

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: 05/11/99

Received By: **kunkemd**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Collins**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **grantpr**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters: **kunkemd**

Subject: **Education - miscellaneous**

Extra Copies: **MJL**

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Collins -

Topic:

TEACH training and technical assistance grants

Instructions:

Paper #900: alternatives 2 and 4 approved

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	kunkemd 05/18/99 grantpr 05/18/99	jgeller 05/18/99		_____			
/1			martykr 05/21/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 05/21/99		

FE Sent For:

<END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: 05/11/99

Received By: kunkemd

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau

By/Representing: Collins

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: grantpr

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters: kunkemd

Subject: Education - miscellaneous

Extra Copies: MJL

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Collins -

Topic:

TEACH training and technical assistance grants

Instructions:

Paper #900: alternatives 2 and 4 approved

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
1/?	kunkemd 05/18/99 grantpr	1 5/18 jlg	km 5/20	ms 5/20 km 5/20			

FE Sent For:

<END>



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 27, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #900

Training and Technical Assistance Grants (TEACH Board)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 565, #3]

CURRENT LAW

The TEACH Board can award up to \$6 million GPR during the 1997-99 biennium in grants for training and technical assistance in the use of educational technology. Eligible grant applicants include CESAs and consortia consisting of: (a) two or more school districts; (b) two or more CESAs; (c) one or more school districts and one or more public library boards; or (d) one or more CESAs and one or more public library boards. Grants are to be awarded through one funding cycle annually on a competitive basis with preference statutorily required to be given to consortia that include one or more public library boards. The Board is required, to the extent possible, to ensure the grants are equally distributed on a statewide basis. Base level funding for this program is \$4 million GPR in 1998-99.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$500,000 GPR annually for the training technical assistance grant program. Further, require TEACH to award at least one grant annually to an applicant located in the territory of each CESA.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In December, 1998, the TEACH Board awarded a total of \$6 million in training and technical assistance grants to the top 23 ranked applicants. Individual grant amounts ranged from \$68,200 to \$500,000. Two applicants were disqualified due to insufficient information and ineligible proposed use of the funding and the remaining 15 applicants did not receive a grant. Further, seven of the applicants that did receive a grant received less funding than originally requested. In total, \$9,946,034 GPR was requested by applicants, after deducting the amount

associated with the two applicants that were disqualified.

2. The TEACH Board, in response to concerns that grant awards were not distributed equitably across the state and that school districts and libraries in four, predominately rural, CESAs received little or no funding under the program, directed TEACH staff to develop recommendations for the creation of a rural technology training initiative. Under this initiative, consortia that: (a) met the definition of rural as approved by the Board; (b) submitted an application for the training and technical assistance grant in 1998-99 and received a score of 70 points or above; and (c) would serve the largest number of schools and libraries in rural areas would be eligible for funding. The Board defined rural areas to include those areas: (a) not designated as a Wisconsin metropolitan area; and (b) not located in a Wisconsin county having a metropolitan area. A metropolitan area was defined as an area in a county that contains a central city that has a population of 50,000 or more.

3. Using the above eligibility criteria, it was determined that an additional four consortia would be eligible for grants under this rural technology initiative (CESAs 3, 11 and 12 and the Lakeland Consortium). Individual grant amounts under the initiative were \$300,000 per CESA and \$100,000 for the Lakeland Consortium for a total of \$1 million GPR, of which \$800,000 (80%) will be paid out in 1998-99. Eleven eligible training grant applicants did not receive funding from either the training and technical assistance program or the rural technology initiative.

4. The rural technology training initiative was funded by reallocating \$1 million GPR within the training and technical assistance program. Under program guidelines for the training and technical assistance grant program, proposals selected for funding receive 80% of the funds at the start of the project and 20% upon completion of the project and receipt of the approval of the grantee's final evaluation. As a result, only \$4.8 million GPR of the committed \$6 million would be disbursed in 1998-99 for grants awarded in December, 1998. Applicants have 12 to 18 months to complete their projects; therefore, the remaining \$1.2 million will be distributed upon the completion of the projects in 1999-00. Of this \$1.2 million, \$1 million was reallocated to fund the rural initiative grants.

5. Through this reallocation of funding, the TEACH Board has committed more GPR funding (\$7 million) for these grants than was appropriated in the 1997-99 biennium (\$6 million). A concern may be raised regarding TEACH's actions to commit future funding prior to the Legislature actually appropriating funding for the program. The Committee could consider modifying the appropriation which funds the training grants from a biennial appropriation to an annual appropriation and prohibiting the Board from committing more funds than appropriated each year.

6. The Governor's recommendations would increase base level funding in the biennial training grant appropriation by \$500,000 GPR annually in 1999-01. This additional money would be sufficient to fund, over the biennium, the \$1 million of 1998-99 grant payments that the Board reallocated to the rural technology training initiative. As a result, the TEACH Board would have \$4 million annually or \$8 million over the biennium available to fund new grants in the 1999-01

biennium.

7. Based on the number of 1998-99 grant applicants and requested funding amounts, it appears that the demand for these grants exceeds current base funding levels. Therefore, it may be reasonable to increase base level funding for the program in order to fund more grant applications. However, because the base level funding increase would not be used to fund new grants until the 2001-03 biennium, it could be argued that a base budget increase should not be provided at this time. Rather, the Legislature and Governor could review demand for the program as part of the next biennial budget and determine at that time if a funding increase is needed for the 2001-03 biennium.

8. If the Committee wishes to ensure that sufficient funding is available to fully fund the training and technical assistance grants that were awarded in 1998-99 but not increase base level funding for the program, the Committee could shift \$500,000 from second fiscal year of the biennium to the first year. This would maintain the \$1 million GPR funding increase for the program; however, base level funding for the program would remain at \$4 million GPR.

9. Alternatively, the Committee could decide that funding for these prior year commitments should be paid out of the base level funds. One could argue that the advance commitment of funding by an agency does not necessitate the Legislature to subsequently provide added funding for the program. Because these monies count toward two-thirds funding of partial school revenues, \$166,700 GPR for equalization aids would need to be provided annually to maintain this goal, if the Governor's recommended funding increase of \$500,000 GPR annually was not approved.

10. The Governor's budget would also require TEACH to award at least one grant annually to an applicant located in the territory of each CESA. Under current law, grants are to be awarded on a competitive basis with preference statutorily required to be given to consortia that include one or more public library boards. The Board is required, to the extent possible, to ensure the grants are equally distributed on a statewide basis.

11. Requiring a grant to be awarded to each CESA could result in some applicants not receiving a grant even though they scored higher than other applicants. If the Committee wishes to have the grants awarded on a strictly competitive basis, it could delete the Governor's recommendation as it relates to awarding a grant to each CESA.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide an additional \$500,000 GPR annually for TEACH training and technical assistance grants. Adjust equalization aid by -\$166,700 GPR annually to maintain two-thirds funding.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$666,600
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by transferring \$500,000 GPR from 2000-01 to 1999-00. Decrease equalization funding by \$166,700 GPR in 1999-00 and increase funding by \$166,700 GPR in 2000-01 to maintain two-thirds funding. Under this alternative, all of the additional \$1,000,000 GPR would be provided in 1999-00 as one-time funding to pay the final amounts due on awarded 1998-99 training and technical assistance grants.

Alternative 2	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$666,600
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

3. Maintain current law and delete \$500,000 GPR annually from the bill and provide \$166,700 GPR annually in equalization aids to maintain two-thirds funding.

Alternative 3	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$666,600]

4. In addition to any of the alternatives, modify the appropriation that funds the training and technical assistance grant program from a biennial to an annual appropriation and prohibit the TEACH Board from committing funding in excess of the appropriation amounts.

5. In addition to any of the alternatives, delete the Governor's requirement that the TEACH Board award at least one grant annually to an applicant located in the territory of each CESA.

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

1999

Date (time) needed SOON

LRB b 0326 / 1

**LFB BUDGET AMENDMENT
[ONLY FOR LFB]**

DN PLS o MDK: JLg

See form **AMENDMENTS — COMPONENTS & ITEMS.**

**LFB AMENDMENT
TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45**

>>FOR JT. FIN. SUB. — NOT FOR INTRODUCTION<<

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

#. Page ³⁹⁵~~395~~, line ¹⁰~~10~~: after that line insert:

- ~~#. Page , line :~~
- ~~#. Page / line :~~
- ~~#. Page , line :~~
- ~~#. Page , line :~~
- ~~#. Page , line :~~



273 m (B)

Section #. 20.275 (1) (et) of the statutes is amended to read:

20.275 (1) (et) Educational technology training and technical assistance grants. ~~Biennially, the~~ The amounts in the schedule for grants to cooperative educational service agencies and consortia under s. 44.72 (1).

History: 1997 a. 27, 237.

(End) ✓

DN

This draft ^{changes} amends s. 20.215 (1)(et)
~~to~~ from a biennium to an annual
appropriation but does not "prohibit the
TEACH board from committing funding
in excess of the appropriation amount(s)"

As we discussed ~~I mentioned~~ on the
phone, ~~that~~ such a ^{prohibition} statutory ~~restriction~~ like that
might create an unintended implication
for other ^{state} agencies. If you need more
~~information, please let me know.~~

PLS

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRBb0326/1dn
PG;jlg:km

May 20, 1999

This changes s. 20.275 (1) (et) from a biennial to an annual appropriation but does not "prohibit the TEACH board from committing funding in excess of the appropriation amounts". As we discussed on the phone, such a statutory prohibition might create an unintended implication for other state agencies.

Peter R. Grant
Managing Attorney
Phone: (608) 267-3362
E-mail: Peter.Grant@legis.state.wi.us



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0326/1
PG&MDK;jlg:km

LFB:.....Collins - TEACH training and technical assistance grants

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 1. Page 395, line 10: after that line insert:

3 "SECTION 273m. 20.275 (1) (et) of the statutes is amended to read:

4 20.275 (1) (et) *Educational technology training and technical assistance*

5 *grants. Biennially, the The* amounts in the schedule for grants to cooperative

6 educational service agencies and consortia under s. 44.72 (1).".

7 (END)