must be made prior to the
12 first committee meeting following adjournment of a regular
13 session.

14 NEW SECTION. Section 3. Term of office. (1)
15 Legislative appointments to the committee are for 2 years. A
16 legislative member of the committee shall serve until the
17 legislator's term of office is ended.

18 (2) Appointments of members of the board of regents to
19 the committee are for 2 years or until the expiration of the
20 members' terms on the board of regents, whichever occurs
21 first.

22 (3) The commissioner of higher education's appointment
23 to the committee is continuous.

24 (4) The appointment of an executive branch
25 representative to the committee is for 2 years.

EXHIBIT 3A

DATE 2-4-93

M

1 NEW SECTION. **Section 4. Vacancies.** (1) A legislative
2 vacancy occurring during a legislative session must be
3 filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

4 (2) A legislative vacancy occurring when the
5 legislature is not in session must be filled by the
6 selection of a member from the appropriate house and
7 political party by the remaining members of the committee.
8 (3) All other vacancies must be filled in the same
9 manner as the original appointment.

10 (4) An appointment to the committee under this section
11 is for the unexpired term of the original member.

12 NEW SECTION. **Section 5. Officers** -- quorum --
13 meetings. (1) The committee shall select one of its members
14 as presiding officer and may elect other officers it
15 considers necessary.

16 (2) A simple majority of the committee constitutes a
17 quorum to do business.

18 (3) The committee shall meet at least quarterly.

19 NEW SECTION. **Section 6. Compensation.** (1) Legislative
20 members are entitled to receive compensation and expenses as
21 provided in 5-2-302.

22 (2) Members appointed by the board of regents are
23 entitled to:

24 (a) \$50 for each day in which a member is actually and
25 necessarily engaged in the performance of committee duties;

1 and

2 (b) travel expenses, as provided for in 2-18-501
3 through 2-18-503.

4 NEW SECTION. **Section 7. Staff assistance.** The
5 legislative fiscal analyst shall provide staff assistance to
6 the committee. The legislative fiscal analyst has the same
7 authority of investigation and examination on behalf of the
8 committee as provided under 5-12-303.

9 NEW SECTION. **Section 8. Powers and duties of**
10 **committee.** (1) The committee may:

11 (a) organize and adopt rules to govern its proceedings;

12 and

13 (b) exercise the investigatory powers of a standing
14 committee under Title 5, chapter 5, part 1.

15 (2) The committee shall:

16 (a) provide information to the board of regents in the
17 following areas:

18 (i) annual budget allocations;

19 (ii) annual goal statement development;

20 (iii) long-range planning;

21 (iv) outcome assessment programs; and

22 (v) any other area that the committee considers to have
23 significant educational or fiscal policy impact;

24 (b) periodically review the success or failure of the
25 university system in meeting its annual goals and long-range

1 plans;
2 (c) periodically review the results of outcome
3 assessment programs;
4 (d) develop mechanisms to ensure strict accountability
5 of the revenues and expenditures of the university system;
6 (e) study and report to the legislature on the
7 advisability of adjustments to the mechanisms used to
8 determine funding for the university system, including
9 criteria for determining appropriate levels of funding;
10 (f) act as a liaison between both the legislative and
11 executive branches and the board of regents;
12 (g) encourage cooperation between the legislative and
13 executive branches and the board of regents; and
14 (h) report its activities, findings, recommendations,
15 and any proposed legislation to the legislature.
16 NEW SECTION. Section 9. Effective date. [This act] is
17 effective on passage and approval.
18 NEW SECTION. Section 10. Termination. [This act]
19 terminates July 1, 1995.

-End-

EXHIBIT 3 B
DATE 2-9-93
SB

EXHIBIT 4
DATE 2-9-93
CS

ISSUES RELATING TO USE OF ADJUSTED FISCAL 1992 BASE

Six University Units Vocational-Technical Centers

I. ISSUE 1 - Potential Increases to the Base. Does the committee wish to add any other costs to the adjusted fiscal 1992 base?

1. Fixed Costs and Inflation - Table 1
 - a) fixed costs total \$728,183 over the biennium for the six units and \$100,614 for the vo-techs.
 - b) inflationary increases currently in the LFA current level for fiscal 1992 expenditures total \$1,385,458 in the six units and \$178,480 in the vo-techs.

2. Personal Services - Table 2
 - a) adding funds to fund personal services to the December RERS level adds \$2,733,780 to the six units and reduces the vo-techs by \$96,188.

3. Other

II. ISSUE 2 - Enrollment and Allocations Among Units - Table 3

Does the committee wish to make any adjustments to the allocations of expenditures among the units?

III. ISSUE 3 - Allocations Among Programs - Table 4

Does the committee wish to make any adjustments to the allocations of expenditures among programs within the six university units?

IV. ISSUE 4 - Enrollment Increases - Table 5

Does the committee wish to make any adjustments to the adjusted actual fiscal 1992 base for changes in enrollment?

V. ISSUE 5 - Tuition Policy and Fee Waivers

A. Tuition Estimates

1. What number of students will be used to estimate tuition
2. What mix of resident and nonresident students will be used
3. What assumptions of increases in tuition fees will be used

B. What if any adjustments to fee waivers will be made - Table 6

TABLE 1
Potential Additional Fixed Costs and Inflation
Six Units and Vo - Techs

Unit	Fiscal 1992 Adjusted Base	----- Six Units ----- Additional Audit Over Base	Additional Insurance	Warrant Writing Fees	Option 1 Adjusted FY 92 Base	LFA Current Level	LFA Over (Under) Adjusted FY 92 Base	Inflation	Option 2 Adjusted FY 92 Base	LFA Over (Under) Adjusted FY 92 Base
MSU	109,096,897	14,339	193,355	25,265	109,329,856	115,657,261	6,327,405	451,392	109,548,289	6,108,972
UM	93,186,413	17,039	162,835	14,557	93,380,844	105,293,507	11,912,663	437,961	93,624,374	11,669,133
EMC	33,931,953	37,274	45,933	12,753	34,027,913	34,538,841	510,928	238,687	34,170,640	368,201
NMC	18,048,612	5,237	38,004	5,961	18,097,814	18,471,363	373,549	56,269	18,104,881	366,482
WMCUM	10,501,727	47,317	21,202	3,775	10,574,021	11,059,382	485,361	68,863	10,570,590	488,792
MCMST	21,084,223	28,722	48,567	6,048	21,167,550	23,568,418	2,400,858	132,286	21,216,509	2,351,909
TOTAL	285,849,825	149,928	509,896	68,359	286,578,008	308,588,772	22,010,764	1,385,458	287,235,283	21,353,489
----- Vo - Techs -----										
Billings	4,060,630	2,068	7,263	1,770	4,071,731	3,883,353	(188,378)	41,736	4,102,366	(219,013)
Butte	3,815,020	3,626	7,145	1,540	3,827,331	3,079,808	(747,523)	18,927	3,833,947	(754,139)
Great Falls	4,675,193	5,112	14,837	3,130	4,698,272	4,530,107	(168,165)	33,916	4,709,109	(179,002)
Helena	5,403,418	5,268	14,678	2,554	5,425,918	5,188,893	(237,025)	34,348	5,437,766	(248,873)
Missoula	5,781,480	8,138	20,574	2,911	5,813,103	5,608,118	(204,985)	49,553	5,831,033	(222,915)
Total	23,735,741	24,212	64,497	11,905	23,836,355	22,290,279	(1,546,076)	178,480	23,914,221	(1,623,942)

TABLE 2
Difference Between Adjusted Fiscal 1992 Base and RERS
December RERS Run
1995 Biennium

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Public Service</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Plant</u>	<u>Total</u>
MSU	989,132	4,230	52,382	541,880	228,849	1,816,473
UM	866,016	19,694	(1,336)	521,286	137,670	1,543,330
EMC	(414,947)	0	(76,759)	(252,557)	26,926	(717,337)
NMC	(66,887)	0	0	(113,064)	49,945	(130,006)
WMCUM	(6,151)	0	0	(28,320)	(85,906)	(120,377)
MCMST	279,254	(5,610)	0	17,523	50,530	341,697
TOTAL	<u>1,646,417</u>	<u>18,314</u>	<u>(25,713)</u>	<u>686,748</u>	<u>408,014</u>	<u>2,733,780</u>
-- Vo-Techs --						
<u>All Programs</u>						
Billings	35,127					
Butte	(49,932)					
Great Falls	24,212					
Helena	(1,785)					
Missoula	(103,810)					
Total	<u>(96,188)</u>					

TABLE SUMMARY
Total Potential Additional Costs
Comparison to LFA Current Level

Unit	Adjusted Base Fiscal 1992	LFA Current Level	LFA Current Level Over (Under) Base	Option 1 Fixed Costs	Option 2 Inflation	Option 3 Dec RERS	Optional Adjusted FY 92 Base	LFA Current Level Over (Under) Optional Base
MSU	109,096,897	115,657,261	6,560,364	232,959	451,392	1,816,473	111,597,721	4,059,540
UM	93,186,413	105,293,507	12,107,094	194,431	437,961	1,543,330	95,362,135	9,931,372
EMC	33,931,953	34,538,841	606,888	95,960	238,687	(717,337)	33,549,263	989,578
NMC	18,048,612	18,471,363	422,751	49,202	56,269	(130,006)	18,024,077	447,286
WMCUM	10,501,727	11,059,382	557,655	72,294	68,863	(120,377)	10,522,507	536,875
MCMST	21,084,223	23,568,418	2,484,195	83,337	132,286	341,697	21,641,543	1,926,875
Total	285,849,825	308,588,772	22,738,947	728,183	1,385,458	2,733,780	290,697,246	17,891,526
Billings	4,060,630	3,883,353	(177,277)	11,101	41,736	35,127	4,148,594	(265,241)
Butte	3,815,020	3,079,808	(735,212)	12,311	18,927	(49,932)	3,796,326	(716,518)
Great Falls	4,675,193	4,530,107	(145,086)	23,079	33,916	24,212	4,756,400	(226,293)
Helena	5,403,418	5,188,893	(214,525)	22,500	34,348	(1,785)	5,458,481	(269,588)
Missoula	5,781,480	5,608,118	(173,362)	31,623	49,553	(103,810)	5,758,846	(150,728)
Total	23,735,741	22,290,279	(1,445,462)	100,614	178,480	(96,188)	23,918,647	(1,628,368)

EXHIBIT 4c
 DATE 2-9-93
 SB _____

TABLE 3
 Comparison of Allocations, by Unit
 Adjusted Actual Fiscal 1992 to LFA Current Level

--- Six University Units ---				
Unit	Adjusted Actual Fiscal 1992	Percent of Total	LFA Current Level 1995 Biennium	Percent of Total
MSU	109,096,897	38.2%	115,657,261	37.5%
UM	93,186,413	32.6%	105,293,507	34.1%
EMC	33,931,953	11.9%	34,538,841	11.2%
NMC	18,048,612	6.3%	18,471,363	6.0%
WMCUM	10,501,727	3.7%	11,059,382	3.6%
MCMST	<u>21,084,223</u>	7.4%	<u>23,568,418</u>	7.6%
Total	<u>285,849,825</u>		<u>308,588,772</u>	
--- Vocational Technical Centers ---				
Billings	4,060,630	17.1%	3,873,137	17.4%
Butte	3,815,020	16.1%	3,068,020	13.8%
Great Falls	4,675,193	19.7%	4,545,360	20.4%
Helena	5,403,418	22.8%	5,160,696	23.2%
Missoula	<u>5,781,480</u>	24.4%	<u>5,585,476</u>	25.1%
Total	<u>23,735,741</u>		<u>22,232,689</u>	

TABLE 4
 Comparison of Allocations Among Programs
 Adjusted Actual Fiscal 1992 to LFA Current Level
 Six University Units

All Units	Adjusted Actual Fiscal 1992	Percent of Total	LFA Current Level 1995 Biennium	Percent of Total
Instruction	75,660,600	52.9%	169,769,915	55.0%
Research	1,472,548	1.0%	2,725,193	0.9%
Public Service	998,275	0.7%	2,042,030	0.7%
Plant	17,854,283	12.5%	35,372,702	11.5%
Support	43,781,141	30.6%	88,800,348	28.8%
Scholar/Fellow	<u>3,158,065</u>	2.2%	<u>9,878,585</u>	3.2%
Total	<u>142,924,912</u>		<u>308,588,773</u>	

TABLE 5
Changes in Enrollment
Budgeted to Fiscal 1992 to Fiscal 1993

Unit	Budgeted 1995 Biennium FTE LFA Current Level	Actual Fiscal 1992 FTE	Fiscal 1992 Over (Under) Budgeted FTE	Estimated Fiscal 1993 FTE*	Fiscal 1993 Over (Under) Budgeted FTE
MSU	9,574	9,491	(83)	10,041	467
UM	9,161	9,482	321	9,628	467
EMC	3,274	3,139	(135)	3,260	(14)
NMC	1,622	1,673	51	1,582	(40)
WMCUM	945	974	29	989	44
MCMST	<u>1,653</u>	<u>1,694</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>1,785</u>	<u>132</u>
Total	<u>26,228</u>	<u>26,453</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>27,285</u>	<u>1,056</u>

*Incorporated in the executive budget revenue estimates

TABLE 6

Total Fee Waivers
Six University Units
Fiscal 1992

Waiver Category	MSU	UM	EMC	NMC	WMCUM	MCMST	Total	Percent of Total
<i>Discretionary Waivers</i>								
In-State 6%	61,833	33,545	102,624	18,556	6,345	41,464	264,367	6.9%
Out-of-State					900		900	0.0%
In-State Athletic	111,922	78,298	17,508		5,220	16,155	229,103	6.0%
Out-of-State Athletic	245,979	172,006	28,417	33,606	15,900	36,585	532,493	14.0%
In-State Graduate	87,732	94,345				1,799	183,876	4.8%
Out-of-State Graduate	192,818	207,387		4,110		12,309	416,624	10.9%
In-State Undergraduate	21,206	15,509				0	36,715	1.0%
Out-of-State Undergraduate	46,610	34,090		21,544		17,753	119,997	3.1%
In-State WICHE						0	0	0.0%
Out-of-State WICHE						8,285	8,285	0.2%
Faculty and Staff	37,938	37,547	12,024	10,789	4,171	9,906	112,375	2.9%
Athletic In-State	106,469	89,922	33,029	52,599	58,643	64,356	405,018	10.6%
In-State Graduate Students	82,851	126,479	36,735	3,577	0	21,003	270,645	7.1%
Total Discretionary Waivers	995,358	889,128	230,337	144,781	91,179	229,615	2,580,398	67.7%
<i>Mandatory Waivers</i>								
Indian Students	95,804	136,692	102,023	139,786	12,793	9,800	496,898	13.0%
Veterans	73,114	78,557	37,143	40,775	9,036	15,152	253,777	6.7%
War Orphans	2,123	1,774	0	2,135	0	0	6,032	0.2%
Prisoners of War	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Senior Citizens	6,416	10,333	2,966	2,299	4,203	2,502	28,719	0.8%
Custodial Students	1,154	15	1,036	0	0	0	2,205	0.1%
Community Colleges	1,076	6,244	3,668	1,124	0	0	12,112	0.3%
High School Honor	193,499	130,971	36,408	10,327	8,593	37,986	417,784	11.0%
National Merit	9,964	3,576	0			0	13,540	0.4%
Total Mandatory Waivers	383,150	368,162	183,244	196,446	34,625	65,440	1,231,067	32.3%
Total Scholarships and Fellowships	1,378,508	1,257,290	413,581	341,227	125,804	295,055	3,811,465	100.0%

EXHIBIT
DATE

40
2-9-93

5
DATE 2-9-93
SB _____

DETERMINATION OF A FUNDING BASE

Six University Units Vocational Technical Centers

ISSUE - WHAT FUNDING MECHANISM WILL BE USED TO CALCULATE 1995 BIENNIUM CURRENT LEVEL BUDGETS FOR THE SIX UNIVERSITY UNITS AND THE VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTERS

- Option 1: Formula Funding Mechanism
- Option 2: Incremental Funding Mechanism

ISSUE - WHAT BASE WILL BE USED TO DETERMINE 1995 BIENNIUM CURRENT LEVEL BUDGETS FOR THE SIX UNIVERSITY UNITS AND THE VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTERS

Considerations:

- 1) 1993 Biennium Pay Plan Costs
- 2) Benefits Adjustments
- 3) Fixed Costs
- 4) Inflation
- 5) Enrollment Adjustments

- Option 1: LFA Current Level
- Option 2: Executive Budget
- Option 3: 1993 Biennium Actual and Appropriated
- Option 4: Adjusted 1992 Actual Expenditures

ISSUE - HOW WILL THE APPROPRIATED FUNDS BE ALLOCATED AMONG UNITS AND AMONG PROGRAMS

Adjustments for a relative shift in student FTE

ISSUE - TUITION AND TUITION POLICY AND ITS IMPACT ON THE CURRENT LEVEL BASE AND GENERAL FUND LEVELS

- 1) Determining total tuition available
 - a) total student FTE
 - b) mix of resident and nonresident
- 2) Impact on expenditures
- 3) Anticipating tuition increases

TABLE A
Comparison of LFA Current Level to 1993 Biennium
Initial Reduction Target
General Fund, Only

DATE 2-9-93

SB

Unit	1993 Biennium	LFA 1995 Biennium	Initial Target	Subcommittee Action Through 06-Feb-93	Remaining Initial Target	Additional Target	Remaining Total Target
---- Six University Units ----							
MSU	71,320,228	70,905,179	(415,049)	71,282,958	(37,270)		
UM	56,350,453	59,089,286	2,738,833	59,200,050	2,849,597		
EMC	21,226,621	21,388,886	162,265	21,194,971	(31,650)		
NMC	12,199,521	11,871,831	(327,690)	11,882,410	(317,111)		
WMCUM	7,009,989	7,207,526	197,537	7,057,176	47,187		
MCMST	<u>14,686,488</u>	<u>16,182,912</u>	<u>1,496,424</u>	<u>16,166,694</u>	<u>1,480,206</u>		
Total Six Units	182,793,300	186,645,620	3,852,320	186,784,259	3,990,959		
---- Vocational Technical Centers ----							
Billings	2,476,634	2,300,841	(175,793)	2,290,625	(186,009)		
Butte	2,925,601	2,235,666	(689,935)	2,223,878	(701,723)		
Great Falls	3,213,251	2,871,311	(341,940)	2,886,564	(326,687)		
Helena	3,999,019	3,767,182	(231,837)	3,738,985	(260,034)		
Missoula	<u>4,085,416</u>	<u>3,964,016</u>	<u>(121,400)</u>	<u>3,941,374</u>	<u>(144,042)</u>		
Total Vo-Techs	16,699,921	15,139,016	(1,560,905)	15,081,426	(1,618,495)		
CHE	21,164,483	22,954,625	1,790,142	22,871,786	1,707,303		
AES	15,170,666	15,869,754	699,088	15,044,344	(126,322)		
CES	5,847,494	5,555,127	(292,367)	5,868,438	20,944		
FCES	1,416,555	1,398,825	(17,730)	1,479,519	62,964		
MINES	2,613,671	2,705,110	91,439	2,731,478	117,807		
FSTS	<u>479,688</u>	<u>496,661</u>	<u>16,973</u>	<u>509,804</u>	<u>30,116</u>		
TOTAL HIGHER ED	246,185,778	250,764,738	4,578,960	250,371,054	4,185,276		
OPI	91,094,589	90,428,764	(665,825)	100,422,130	9,327,541		
Board of Pub Ed	209,980	229,268	19,288	222,199	12,219		
MSDB	<u>5,504,347</u>	<u>5,626,423</u>	<u>122,076</u>	<u>4,958,869</u>	<u>(545,478)</u>		
TOTAL EDUCATION	342,994,694	347,049,193	4,054,499	355,974,252	12,979,558	20,328,073	33,307,631

TABLE B
Comparison of LFA Current Level to 1993 Biennium
Initial Reduction Target
Total Funds

Unit	1993 Biennium	LFA 1995 Biennium	Initial Target	Subcommittee Action Through 06-Feb-93	Remaining Initial Target	Percent Reduction LFA 1995 Biennium	Subc Action Remove Target Over (Under) 1993 Biennium	Additional Target Allocated Based Upon Subcommittee Action	Total Funds	Subc Action Remove Target Over (Under) 1993 Biennium
--- Six University Units ---										
MSU	107,707,551	115,657,261	(415,049)	116,035,040	(37,270)	--	7.7%	7,640,296	108,394,744	0.6%
UM	93,510,666	105,293,507	2,738,833	105,404,271	2,849,597	2.7%	9.7%	6,940,316	95,614,358	2.2%
EMC	32,875,742	34,538,841	162,265	34,344,926	(31,650)	--	4.5%	2,261,432	32,083,494	-2.4%
NMC	17,708,886	18,471,363	(327,690)	18,481,942	(317,111)	--	4.4%	1,216,938	17,265,004	-2.5%
WMCMCUM	10,222,640	11,059,382	197,537	10,909,032	47,187	0.4%	6.3%	718,302	10,143,543	-0.8%
MCMST	20,610,158	23,568,418	1,496,424	23,552,200	1,480,206	6.3%	7.1%	1,550,788	20,521,206	-0.4%
Total Six Units	282,635,643	308,588,772	3,852,320	308,727,411	3,990,959	1.3%	7.8%	20,328,073	284,022,348	0.6%
--- Vocational Technical Centers ---										
Billings	3,891,444	3,883,353	(175,793)	3,873,137	(186,009)	--	-0.5%			
Butte	3,662,475	3,079,808	(689,935)	3,068,020	(701,723)	--	-16.2%			
Great Falls	4,539,700	4,530,107	(341,940)	4,545,360	(326,687)	--	0.1%			
Helena	5,156,999	5,188,893	(231,837)	5,160,696	(260,034)	--	0.1%			
Missoula	5,472,634	5,608,118	(121,400)	5,585,476	(144,042)	--	2.1%			
Total Vo-Techs	22,723,252	22,290,279	(1,560,905)	22,232,689	(1,618,495)	-7.3%				
Additional Target								20,328,073		

5
2-9-93

TABLE B1
Comparison of LFA Current Level to 1993 Biennium
Initial Reduction Target
Total Funds, with Budget Amendments

Unit	DATE	SB	1993 Biennium	LFA 1995 Biennium	Initial Target	Subcommittee Action Through 06-Feb-93	Remaining Initial Target	Percent Reduction LFA 1995 Biennium	Subc Action Remove Target Over (Under) 1993 Biennium	Additional Target Allocated Based Upon Subcommittee Action	Total Funds	Subc Action Remove Target Over (Under) 1993 Biennium
--- Six University Units ---												
MSU			112,877,612	115,657,261	(415,049)	116,035,040	(37,270)	--	2.8%	7,640,296	108,394,744	-4.0%
UM			100,424,500	105,293,507	2,738,833	105,404,271	2,849,597	2.7%	2.1%	6,940,316	95,614,358	-4.8%
EMC			33,594,432	34,538,841	162,265	34,344,926	(31,650)	--	2.2%	2,261,432	32,083,494	-4.5%
WMCUM			18,267,477	18,471,363	(327,690)	18,481,942	(317,111)	--	1.2%	1,216,938	17,265,004	-5.5%
MCMST			10,596,956	11,059,382	197,537	10,909,032	47,187	0.4%	2.5%	718,302	10,143,543	-4.3%
			21,491,788	23,568,418	1,496,424	23,552,200	1,480,206	6.3%	2.7%	1,550,788	20,521,206	-4.5%
Total Six Units			297,252,765	308,588,772	3,852,320	308,727,411	3,990,959	1.3%	2.5%	20,328,073	284,022,348	-4.3%
--- Vocational Technical Centers ---												
Billings			4,111,316	3,883,353	(175,793)	3,873,137	(186,009)	--	-5.8%			
Butte			3,706,702	3,079,808	(689,935)	3,068,020	(701,723)	--	-17.2%			
Great Falls			4,680,170	4,530,107	(341,940)	4,545,360	(326,687)	--	-2.9%			
Helena			5,244,038	5,188,893	(231,837)	5,160,696	(260,034)	--	-1.6%			
Missoula			5,620,209	5,608,118	(121,400)	5,585,476	(144,042)	--	-0.6%			
Total Vo-Techs			23,362,435	22,290,279	(1,560,905)	22,232,689	(1,618,495)	-7.3%				
Additional Target										20,328,073		

TABLE C
Comparison of LFA Current Level to Adjusted Fiscal 1992 Expenditures
1995 Biennium
Total Funds

EXHIBIT 5
DATE 2-9-93
SD

----- Six University Units -----

Unit	Adjusted Actual Fiscal 1992	1995 Biennium Base	LFA Current Level	LFA Over (Under) Base
MSU	54,548,448	109,096,897	116,035,040	6,938,143
UM	46,593,206	93,186,413	105,404,271	12,217,858
EMC	16,965,977	33,931,953	34,344,926	412,973
NMC	9,024,306	18,048,612	18,481,942	433,330
WMCUM	5,250,863	10,501,727	10,909,032	407,305
MCMST	<u>10,542,111</u>	<u>21,084,223</u>	<u>23,552,200</u>	<u>2,467,977</u>

Total Six Units	142,924,911	285,849,825	308,727,411	22,877,586
-----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------

General Fund	97,253,415	163,906,672	186,784,259	22,877,587
Millage	11,887,000	25,085,000	25,085,000	0
Tuition	33,158,465	95,284,356	95,284,356	0
Other	<u>626,032</u>	<u>1,573,796</u>	<u>1,573,796</u>	<u>0</u>

Total Funding	142,924,912	285,849,824	308,727,411	22,877,587
---------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------

----- Vocational Technical Centers -----

Billings	2,099,019	4,198,038	3,873,137	(324,901)
Butte	1,919,727	3,839,454	3,068,020	(771,434)
Great Falls	2,463,728	4,927,457	4,545,360	(382,097)
Helena	2,792,633	5,585,266	5,160,696	(424,570)
Missoula	<u>3,002,618</u>	<u>6,005,236</u>	<u>5,585,476</u>	<u>(419,760)</u>

Total Vo-Techs	12,277,725	24,555,451	22,232,689	(2,322,762)
----------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------

General Fund	9,389,053	17,404,188	15,081,426	(2,322,762)
Millage	965,005	1,800,000	1,800,000	0
Tuition	1,885,761	5,275,449	5,275,449	0
Other	<u>37,907</u>	<u>75,814</u>	<u>75,814</u>	<u>0</u>

Total Funding	12,277,726	24,555,451	22,232,689	(2,322,762)
---------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------

Total Reduction from LFA Current Level				20,554,825
--	--	--	--	------------

TABLE C1
Comparison of LFA Current Level to Adjusted Fiscal 1992 Expenditures
1995 Biennium
Total Funds, Including Budget Amendments

EXHIBIT 5

DATE 2-9-93

SB _____

----- Six University Units -----

Unit	Adjusted Actual Fiscal 1992	1995 Biennium Base	LFA Current Level	LFA Over (Under) Base
MSU	55,850,456	111,700,913	116,035,040	4,334,127
UM	49,442,083	98,884,167	105,404,271	6,520,104
EMC	17,073,958	34,147,915	34,344,926	197,011
NMC	9,311,036	18,622,072	18,481,942	(140,130)
WMCUM	5,397,731	10,795,463	10,909,032	113,569
MCMST	<u>10,831,606</u>	<u>21,663,213</u>	<u>23,552,200</u>	<u>1,888,987</u>
Total Six Units	147,906,870	295,813,743	308,727,411	12,913,668

General Fund	97,253,415	173,870,590	186,784,259	12,913,669
Millage	11,887,000	25,085,000	25,085,000	0
Tuition	38,140,424	95,284,356	95,284,356	0
Other	<u>626,032</u>	<u>1,573,796</u>	<u>1,573,796</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Funding	147,906,871	295,813,742	308,727,411	12,913,669

----- Vocational Technical Centers -----

Billings	2,169,163	4,338,326	3,873,137	(465,189)
Butte	1,937,565	3,875,130	3,068,020	(807,110)
Great Falls	2,501,963	5,003,927	4,545,360	(458,567)
Helena	2,822,403	5,644,806	5,160,696	(484,110)
Missoula	<u>3,028,967</u>	<u>6,057,934</u>	<u>5,585,476</u>	<u>(472,458)</u>

Total Vo-Techs	12,460,061	24,920,123	22,232,689	(2,687,434)
General Fund	9,389,053	17,768,860	15,081,426	(2,687,434)
Millage	965,005	1,800,000	1,800,000	0
Tuition	2,068,097	5,275,449	5,275,449	0
Other	<u>37,907</u>	<u>75,814</u>	<u>75,814</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Funding	12,460,062	24,920,123	22,232,689	(2,687,434)

Total Reduction from LFA Current Level	10,226,235
--	------------

TABLE C2
Comparison of LFA Current Level to Adjusted Fiscal 1992 Expenditures
1995 Biennium
Total Funds

EXHIBIT 5
DATE 2-9-93
SB _____

Unit	----- Six University Units -----		
	Executive 1995 Biennium	LFA Current Level	LFA Over (Under) Executive
MSU	110,172,376	116,035,040	5,862,664
UM	97,762,887	105,404,271	7,641,384
EMC	34,277,183	34,344,926	67,743
NMC	18,602,817	18,481,942	(120,875)
WMCUM	10,716,016	10,909,032	193,016
MCMST	<u>21,673,936</u>	<u>23,552,200</u>	<u>1,878,264</u>
Total Six Units	293,205,215	308,727,411	15,522,196
General Fund	171,449,727	186,784,259	15,334,532
Millage	24,940,396	25,085,000	144,604
Tuition	95,001,296	95,284,356	283,060
Other	<u>1,813,796</u>	<u>1,573,796</u>	<u>(240,000)</u>
Total Funding	293,205,215	308,727,411	15,522,196
Billings	4,084,181	3,873,137	(211,044)
Butte	3,752,501	3,068,020	(684,481)
Great Falls	4,688,798	4,545,360	(143,438)
Helena	5,399,934	5,160,696	(239,238)
Missoula	<u>5,783,912</u>	<u>5,585,476</u>	<u>(198,436)</u>
Total Vo-Techs	23,709,326	22,232,689	(1,476,637)
General Fund	16,484,568	15,081,426	(1,403,142)
Millage	1,852,964	1,800,000	(52,964)
Tuition	5,292,530	5,275,449	(17,081)
Other	<u>79,264</u>	<u>75,814</u>	<u>(3,450)</u>
Total Funding	23,709,326	22,232,689	(1,476,637)
Total Reduction from LFA Current Level			14,045,559

2-9-93

TABLE D
Allocation of Budget Amendments, by Program*
1993 Biennium

Fiscal 1992								
Program	MSU	UM	EMC	NMC	WMCUM	MCMST	TOTAL	Percent
Instruction	321,637	1,804,534	82,786	133,000	96,400	186,886	2,625,243	52.7%
Research	0	4,732	0	0	0	102	4,834	0.1%
Public Service	0	1,496	0	0	0	0	1,496	0.0%
Support	650,754	633,646	0	89,203	10,937	6,089	1,390,629	27.9%
Fee Waivers	107,442	324,184	25,195	64,527	39,531	92,520	653,399	13.1%
Plant	222,175	80,285	0	0	0	3,898	306,358	6.1%
Total	1,302,008	2,848,877	107,981	286,730	146,868	289,495	4,981,959	100.0%
Program	MSU	UM	EMC	NMC	WMCUM	MCMST	TOTAL	Percent
Instruction	1,253,576	1,590,156	448,964	162,608	84,318	310,666	3,850,288	40.4%
Research	0	5,530	0	0	0	811	6,341	0.1%
Public Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Support	1,192,211	1,744,798	44,000	113	70,219	69,287	3,120,628	32.7%
Fee Waivers	454,755	425,384	104,561	102,926	69,464	164,741	1,321,831	13.9%
Plant	930,000	265,336	0	0	0	40,738	1,236,074	13.0%
Total	3,830,542	4,031,204	597,525	265,647	224,001	586,243	9,535,162	100.0%

* Does not include additional \$100,000 of six mill levy funds because the documents have not yet been received.

Includes additional tuition revenue not yet approved by the legislature.

*Does not include additional \$100,000 of six mill levy funds because the documents have not yet been received.
Includes additional tuition revenue not yet approved by the legislature.

TABLE E
Changes in Enrollment
Budgeted to Fiscal 1992 to Fiscal 1993

EXHIBIT 5
DATE 2-9-93

Unit	Budgeted 1995 Biennium FTE LFA Current Level	Actual Fiscal 1992 FTE	Fiscal 1992 Over (Under) Budgeted FTE	Estimated Fiscal 1993 FTE*	Fiscal 1993 Over (Under) Budgeted FTE
MSU	9,574	9,491	(83)	10,041	467
UM	9,161	9,482	321	9,628	467
EMC	3,274	3,139	(135)	3,260	(14)
NMC	1,622	1,673	51	1,582	(40)
WMCUM	945	974	29	989	44
MCMST	<u>1,653</u>	<u>1,694</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>1,785</u>	<u>132</u>
Total	<u>26,228</u>	<u>26,453</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>27,285</u>	<u>1,056</u>

*Incorporated in the executive budget revenue estimates

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
VISITOR REGISTER

EDUCATION _____ SUBCOMMITTEE _____ DATE 2-9-93
DEPARTMENT(S) _____ DIVISION _____

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	REPRESENTING	
Patricia Abelin	Bozeman Chamber	
Hutchinson		
Sundsted		
Vardemann		

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT
FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.