



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 10, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #872

### Eligibility for Secured Correctional Facilities (TEACH)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 631, #11]

#### CURRENT LAW

School districts are eligible to receive TEACH block grants, and school districts, private schools, CESAs, technical colleges, private colleges, public library systems and boards and the state residential schools are eligible to receive telecommunications access funding. CESAs and consortia of school districts, CESAs, and public library boards are eligible to receive training and technical assistance grants.

In 2000-01, \$35,000,000 GPR is provided for block grants, and \$4,000,000 GPR is provided for educational technology training and technical assistance grants. For telecommunications access in 2000-01, \$7,195,700 SEG is provided for school districts and CESAs, \$2,014,600 SEG is provided for libraries and technical colleges, \$1,003,100 SEG is provided for private K-12 schools, and \$55,200 SEG is provided for the state residential schools. The telecommunications access program is funded through the universal service fund (USF).

#### GOVERNOR

Provide \$251,100 SEG in 2001-02 and \$233,400 SEG in 2002-03 to fund telecommunications access services for three juvenile secured correctional facilities. Specify that the secured correctional facilities would be the Southern Oaks Girls School, the Ethan Allen School and the Lincoln Hills School. Create an appropriation to fund subsidized telecommunications access for those facilities. Require TEACH to promulgate rules to ensure that secured correctional facilities that receive access to data lines and video links use them only for educational purposes. Staff from DOA indicate that these funding amounts should be revised downward by \$62,800 SEG in 2001-02 and \$58,400 SEG in 2002-03.

Provide that these facilities would also be eligible to apply for educational technology training and technical assistance grants as members of consortia.

Require the Secretary of Corrections to submit a written request to TEACH in order for those facilities to be eligible for educational technology block grants. Limit the amount the Department of Corrections (DOC) would receive in block grants for each facility to \$5,000 annually, and allow DOC to allocate the funds received through this program among the eligible facilities as it deems appropriate, although the monies would have to be deposited in a separate fund.

Require DOC to submit a report to DOA by June 30, 2002, that specifies any cost savings by DOC due to secured correctional facilities' receipt of grants or subsidies from TEACH.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Wisconsin secured juvenile correctional facilities are funded with program revenue generated by statutory daily rates charged to counties and the state for certain serious juvenile offenders. County costs are reimbursed, in whole or in part, by GPR funds for community youth and family aids (youth aids).

2. The Governor's proposal is based on an agency budget request submitted by DOC. The Department operates middle and high school programs in its secured correctional facilities serving about 900 pupils on average each day. According to DOC, the pupils tend to be several grade levels behind their age peers when initially assessed for educational placement upon incarceration, often due to long periods of separation from school because of disciplinary or behavioral problems and learning disorders.

3. Arguably, while youth are placed with DOC for secure facility services, the youth should advance their education, so that they can make a successful transition back to community school programs or vocational programs upon release. Without exposure to the types of educational technology used in Wisconsin's schools, youth are more at risk of again falling behind their age peers when they return to school and being unable to take advantage of the learning and work opportunities offered through technology.

4. Treating the secured correctional facility schools like school districts and education agencies in the state in terms of access to TEACH grants and subsidies would enable the purchase of newer equipment, training of education staff, and appropriate access to on-line resources and distance learning for incarcerated youth.

5. TEACH technology training and technical assistance grants are awarded through a competitive process. DOC would be allowed to compete for these grants as members of consortia under the Governor's proposal, but would not be guaranteed an award. These grants are funded through a biennial appropriation, and for 1999-01 a total of \$9 million was available. For 2001-03, the bill provides a total of \$8 million for this purpose, with no additional funding provided to reflect the proposed participation of these facilities.

6. TEACH would be required to pay DOC \$15,000 annually for block grants for the three juvenile secured correctional facilities for educational technology block grants. The Governor did not increase the total amount of funding that the TEACH Board will have available for block grants in 2001-02 or 2002-03. Therefore, if these monies are provided to these facilities, funding available for block grants to school districts would be reduced by \$15,000 annually, which would represent a reduction of 0.04% in each year.

7. The TEACH telecommunications access program is funded through the USF. Under current law, telecommunications providers are allowed to fully recover their share of assessment costs for USF expenditures related to the TEACH Board through a "pass-through" adjustment applied only to subscribers' local exchange service rates. Under the proposal, this assessment, passed through to subscribers, would be raised to cover the additional costs of funding Internet access for these facilities at DOC.

8. Including the proposed \$251,100 in 2001-02 and \$233,400 in 2020-03 to fund telecommunications access services for three juvenile secured correctional facilities, the budget bill would authorize \$13.7 million annually from universal service fund assessments for the TEACH program. The total USF pass-through assessment would be \$16.5 million in 2001-02 and \$16.4 million in 2002-03 under the bill. Because this pass-through assessment affects millions of telephone customers, it may be undesirable to extend the use of this funding to additional entities.

9. The amount of funding that these facilities would receive under the Governor's recommendations relating to block grants and training and technical assistance grants would likely represent only a small portion of total funding for these programs. However, these appropriations are counted towards state two-thirds funding of K-12 partial school revenues, and this proposal could be viewed as weakening the state's commitment to the 426 public school districts in the state. In addition, if a determination is made that these facilities are eligible for these state categorical aids under TEACH, it is possible that, in the future, to be consistent the law would be modified so that other state categorical aids under DPI would apply to these facilities.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation as modified to reflect corrected funding amounts, which would: (a) make three secured juvenile correctional facilities eligible for TEACH block grants and training and technical assistance grants; (b) provide \$188,300 SEG in 2001-02 and \$175,000 SEG in 2002-03 to fund telecommunications access services for these three facilities; and (c) require DOC to report cost savings.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$363,300
[Change to Bill]	- \$121,200]

2. Maintain current law.

**Alternative 2**

**SEG**

**2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)**  
[Change to Bill

**\$0**  
- \$484,500]

Prepared by: Layla Merrifield

MO#

*Alt. 1*

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

*get  
vote  
from Diane*

*Alt 1  
BB move 1  
Gard - 2*

TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

Secured Juvenile Correctional Facilities

[LFB Paper 872]

Motion:

Move to require the Department of Corrections (DOC) to purchase an Internet management service for the secured juvenile correctional facilities that receive Internet access through TEACH-subsidized data lines and video links. Provide that DOC is not eligible for assistance under the educational telecommunications access program unless the DOC provides a service on its computers that filters or blocks access to material on the Internet that is harmful to minors. Specify that "harmful to minors" would be defined as that quality of any description, narrative account, or representation, in whatever form, of nudity, sexually explicit conduct, sexual enticement, sadomasochistic abuse, physical torture, or brutality, that does all of the following: (1) predominantly appeals to the prurient, shameful, or morbid interest of children; (2) is patently offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community as a whole with respect to what is suitable for children; and (3) lacks serious literary, artistic, political, scientific, or educational value for children, when taken as a whole.

---

Note:

The Governor recommended TEACH eligibility for three secured correctional facilities: the Southern Oaks Girls School, the Ethan Allen School and the Lincoln Hills School. If approved by the Committee, the provision would allow these facilities to receive subsidies for telecommunications access services and educational technology block grants from the TEACH Board. These facilities would also be eligible to apply as members of consortia for TEACH training and technical assistance grants.

This motion would require DOC to purchase an Internet management service from the Internet service provider chosen for the facilities. Such a service would block Internet access to visual depictions or materials that are harmful to minors. The service would be purchased separately and would not be subsidized by the access program. This motion does not provide funding for the service. The estimated annual cost of such a filtering service is \$540 annually for one to 99 workstations.

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

[Amendment to LFB Paper #872]

Motion:

Move to include the Youth Leadership Training Center as a facility eligible for TEACH programs, included under Alternative #1 of Paper #872.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS 0

TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

Secured Juvenile Correctional Facilities

[LFB Paper 872]

Motion:

Move to require the Department of Corrections (DOC) to purchase an Internet management service for the secured juvenile correctional facilities, to include the Youth Leadership Training Center, that receive Internet access through TEACH-subsidized data lines and video links. Provide that DOC is not eligible for assistance under the educational telecommunications access program unless the DOC provides a service on its computers that filters or blocks access to material on the Internet that is harmful to minors. Specify that "harmful to minors" would be defined as that quality of any description, narrative account, or representation, in whatever form, of nudity, sexually explicit conduct, sexual enticement, sadomasochistic abuse, physical torture, or brutality, that does all of the following: (1) predominantly appeals to the prurient, shameful, or morbid interest of children; (2) is patently offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community as a whole with respect to what is suitable for children; and (3) lacks serious literary, artistic, political, scientific, or educational value for children, when taken as a whole.

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
<u>2</u> GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0





# Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 10, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #873

## Eligibility for Charter Schools (TEACH)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 631, #12]

### CURRENT LAW

*A-1  
B-2  
Alzche  
C0885 - A 2  
(no agreement)*

School districts are eligible to receive TEACH block grants, and school districts, private schools, CESAs, private and technical colleges, public library systems and boards and the state residential schools are eligible to receive telecommunications access funding. CESAs and consortia of school districts, CESAs, and public library boards are eligible to receive training and technical assistance grants. School districts and public libraries are eligible to receive infrastructure financial assistance.

In 2000-01, \$35,000,000 GPR is provided for block grants, and \$4,000,000 GPR is provided for educational technology training and technical assistance grants.

For telecommunications access, \$7,195,700 SEG is provided for school districts and CESAs, \$2,014,600 SEG is provided for libraries and technical colleges, \$1,003,100 SEG is provided for private K-12 schools, and \$55,200 SEG is provided for the state residential schools. The telecommunications access program is funded through the segregated universal service fund (USF). The USF receives its funding through assessments on annual gross operating revenues from intrastate telecommunications providers.

Under current law, for infrastructure financial assistance \$100 million of general obligation bonding is authorized for school districts and \$10 million for libraries. Fifty percent of the assistance is provided in loans, for which schools and libraries pay the debt service, and 50% is provided in grants, for which TEACH pays the debt service from a sum sufficient GPR appropriation.

Under current law, the City of Milwaukee, UW-Milwaukee (UWM), and Milwaukee Area Technical College District Board (MATC) are the only entities that would qualify as charter school sponsors that are not currently eligible for TEACH programs.

## GOVERNOR

Extend eligibility for TEACH programs to Milwaukee charter school sponsors, including the City of Milwaukee, UWM and MATC, as follows:

*a. Educational technology block grants.* Require TEACH to calculate block grants for charter school sponsors by dividing the statewide average equalized valuation per member by the Milwaukee Public Schools' (MPS) equalized valuation per member and multiplying the result by the number of pupils attending the charter school on the third Friday of September. Specify that a charter school sponsor could use these monies for any purpose related to educational technology that benefits pupils attending the charter school, except to pay the salary or benefits of any charter school employee;

*b. Infrastructure financial assistance.* Require TEACH to include a condition requiring charter school sponsors to use any financial assistance under the program for wiring upgrading and installation that benefits pupils attending the charter school;

*c. Telecommunications access.* Require TEACH in establishing eligibility requirements to require that charter school sponsors use data lines or video links under the program to benefit pupils attending the charter school;

*d. Training and technical assistance grants.* Include charter school sponsors as eligible participants in consortia that apply for grants.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Milwaukee charter school program (MCSP) is funded from a separate, GPR sum sufficient appropriation established for that purpose. The estimated direct cost to the general fund of the payments from the MCSP appropriation is offset by a reduction to the general school aids received by school districts in an amount equal to the estimated payments under the program. DPI is required to proportionately reduce the general school aids for which each of the 426 school districts, including MPS, is eligible to be paid by an amount totaling estimated MCSP payments. A school district's revenue limit calculation is not affected by these aid reductions. Thus, a school district can increase its property tax levy to offset any aid reduction made related to the charter program.

2. In an opinion by the office of legal counsel within DOA issued in March 2000, the TEACH Board was advised that it would not be unreasonable to assume that the absence of a reference to Milwaukee charter schools from statutes governing TEACH eligibility was a legislative

oversight. The opinion identified several changes in 1999 Act 9 in other aid programs (special education and special education transportation) and relating to standards, assessments and promotion requirements, where laws applicable to school districts were extended to apply to MCSP schools as well. The opinion concluded that the TEACH Board could choose to treat Milwaukee charter schools as functional equivalents of school districts for the purpose of administering the TEACH funding statutes. The DOA opinion further advised the Board to seek legislative action in the 2001-03 budget process to codify Milwaukee charter schools' participation in TEACH programs. This opinion replaced an earlier opinion, dated November 1999, that concluded that MCSP schools were not eligible to participate in TEACH programs.

3. The Governor's 2001-03 budget recommendations provide the opportunity for the Legislature to make clear its intentions as to the eligibility of MCSP schools for TEACH programs. From one point of view, these schools are part of the public K-12 school system, and could receive aid from the TEACH Board just like school districts. The state's per pupil payment amount of \$6,494 in 2000-01 is less than the per pupil partial school revenues (sum of state general aid, categorical aid and property tax levy) in 425 of the state's 426 school districts. Allowing MCSP schools to qualify for assistance under the TEACH Board would provide these schools with needed additional resources.

4. An argument against making MCSP schools eligible for TEACH Board programs is that the \$6,494 per pupil payment received by MCSP schools in 2000-01 exceeds per pupil general school aids in 421 out of the 426 school districts, and exceeds per pupil general and categorical aids in 399 school districts. From this point of view, the state already provides greater per pupil support to pupils in these schools than in the vast majority of the state's school districts, and authorizing the receipt of aids from the TEACH Board would exacerbate this difference. However, MCSP schools do not have access to local property taxes as an additional source of revenue, as do school districts.

5. Under the current law educational technology block grant program, TEACH first distributes \$5,000 to each eligible school district. The balance of the appropriation is then distributed to the districts in proportion to the weighted membership of each district. To determine that amount, the statewide average equalized value per member is divided by the district's equalized value per member, and the result is multiplied by the district's membership. This calculation of weighted membership is done so that lower value per member school districts, which are less able to generate revenues from the property tax, will receive more block grant monies from TEACH.

6. For the TEACH block grant program, the bill directs TEACH to calculate weighted membership for charter school sponsors using the equalized value per member of Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). MPS's equalized value per member would be used because the MCSP schools are located there. However, the purpose of using weighted membership in the TEACH block grant program is to adjust the aid received by school districts based on their relative ability to generate revenue from the property tax. Because MCSP schools are fully funded with state aid and do not use the property tax to support their operations, MPS's equalized value per member is irrelevant in considering the revenues available to these schools. Instead, it may be desirable to direct TEACH to use the statewide average equalized value per member in calculating block grants for these schools.

This would apply a neutral weighting factor of 1.0 in the calculation of their block grants, rather than a higher weighting factor of 1.8 or 1.9 if MPS's equalized value per member is used. If the 1.0 weighting factor had been used for the MCSP grant calculations in 2000-01, then an aid shift of approximately \$40,000 from the Milwaukee charter schools to school districts would have resulted.

7. The budget bill as drafted would not require MCSP school sponsors to request block grants, as intended by the administration.

**ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

**A. MCSP Eligibility for TEACH Funding**

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to make Milwaukee charter school sponsors eligible for TEACH funding, which would codify current practice by the TEACH Board. Clarify that these school sponsors would be required to submit a board resolution or a written request to the TEACH Board in order to receive a technology block grant.

2. Specify that MCSP schools would be ineligible for TEACH funding, beginning in 2001-02.

**B. Block Grant Weighting Factor for MCSP Schools**

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to calculate block grants for MCSP schools using membership weighted by the equalized value per member of Milwaukee Public Schools.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation to, instead, calculate block grants for MCSP schools using membership weighted by the statewide average equalized value per member.

MO# A.2

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 1 NO 15 ABS 0

MO# A.1, B.2

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
Merri GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS 0



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 10, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #874

### Ameritech Settlement (TEACH)

#### CURRENT LAW

In the fall of 2000, the Public Service Commission (PSC) conducted an investigation of the quality of phone services provided to Wisconsin customers by Ameritech, which is regulated by the PSC. As a result of this investigation, Ameritech was required to: (1) provide a direct credit totaling \$7.8 million to customers who were without service between January 1 and September 30, 2000; (2) create a \$2 million trust fund for relief sought by customers who claimed harm was caused by the loss of telephone services, such as loss of business; and (3) pay \$500,000 to the Technology for Educational Achievement in Wisconsin Board (TEACH).

Current law requires that unless otherwise provided by law, all gifts, grants, bequests and devises to the state or to any state agency for the benefit or advantage of the state must be approved by the Joint Committee on Finance and must be used according to the provisions of the entity making the gift.

#### GOVERNOR

No provision.

#### DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The PSC has hired a vendor to process customer claims, based upon criteria established by the Commission. Claims could be filed through April 30, 2001. The vendor may process these claims through May 18, 2001. Any residual amounts remaining in the \$2,000,000 trust account after May 18 will then be awarded to TEACH, as ordered by the PSC. Currently, it is estimated that the payments to customers will total \$500,000, which would leave a balance in the trust account of \$1.5 million. In February 2001, TEACH received the initial payment of \$500,000

as part of the settlement. That payment was deposited in the Board's appropriation for gifts and grants. TEACH has begun working on a proposal for use of the funds, which would be submitted to the Joint Committee on Finance for approval of the acceptance and use of the funds under s. 20.907(1) of the statutes.

2. The TEACH Board is collaborating with the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) on a grant program that would be funded in part with Ameritech settlement funds. The focus of the grant program would be to assist TEACH-eligible public libraries and public schools that do not have sufficient funds to install high-speed Internet access. Thirty-one percent of the eligible public libraries and 6% of public school districts have not applied for telecommunications access services through TEACH. According to DPI officials, many libraries continue to lag behind in DPI's Internet policy plan, adopted in 1994, due to their small size, inadequate funding for technology costs, and lack of physical infrastructure to acquire access service. The new grant program would provide an additional funding source for libraries' technology needs. DPI has agreed to provide an additional \$100,000 for the program from federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds, to pay for TEACH data line costs for one year.

3. Public schools and libraries are currently eligible for a variety of programs through the TEACH Board intended to subsidize, as well as fund installation of necessary hardware for, Internet access. Under the TEACH infrastructure financial assistance program, school districts and public libraries may apply for loans and grants to fund the upgrading of electrical wiring in buildings in existence on October 14, 1997, and installation and upgrading of computer network wiring. Schools and libraries are required to pay the debt service on the loans, which represent 50% of the financial assistance, and the state pays the debt service for the grants, which are the other half of the financial assistance. Under current law, \$100 million of general obligation bonding is authorized for school districts and \$10 million is authorized for libraries for infrastructure loans.

4. The Governor's budget includes a provision to decrease the \$10 million of library bonding to \$5 million, and provide \$5 million of bonding for infrastructure financial assistance for communications hardware for libraries. The budget provision would allow public library boards to purchase communications servers, routers, hubs or switches that enable a computer network in a library building to be directly connected to the Internet, but could not be used to purchase personal computers. Public library boards receiving this assistance would also be required to apply for a federal E-rate discount for any hardware purchased with the assistance.

5. Under the technology block grant program, TEACH distributes \$35 million GPR annually to school districts for any purpose related to educational technology. Some possible uses of these grants include network upgrades, infrastructure financial assistance loan payments, computer lab improvements, purchase of hardware or software, consulting or planning services, professional development and telecommunications access assistance. Public libraries and school districts are also currently eligible for the TEACH educational telecommunications access program. This program, funded with universal service fund monies, provides eligible entities subsidized access to new data lines and video links or grants for data lines and video links in existence on October 14, 1997.

6. Arguably, the grant program proposal being developed by the TEACH Board to expend the Ameritech settlement monies shares its goals with those of existing TEACH programs. The Committee could direct the TEACH Board to use these Ameritech settlement funds to offset spending under the GPR technology block grant program, which under the Governor's budget would remain at its base level of \$35 million GPR annually. A program revenue appropriation could be created for all Ameritech settlement monies, which would be used dollar-for-dollar to offset the GPR block grant program and allow a corresponding lapse to the general fund. By setting up this type of applied receipts appropriation, the full \$35 million of GPR funding would remain available for expenditure in 2001-02, if for some reason the additional \$1.5 million of Ameritech settlement monies expected to be distributed to TEACH were not received by the state. However, it appears that in total \$2.0 million of these monies will be received in 2000-01 and would be available for expenditure as applied receipts in 2001-02, which would result in an estimated reduction of GPR block grant expenditures (lapse) of \$2.0 million.

7. As an alternative to allow the TEACH Board to proceed with its proposed expenditure of \$500,000 of Ameritech settlement monies, subject to Committee approval under current law governing the receipt of such monies, a separate applied receipts appropriation could be created only for monies received in excess of \$500,000. In this case, a program revenue appropriation could be created for all Ameritech settlement monies received by the state in excess of \$500,000, which would be used dollar-for-dollar to offset the GPR block grant program and allow a corresponding lapse to the general fund. As noted above, by setting up this type of applied receipts appropriation, the full \$35 million of GPR funding would remain available for expenditure in 2001-02, if for some reason an additional \$1.5 million of Ameritech settlement monies were not received by the state.

**ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

1. Maintain current law, which would allow the TEACH Board to develop a proposal for a grant program to expend the Ameritech settlement funds in 2000-01 and to submit the proposal to the Committee under the receipt and approval provisions of current law outside of the 2001-03 budget process.

2. Provide \$2,000,000 PR in 2001-02 in a new continuing PR appropriation under TEACH designated for the receipt of all Ameritech settlement monies received by the TEACH Board. Specify that all Ameritech settlement monies received in 2000-01 and thereafter from this source would be transferred or deposited to this appropriation. Treat these monies as applied receipts for the TEACH GPR block grant program, so that an estimated GPR lapse of \$2,000,000 would occur in 2001-02.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>GPR-Lapse</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
<i>[Change to Bill]</i>	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000

3. Provide \$1,500,000 PR in 2001-02 in a new continuing PR appropriation under TEACH designated for the receipt of all Ameritech settlement monies in excess of \$500,000. Specify that the first \$500,000 received in 2000-01 would be deposited in the TEACH Board's gifts and grants appropriation and that all monies from this source received in 2000-01 and thereafter in excess of \$500,000 would be transferred or deposited in this new appropriation. Treat these monies as applied receipts for the TEACH GPR block grant program, so that an estimated GPR lapse of \$1,500,000 would occur in 2001-02.

Alternative 3	PR	GPR-Lapse
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
[Change to Bill]	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000

Trifield

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

Handwritten notes on a piece of paper:

10  
 B  
 Alt 2 of 3  
 [Signature]  
 discussion of Alt. 3.  
 plus in view of



TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

Ameritech Settlement -- First \$500,000 for Library Grant Program

[LFB Paper #874]

Motion:

Move to require the TEACH Board to establish a grant program for libraries that do not have access to high-speed Internet data lines as of May 1, 2001. Require the Board to collaborate with the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to establish criteria for the program. Specify that the amount of the grants would be determined by the TEACH Board, and that the grants could be used for infrastructure, wiring, communications hardware, computer and access costs associated with the installation and use of high-speed Internet data lines in libraries. Provide \$1,500,000 PR in 2001-02 in a new continuing PR appropriation under TEACH designated for the receipt of all Ameritech settlement monies in excess of \$500,000. Treat these monies as applied receipts for the TEACH GPR block grant program, so that an estimated GPR lapse of \$1,500,000 would occur in 2001-02. Specify that the first \$500,000 received in 2000-01 would be deposited in or transferred to a new PR annual appropriation under TEACH with no monies in the schedule and that all monies from this source received in 2000-01 and thereafter in excess of \$500,000 would be transferred or deposited to the new PR continuing appropriation to be treated as applied receipts. Require TEACH to expend \$500,000 from the Ameritech settlement monies for the new grant program for libraries between May 1, 2001, and June 30, 2002. Require DPI to expend \$100,000 from federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds between May 1, 2001, and June 30, 2002, for this grant program. Specify that this action would constitute Committee acceptance of these monies in accordance with s. 20.907(1) of the statutes.

---

Note:

This motion would replace Alternative 3 in LFB paper #874. As a change to the bill, it would delete \$500,000 PR of gifts and grants funding and provide \$1,500,000 PR of funding in a continuing appropriation to offset GPR expenditures under the TEACH block grant program. The motion would specify that the first \$500,000 of Ameritech monies would be deposited or transferred to a new PR annual sum certain appropriation. No monies would be provided in that appropriation so that TEACH would have to request expenditure authority under s. 16.515 of the

statutes in a subsequent request to the Committee. This motion requires TEACH to expend the \$500,000 from the Ameritech settlement monies provided by Alternative 3 for a grant program to provide access to high-speed Internet data lines to TEACH-eligible public libraries that have not had sufficient funding to install and use such lines. TEACH is currently collaborating with DPI for such a grant program.

[Change to Bill: \$1,000,000 PR and \$1,500,000 GPR-lapse]  
 [Change to Base: \$1,000,000 PR and \$1,500,000 GPR-lapse]

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS 0

TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

Existing Contract Grants -- Extend Sunset Date

Motion:

Move to extend the sunset date on current law directing the TEACH Board to provide grants to school districts and private schools for data lines and video links in existence on October 14, 1997, from June 30, 2002, to December 31, 2005. Provide \$2,000,000 SEG for telecommunications access for school districts and \$100,000 SEG for telecommunications access for private schools in 2002-03 from the segregated universal service fund (USF). Delete \$666,700 GPR in 2002-03 from general school aids to adjust state two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

---

Note:

Under current law the TEACH Board awards grants for existing contracts under the telecommunications access program. The telecommunications access program is funded through the USF, which receives its revenues from pass-through assessments on telephone customers. Current law specifies that no grant may be awarded for existing contracts after June 30, 2002.

Under the motion, the sunset date would be extended until December 31, 2005. Beginning in 2002-03, annual costs for existing contract grants are estimated at \$2,100,000 SEG.

A total of 98 public school districts and two private K-12 schools may request a grant for reimbursement of their video link contracts. Four public school districts and seven private K-12 schools may request a grant for reimbursement of their data line contracts.

Under the two-thirds funding calculation, if funding for categorical aids such as TEACH existing contract grants are increased, there is a reduction in general school aids equal to one-third of the increase. This reduction is made so that total state aid does not exceed the two-thirds funding goal. Similarly, if categorical aids are decreased, there is an increase in general school aids equal to one-third of the decrease in categorical aid in order to maintain two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

[Change to Bill: \$2,100,000 SEG and -\$666,700 GPR]

[Change to Base: \$2,100,000 SEG and -\$666,700 GPR]

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

DATE: 10/10/54

TO: MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

Existing Contract Grants -- More Than One High School

Motion:

Move to modify current law governing the existing contract grants portion of the educational telecommunications access program. Allow the TEACH Board to award annual grants for each high school to school districts that operate more than one high school and that had in effect on October 14, 1997, contracts for access to more than one data line or video link involving those additional high schools. Provide \$138,000 SEG in 2001-02 to the school district telecommunications access appropriation from the universal service fund for this purpose. Delete \$46,000 GPR in 2001-02 from general school aids to adjust state two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

---

Note:

Under current law, the TEACH Board awards annual grants to school districts and private schools that had in effect, a contract for access to a data line or video link on October 14, 1997. The funding source for the grants is the segregated universal service fund, which is funded through assessments on telephone customers.

The Board has interpreted the statutes to allow only one annual grant per school district for either a data line or a video link. This motion would allow the Board to award grants for multiple eligible lines or links. The Board determines the amount of the existing contract grants, which under current law cannot exceed the cost of a TEACH-provided line or link. TEACH estimates that the maximum grant award for 2001-02 will be approximately \$21,000.

According to TEACH staff, a total of 18 links in three school districts, Milwaukee, Oshkosh and Appleton, would be newly eligible for grants under this motion. Of the total, 15 links in Milwaukee would be eligible for federal E-rate discounts that would cover 90% of the cost of the contract. The actual cost of Milwaukee's links is approximately \$50,000 each. Less the E-rate discount, Milwaukee would be eligible to receive \$75,000 from TEACH in grants. The three links in Oshkosh and Appleton would likely be eligible for the full \$21,000 per link. The total estimated

cost of providing grants for these 18 existing contracts would be \$138,000 SEG in 2001-02. The existing contract grants portion of the telecommunications access program sunsets June 30, 2002, and thus it would not be necessary to provide funding for 2002-03.

Under the two-thirds funding calculation, if funding for categorical aids such as the TEACH telecommunications access program are increased, there is a reduction in general school aids equal to one-third of the increase. This reduction is made so that total state aid does not exceed the two-thirds funding goal. Similarly, if categorical aids are decreased, there is an increase in general school aids equal to one-third of the decrease in categorical aid in order to maintain two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

[Change to Bill: \$138,000 SEG and -\$46,000 GPR]

[Change to Base: \$138,000 SEG and -\$46,000 GPR]

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

# TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

## LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #	Title
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
4	Educational Telecommunications Access
10	Governor's Wisconsin Educational Technology Conference
14	Public Library Boards Telecommunications Access
15	Public Library Boards Telecommunications Access Shared Service Agreements

## LFB Summary Items to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper

Item #	Title
2	Base Budget Reductions
7	WATF Existing Grants
8	Delete Current WATF Positions
9	WATF Existing Grant Administration

## LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Le...

Item #	Title
16	TEACH Block Grant Reporting Requirement

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
2 GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

**AGENCY:** Employment Relations Commission (Base Agency)

**LFB PAPER #:** 426

**ISSUE:** Staff Support for Collective Bargaining Training Activities

**ALTERNATIVE:** 2

**SUMMARY:** You're swapping GPR for PR here, so either Alt. 1 or 2 is ok. LFB points out arguments for supporting the additional expenditure authority in Alt. 2 on page 4, item #16. This alternative will allow WERC to continue to contract with DER to provide labor/management cooperative training to supervisors and union members in state agencies. They started a cooperative agreement with a federal grant DER won. This will allow them to continue with that contract & carry through with the training activities they've set up.

Also, Alternative 2 will allow WERC to capture a \$25,000 grant from AFSCME International to its local Council 24 to help continue these training activities.

You save a little more GPR (\$9,800 over the biennium) by going with alternative #1. However, by continuing the contract with DER by going with Alt. 2, you get the extra \$25,000 from AFSCME.

**BY:** Cindy

*2 ok*

*JG/BB*





## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 2, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #426

### **Staff Support for Collective Bargaining Training Activities (Employment Relations Commission)**

#### **CURRENT LAW**

Public and private employers and labor unions may request the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission (WERC) to assemble a list ("panel") of arbitrators who are not employees or members of the Commission to arbitrate contract grievances. The WERC is required to provide training programs on a regular basis to prepare individuals to serve as outside arbitrators.

The WERC also offers periodic sessions to train employers and employees in consensus bargaining techniques and labor/management cooperation programs. Modest fees are charged to participants in all of these programs and are credited to an annual program revenue account that supports collective bargaining training activities. The base level expenditure authority for this appropriation is \$12,000 PR annually.

#### **GOVERNOR**

Continue base level expenditure authority of \$12,000 PR annually for collective bargaining training expenses.

#### **DISCUSSION POINTS**

1. The following table summarizes the number of collective bargaining training sessions offered by WERC staff and the total amount of fee revenues collected from the session participants since the 1997-98 fiscal year.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Number of Training Sessions</u>	<u>Revenues Collected</u>
1997-98	13	\$23,700
1998-99	21	33,200
1999-00	17	21,000
2000-01*	14	16,500

\*Data through March 31, 2001.

2. Most of the sessions offered by the WERC during the last several years have been either the consensus bargaining training program or the labor/management cooperation program. The former program emphasizes the development and use of problem-solving techniques (such as interest-based bargaining and "win-win" bargaining approaches) that can be used effectively during actual contract negotiations. The latter program emphasizes consensus decision-making and problem solving approaches that may be used in resolving disputes and grievances that arise once a collective bargaining agreement is already in place.

3. The training programs are often structured to address issues of concern to management and labor interests in a specific unit of government (such as a municipality or a school district) and may be offered by the Commission in a variety of half-day, one-day, one and one-half day and two-day formats to meet participants' needs. The training consists of face-to-face lectures delivered by qualified WERC staff and group exercises to be completed by the trainees. Fees charged to individuals involved in one-day (or less) formats are \$70 per participant. For individuals involved on training programs lasting more than one day, the fee charged is \$110 per participant.

4. Frequently, in an effort to encourage participant follow-through in applying the approaches covered in earlier, formal training sessions, the Commission will allow recent trainees to sit in on subsequent "refresher" training sessions at no additional cost to the participant.

5. These training sessions are typically coordinated and conducted by a Commission staff member who functions as director of labor/management cooperation programs. Additional assistance is generally provided, as needed, by one or more Commission attorneys and by one of the Commissioners, who has a strong interest in consensus building collective bargaining techniques. All of these agency positions are currently entirely GPR-funded.

6. On March 31, 2001, there was an unappropriated revenue balance of \$65,300 PR in the collective bargaining training appropriation account. In addition, based on the last three full fiscal years (1997-98 through 1999-00), program receipts credited to this appropriation account have averaged \$26,000 PR-REV annually. The collective bargaining training revenue stream appears to be reasonably reliable; furthermore, the opportunity would appear to exist for the Commission to generate yet additional revenues if it began to charge a fee for post-training course "refresher" sessions or promoted additional basic training sessions.

7. Based on the current unappropriated balance in the collective bargaining training appropriation account and likely future revenues into this account, an argument can be advanced

that there are sufficient funds available to convert a portion of the position that functions as director of labor/management cooperation programs from GPR funding to PR funding.

8. However, insufficient revenues are available to convert 1.0 FTE position entirely from GPR to PR funding. The portion of the position that could be converted will depend on what additional expenditures the Committee authorizes to be funded from this appropriation.

9. Base level supplies and services funding of \$12,000 PR annually associated with offering the current program of training sessions is budgeted to this appropriation. These expenditures support the purchase of training equipment and instructional materials and some limited travel-related expenses. These costs appear reasonable, and the level of funding provided appears to be consistent with actual program needs. In the 1999-00 fiscal year, less than \$1,000 PR in supplies and services expenditure authority remained unused by the end of the year.

10. Allowing for a continuation of \$12,000 PR annually of base level supplies and services funding, the collective bargaining training appropriation could additionally support the conversion of 0.3 FTE and \$29,700 annually associated with the mediator position at the WERC engaged in directing labor/management cooperative programs from GPR to PR funding.

11. However, on April 13, 2001, this Committee approved a s. 16.515 request from the WERC to provide increased expenditure authority of \$20,200 PR in 2000-01 under the collective bargaining training appropriation. The purpose of the increased expenditure authority is to permit the WERC to contract with the Department of Employment Relations (DER) to continue to deliver labor/management cooperative training to supervisors and union members in state agencies and to offer such training to interested local governments. While the Committee's action to provide \$20,200 PR in 2000-01 will have the effect of reducing the current unappropriated balance under collective bargaining training account by an equivalent amount, this adjustment has already been taken into account in developing the above 0.3 FTE funding conversion proposal.

12. The WERC originally sought \$50,000 PR under its s. 16.515 request, with \$20,200 PR provided in the 2000-01 fiscal year and the remaining \$29,800 PR provided in the 2001-02 fiscal year. The total proposed budget would have supported: (a) DER meeting and administrative costs to design the program's expansion and the associated development of training modules (\$23,400 PR); (b) workshops and training forums (\$18,900 PR); (c) website development (\$3,500 PR); and (d) newsletter production and distribution (\$4,200 PR).

13. In approving the WERC request for 2000-01 only, the Committee advised the agency that the question of providing additional expenditure authority of \$29,800 PR in 2001-02 under the collective bargaining training appropriation would be addressed as part of this body's biennial budget deliberations.

14. DER has developed a consensus bargaining approach as part of biennial contract negotiations between the Wisconsin State Employees Union (WSEU) and the state as employer. DER was initially successful in securing a \$90,000 grant in 1997-98 from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to create a Joint Labor/Management Committee to identify, communicate and replicate "best practices" in labor/management cooperation. The initial federal grant was used

to prepare "best practice" documents and presentations and to offer several regional training forums.

15. The initial federal grant has now been fully expended. The proposal to have WERC fund a contract extension with DER into 2001-02 would permit the latter agency to continue the development of appropriate labor/management cooperation practices for state agencies.

16. Arguments in favor of providing additional expenditure authority of \$29,800 PR in 2001-02 would include the following:

- The best practice teams organized in a number of state agencies arguably have had a tangible benefit for the state by directly reducing state agency costs associated with grievance and discharge arbitrations. DER believes that the agency staff involvement costs foregone in 1999-00 as a result of the reduced number of arbitrations in that year compared to historic caseload patterns amounted to \$303,800 (all funds) on grievance arbitrations and \$152,500 (all funds) on discharge arbitrations. However, it should be noted that these amounts were not lapsed from agency budgets. Staff time and base funding were simply freed for other activities.

- DER could continue to develop and evaluate training interventions and processes that facilitate team-building relationships.

- DER could involve new teams and state agency work sites in learning "best practices" approaches thereby making it more likely that additional grievance related costs could be avoided.

- DER could continue follow-up training for past participants in the program.

- Continuation of the contract would help maximize an additional \$25,000 grant from AFSCME International to its local Council 24 to help continue these "best practice" approaches in state government agencies.

17. Arguments against providing additional expenditure authority of \$29,800 PR in 2001-02 would include the following:

- The additional amounts provided for a contract with DER would have the effect of reducing the portion of the WERC mediator position that could be converted from GPR funding to PR funding. No more than 0.25 FTE position and \$24,800 annually could be converted from GPR to PR funding, if the DER contract continuation amounts of \$29,800 PR in 2001-02 are also funded at this time by the Committee.

- There does not appear to be any reason why WERC staff could not offer some of this type of training to state agency personnel and also charge fees that would help support Commission activities supported by the collective bargaining training appropriation.

- The \$20,200 PR already provided for 2000-01 should be sufficient to support most of DER's costs associated with the actual design of the program's expansion and the development of training modules. DER could explore other funding options, such as charging additional participant fees to fund the additional training sessions.

18. If the Committee chooses to convert a portion of the WERC staff function associated with the supervision of the agency's labor/management cooperative training program and not provide any additional funding to permit the WERC to contract with DER in 2000-01 to deliver similar training to supervisors and union members primarily in state agencies, then it could convert 0.3 FTE position and \$29,700 annually from GPR to PR funding.

19. Alternatively, if the Committee chooses to convert a portion of the WERC staff function associated with the supervision of the agency's labor/management cooperative training program and also provide \$29,800 PR in 2001-02 to the agency's collective bargaining training appropriation to permit the WERC to contract with DER in 2000-01 to deliver similar training to supervisors and union members primarily in state agencies, then it could convert 0.25 FTE position and \$24,800 annually from GPR to PR funding.

### ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Convert 0.3 FTE position and \$29,700 annually associated with the supervision of the WERC's labor/management cooperative training program from GPR to PR funding, to be supported from collective bargaining training fees.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$59,400	\$59,400	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$59,400	\$59,400	\$0]
2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	- 0.30	0.30	0.00
[Change to Bill]	- 0.30	0.30	0.00]

2. Convert 0.25 FTE position and \$24,800 annually associated with the supervision of the WERC's labor/management cooperative training program from GPR to PR funding, to be supported from collective bargaining training fees, and provide \$29,800 PR in 2001-02 to the collective bargaining training appropriation to permit the WERC to contract with the Department of Employment Relations to deliver labor/management cooperative training to supervisors and union members primarily in state agencies.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$49,600	\$79,400	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$49,600	\$79,400	\$0]
2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	- 0.25	0.25	0.00
[Change to Bill]	- 0.25	0.25	0.00]

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Tony Mason

MO#

Alt 2

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
2 GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 0 ABS

## **EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION**

### **LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
3	SASI Initiative

### **LFB Summary Item to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
2	Base Budget Reductions

### **LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
5	Selection by School Districts of Group Health Insurance Providers Made a Permissive Subject of Bargaining Under Certain Circumstances
6	Prohibited Subjects of Bargaining Currently Affecting the Milwaukee Public Schools Made Applicable to all School Districts
7	New Prohibited Subjects of Bargaining Applicable to All School Districts

### **LFB Summary Item Addressed at the Committee's May 2, 2001 Executive Session**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
4	Arbitration Awards Affecting City of Milwaukee Police Officers (see Paper #425)

MO# include items

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 0 ABS \_\_\_\_\_