

S

**(Gov) Agency:** UW-LaCrosse Health Science Center

**Recommendations:**

**Paper #994:** Alternative 1 (gov's proposal, no action needed)

**Comments:** This helps the new health center get up and running. Various options to chisel away small chunks of this are OK, as would be sunseting. But this appears to be a reasonable approach to providing more primary health practitioners for an underserved area.

Prepared by: Bob



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #994

### La Crosse Health Science Center (UW System)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 626, #17]

#### CURRENT LAW

In 1998-99, the adjusted base budget for the UW System totals approximately \$2,771.1 million, of which \$911.0 million or 32.9% is funded from state, general purpose revenues. Approximately 80.7% of the University's GPR budget is provided under an appropriation for general program operations for University education, research and public service. The UW System has the ability to combine the GPR general program operations funds with monies received from tuition and certain federal indirect cost reimbursements, creating an approximate \$1.2 billion pool of funds that it may use to run its operations.

Annually in June or July, the UW Board of Regents approves budget allocations to the 26 campuses in the System based on past allocations, targeted budget initiatives, planned enrollment changes and planned programmatic changes.

#### GOVERNOR

Provide \$184,600 GPR and \$99,400 PR in 1999-00 and \$369,200 GPR and \$198,800 PR in 2000-01 to support UW-La Crosse's share of the operating and maintenance costs of the La Crosse Health Science Center. Because the Center is not expected to open until February, 2000, funding is provided for only six months in the first year of the biennium.

#### DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The La Crosse Medical Health Science Consortium was formed in 1993 to enhance and strengthen primary care and medical health science education and research through collaborative programming and the use of shared resources and expertise. The Consortium consists

of UW-La Crosse, Western Wisconsin Technical College (Western), Viterbo College, Gundersen Lutheran and Franciscan Skemp Healthcare/Mayo Health System. The Consortium was established to address health care provider shortages and other issues in 22 counties in a tri-state area that includes southwestern Wisconsin, northeastern Iowa and southeastern Minnesota.

2. In March, 1998, the Consortium began construction of the La Crosse Health Science Center, a 168,655 square foot facility that is expected to open in February, 2000. The Center will house the UW-La Crosse and Western allied health programs, a student health center and laboratory and research space. The student health center will be operated by UW-La Crosse and Western will pay a fee for its use by its students. The Center is also expected to provide distance education and telemedicine services. One of the primary purposes of the Center is to increase the number of healthcare professionals in the counties located in the tri-state region, many of which have been designated as medically underserved areas. The consortium intends to achieve this goal, in part, through the expansion of UW-La Crosse's and Western's allied health programs based on the idea that healthcare professionals are likely to remain in the region in which they received their education.

3. The Center is expected to serve a total of 530 students in 13 UW and technical college programs. The UW-La Crosse programs that would be housed in the Center include nuclear medicine technology, medical laboratory science, radiation therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy and clinical microbiology. Research related to human physiology and microbiology will also be located at the Center. In addition, students enrolled in other health-related programs at UW-La Crosse are also expected to receive some of their classroom and clinical training at the Center.

4. The facility, which is located between the UW-La Crosse and Western campuses on land owned by Western, is being constructed at a total cost of \$26.8 million. Of the total, \$13.4 million in general fund supported borrowing was provided through the Wisconsin Initiative for State Technology and Applied Research (WISTAR) program. An additional \$5.4 million was provided by Western in the form of \$3.65 million in bonds, \$1.25 million for the 1.6 acres of land for the Center and movable equipment valued at \$500,000. The remaining \$8 million will be obtained through private fundraising.

5. The total annual cost of operations and maintenance for the Center has been estimated at \$1,254,700. This amount includes costs associated with such items as custodial and maintenance labor, heating, electricity, water and sewer, technology, landscaping and insurance. Since the Center will be used to varying extents by all of the consortium members, each member will be required to pay a portion of these costs based on the percentage of total space which they occupy in the building. The estimated operating and maintenance costs are based on average costs for all of the consortium partners. Costs were identified separately for clinical space and for education and research space and were based on costs incurred by the partners involved in those activities. However, the Director of the Consortium has indicated that actual costs will not be known until after the facility is operational. Similarly, the exact allocation of space to each Consortium member will not be finalized until after the Center opens. Consequently, the amount requested for La Crosse's portion of the costs is estimated.

6. In its 1999-01 biennial budget submission, the UW System requested a total of \$1,185,000 (\$770,400 GPR and \$414,600 PR tuition revenues) over the biennium to support UW-La Crosse's share of the operating and maintenance costs of the Center based on its share of the facility, which is estimated at 63%, or approximately 106,250 square feet. Of the amount requested, the bill would provide \$852,000 (\$553,800 GPR and \$298,200 PR) over the biennium. According to DOA staff, this amount excludes funding for expenses associated with student health services and research as well as certain technology equipment costs. Since the Center is not expected to open until February, 2000, funding for the remaining costs would be provided for only six months in the first year of the biennium.

7. While the Consortium estimated the total annual cost of operations and maintenance for the Center at \$1,254,700, for the purpose of determining UW-La Crosse's share of the total cost, DOA excluded \$96,700 for technology costs from its calculation, resulting in an annual cost of \$1,158,000. UW-La Crosse's share of the omitted technology costs would be \$47,400 annually. DOA staff indicate that these costs were excluded because they were viewed as relating to technology infrastructure and hardware replacement expenses which are not typically designated as operating and maintenance expenses.

8. According to the Director of the Consortium, the amount budgeted for technology represents legitimate operating and maintenance costs based on UW-La Crosse's average expenditures for the maintenance of data connections. These costs include: equipment contract and service costs; distance education lines and connections; software licenses; and local area network maintenance, including switches, routers, network-related servers and student help. Not included in the estimate are expenditures for staff salaries, wiring upgrades and major equipment items such as computers and primary servers.

9. DOA staff indicate that funding associated with approximately 8,500 square feet of space allocated to research activities was excluded from the bill because providing state funding for research would conflict with the intent of the WISTAR program under which much of the funding for the construction of the Center was provided. When it was created in the 1991-93 state budget, the WISTAR program was intended to improve research facilities at the University and other state agencies in order to attract federal and private research funding. Thus, it is argued that the omission of GPR funds for the costs associated with UW-La Crosse's research activities at the Center would be consistent with the state's treatment of other WISTAR programs. These costs are estimated at \$58,600 annually.

10. UW-La Crosse staff contend that the exclusion of costs related to the research space would be inappropriate because at least 95% of the research that would take place at the Center would be in the form of undergraduate research projects initiated by students and faculty members and would be instructional in nature. These projects, it is argued are not of the type that would normally attract federal or private support.

11. The Governor's proposal would exclude operating and maintenance costs associated with 15,000 square feet of space that would be allocated for student health services. DOA staff

indicate that these costs, estimated at \$102,900 annually, were omitted because the campus currently provides student health services in another building on campus and these activities would simply be relocated to the Center. Therefore, the campus should be able to use existing funding related to student health services to support these costs.

12. In the 1997-99 state budget, the Legislature provided \$1,041,200 to UW-La Crosse to expand its physical therapy program and to establish an occupational therapy program. The UW System views the provision of state funding for the operating and maintenance costs of the Center as the next step in completing the UW-La Crosse allied health initiative. UW staff have indicated that if the proposed funding is not provided, the campus would have to reallocate funds from other programs.

13. On April 21, 1999, the Joint Committee on Finance reallocated base funding of \$590,600 GPR over the biennium from the incentive grants program administered by the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Board to support Western's portion of the operating and maintenance costs of the Center. Similar to the Governor's recommendation for UW-La Crosse, the technology costs were excluded from the calculation on which Western's funding amount was based. Under the Committee's action, the allocation of the funding for Western will sunset on June 30, 2001. Given the current uncertainty of the actual operating and maintenance costs for the facility and the percentage of total space that will be occupied by UW-La Crosse, funding provided to the campus for this purpose could also include a sunset date which would allow the Legislature to reevaluate the provision of the funding in the next biennium based on actual costs.

14. While all construction projects proposed by the campuses must first be approved by the Board of Regents, the Board does not require campuses to estimate the operating and maintenance costs associated with a new building or to indicate how such costs would be funded. In general, however, UW institutions are expected to pay for operating and maintenance costs associated with new buildings through base reallocations. One could argue that the Governor's proposal to fund the operating and maintenance costs for this particular facility could set a precedent for other campuses to request funding for similar purposes. Further, such action may be construed as a commitment to fund future increases in the operating and maintenance costs of the Center. UW System staff indicate that while La Crosse will attempt to fund such increases from base reallocations, requests for additional monies may be necessary.

## ALTERNATIVES

1. *Approve the Governor's Recommendation.* Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$184,600 GPR and \$99,400 PR in 1999-00 and \$369,200 GPR and \$198,800 PR in 2000-01 to support UW-La Crosse's share of the operating and maintenance costs of the La Crosse Health Science Center.

2. *Provide Funding for Research and/or Student Health Services Costs.* Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing additional funding for the following items:

	1999-00		2000-01		Total	
	GPR	PR	GPR	PR	GPR	PR
2a. Research	\$19,000	\$10,300	\$38,100	\$20,500	\$57,100	\$30,800
2b. Student Health Services	33,500	18,000	66,900	36,000	100,400	54,000

3. *Provide Funding for Technology Costs.* Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing an additional \$15,400 GPR and \$8,300 PR in 1999-00 and \$30,800 GPR and \$16,600 PR in 2000-01 to support UW-La Crosse's share of the technology costs for the Center.

Alternative 3	GPR	PR	TOTAL
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$46,200	\$24,900	\$71,100

4. *Provide Funding for Technology costs and Research and/or Student Health Services Costs.* In addition to Alternative #3, modify the Governor's recommendation by providing additional funding for the following items:

	1999-00		2000-01		Total	
	GPR	PR	GPR	PR	GPR	PR
4a. Research	\$20,700	\$11,100	\$41,300	\$22,200	\$62,000	\$33,300
4b. Student Health Services	36,300	19,500	72,500	39,000	108,800	58,500

5. *Sunset Provision.* Modify any of the above alternatives to specify that amount provided to support UW-La Crosse's share of the operating and maintenance costs would sunset on June 30, 2001.

6. Maintain current law.

Alternative 6	GPR	PR	TOTAL
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$553,800	-\$298,200	-\$852,000

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO#	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
BURKE	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
DECKER	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z
JAUCH	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOORE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SHIBILSKI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PLACHE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
COWLES	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PANZER	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
GARD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PORTER	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
KAUFERT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ALBERS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DUFF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WARD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
HUBER	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RILEY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

**(Gov) Agency:** UW – State Laboratory of Hygiene

**Recommendations:**

**Paper #995:** Alternative <sup>2</sup> (gov's proposal, no action needed)

**Comments:** The lab provides drug and alcohol analysis services to docs, coroners, medical examiners, hospital and clinical labs. The gov says they need more money because of increased workload.

Prepared by: Bob



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #995

### State Laboratory of Hygiene (UW System)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 626, #18b]

#### CURRENT LAW

The Wisconsin State Laboratory of Hygiene (WSLH), which is attached to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, provides comprehensive drug and alcohol analysis services to Wisconsin physicians, coroners, medical examiners, hospital and clinical laboratories, law enforcement agencies, public health departments and other state agencies. These services include drug abuse detection, overdose and death investigations, alcohol and other drug analysis related to highway safety, toxicology consultation and interpretation, and courtroom testimony. In 1998-99, \$639,700 of program revenue, derived from a surcharge collected from persons convicted of an OWI offense, was appropriated for services related to OWI testing. This surcharge currently funds 10.0 positions (9.0 chemists and 1.0 clerical), which provide support to law enforcement agencies under Wisconsin's implied consent statute.

#### GOVERNOR

Provide \$210,000 PR in 1999-00 and \$15,000 PR in 2000-01 to support the increased workload of alcohol and drug tests performed by the State Laboratory.

#### DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The State Laboratory of Hygiene provides alcohol and drug analyses under Wisconsin's implied consent statute. In fiscal year 1997-98, the WSLH provided alcohol analysis on 15,484 blood and 137 urine samples related to implied consent and motor vehicle deaths. Funding for this testing is obtained from the operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated (OWI) surcharge assessed to persons convicted under this statute. Persons who are assessed a fine or forfeiture for OWI violations are required to pay a \$340 driver improvement surcharge in addition to any applicable fine, forfeiture, penalty assessment or jail assessment. By statute, counties must



remit 37.6 percent of the revenues collected for the surcharge to the state treasurer, which are budgeted by the Legislature to support programs administered by the Department of Health and Family Services, Department of Transportation, Justice, Public Instruction and the WSLH.

2. The toxicology staff at the WSLH is also responsible for providing expert testimony to support drug and alcohol analyses performed at the Laboratory and for providing technical expertise regarding methodology or interpretation of results. In fiscal year 1997-98, staff received 3,087 subpoenas and gave testimony in 241 cases across the state.

3. As part of its 1999-01 budget request and under a s.16.515/505(2) request submitted in October of 1998, WSLH requested funding for 3.0 PR positions (2.0 chemists and 1.0 program assistant) and increased expenditure authority of \$231,400 PR (OWI surcharge funding) to support increased drug and alcohol testing and testimony workloads. No additional position authority was requested because staff indicated that vacant positions from another program could be transferred to meet this staffing need. Staff from WSLH indicated that alcohol tests increased by 31 percent, drug screening panels increased by 14 percent and blood collection kits shipped by the WSLH increased by 26 percent in 1997-98. In addition, there was a 20 percent increase in subpoenas received and a 26 percent increase in court appearances made by WSLH staff in 1997-98.

4. DOA recommended approval of 1.0 permanent FTE chemist and funding for additional blood testing kits under the s. 16.515/505 request. Due to the uncertainty that workload increases would be long-term and the ability to review the Lab's staffing needs as part of the biennial budget process, during which WSLH's request could be considered along with those of the other OWI surcharge funded programs, DOA did not recommend funding the entire request. DOA's recommendation was approved by the Committee on October 28, 1998.

5. The WSLH's 1999-01 budget submission, included a request for funding the 3.0 FTE additional positions (\$213,100 PR in 1999-00 and \$223,300 PR in 2000-01) and funding for lab equipment (\$140,000 PR in 1999-00 and \$40,000 PR in 2000-01). The budget submission included funding requested for the items approved under the Lab's s. 16.515/505 request due to the timing of the budget request and 14-day passive review request.

6. The budget bill would provide \$210,000 PR in 1999-00 and \$15,000 PR in 2000-01 to support the increased workload of alcohol and drug tests performed by WSLH. According to the Executive Budget Brief, the funding provided by the Governor is intended to expand clerical support for the program and purchase equipment and expenses. Of the funding recommended, \$15,000 PR annually would be for salary, fringe benefit and supplies and services costs. In 1999-00, one-time funding of \$195,000 PR would be provided for equipment purchases.

7. Staff from the WSLH indicate that over the past six months their workload has not decreased; rather, they have experienced a 12 percent increase in the number of implied consent and motor vehicle death alcohol blood tests performed as compared to the tests conducted in those months in the prior year. In addition, staff report that the number of subpoenas received and court appearances has not declined. Staff from WSLH note that the turn-around time for reporting test results has increased. Further, court appearances are being scheduled three to four months in the

future because there are not enough chemists to run the test and testify in court. Staff note that this testimony is often critical for gaining the convictions upon which the OWI surcharge is levied.

8. These increases are part of an overall five-year workload increase. From 1993-94 through 1997-98, alcohol tests performed by the Lab have increased 75 percent, drug panels by 63 percent, court appearances by 27 percent and the number of subpoenas received by 77 percent.

9. WSLH staff believe that the increased workload is due to decisions by local enforcement agencies to use blood as the specimen of choice in OWI arrests rather than breath. WSHL staff indicate several reasons for the increased use of blood samples in these cases. These reasons include: (a) problems with intoxilyzers including poor repair and certification records; (b) blood tests being perceived as more reliable than breath, resulting in fewer cases tried and fewer cases lost; (c) processing time for arrests is shortened allowing for more effective utilization of officer time and cost savings to agencies; and (d) the use of blood tests allows for testing for other intoxicating drugs.

10. Based on the information provided by WSLH, it appears the request for additional staff to handle the increased workload is justifiable. However, concerns may still remain regarding whether the workload increase is long-term in nature. Staff from DOA indicated in the 14-day passive review recommendation that the long-term impact of the above-discussed items is hard to predict for three reasons. First, as part of the 1997-99 biennial budget act, DOT was provided with funding to replace all existing breathalyzers by December, 1999. Second, a court decision that evidence of intoxication from breathalyzers retrofitted with non-standard parts was not automatically admissible in OWI trials has been overturned and will no longer be an issue because new machines are being provided. Finally, DOA noted that data indicates that while the percentage of OWI blood tests has increased the total number of OWI tests, blood and breathalyzer, has not changed significantly since 1995. Therefore, DOA argued that the effect of the court case and distribution of new breathalyzer machines will decrease demand for blood tests.

11. Staff from the Lab, however, believe the workload will not decrease in the near future even with the distribution of the new machines and the recent court decision. First, staff believe a number of legal challenges will be made related to the accuracy of the new machines, which could take years to fully litigate and will result in staff time spent on researching and testing the machines and testifying in court. In addition, staff believe that the benefits of being able to test for other drugs and the cost savings sheriff's departments can realize by using blood tests will continue to motivate enforcement officers to use blood tests. Finally, the expertise of the Lab staff is beneficial to prosecutors when a case is taken to trial.

12. The Finance Committee could decide that based on the increased workload additional funding for 1.0 chemist and 1.0 program assistant should be provided. Under this alternative, \$88,100 PR in 1999-00 and \$100,300 PR in 2000-01 would be needed to fund both positions. This would be an increase of \$73,100 PR in 1999-00 and \$85,300 PR in 2000-01 over the Governor's recommended funding for position costs.

13. This funding would be provided from the OWI surcharge fund, which is estimated to

have a balance of \$1.66 million at the end of 1998-99. Under the Governor's budget proposal, it is estimated that there will be a balance of approximately \$570,600 in 1999-00 and \$852,700 in 2000-01. Therefore, based on these estimates it appears that there would be sufficient monies available to fund the additional positions.

14. If the Finance Committee wishes to reduce the effect of funding two additional positions on the OWI surcharge fund balance, members could offset a portion of the costs associated with these new positions by reducing the funding recommended by the Governor's for one-time equipment costs. The Governor's recommendation would provide \$195,000 PR in 1999-00 for lab equipment purchases. Of the equipment, staff from WSLH has indicated it would purchase with the additional funding, one item must be replaced prior to January 1, 2000, after which the equipment will be unserviceable and obsolete. The Committee could provide \$90,000 PR in one-time funding in 1999-00 for this equipment purchase, rather than the \$195,000 PR. However, one could argue that funding for equipment purchases is necessary to allow the Lab to continue performing high-quality testing.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$210,000 PR in 1999-00 and \$15,000 PR in 2000-01 for the State Laboratory of Hygiene.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$73,100 PR in 1999-00 and \$85,300 PR in 2000-01 and transfer position authority for 2.0 vacant positions from the s. 20.285(i) WSLH appropriation funded with testing fees and contract amounts to the s. 20.285(ia) appropriation, which is funded with OWI surcharge revenues.

<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>PR</b>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$158,400

3. In addition to alternative 2, reduce funding for one-time equipment purchases by \$105,000 PR in 1999-00.

<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>PR</b>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$105,000

4. Maintain current law.

<b>Alternative 4</b>	<b>PR</b>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$225,000

MO# 111-2

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<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
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PORTER	<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
HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
RILEY	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

**(Gov) Agency:** UW – Precollege Programs

*Cond  
A4, B-1, C-3+4*

**Recommendations:**

**Paper #996:** A1 (gov's proposal), B1, C1

**Comments:** The gov proposes modest increases for precollege programs intended to increase the enrollment of minority and disadvantaged students in the UW system. The committee just authorized upping related DPI programs. UW sees a need to dial up its capacity to accommodate the added students. The commitment to DPI should not be seen as an excuse to back away from the UW programs.

Alternative A2 would be great, if there is an appetite for spending. A1 provides no money in the first year. UW says it needs help in year one.

Prepared by: Bob



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #996

### Precollege Programs (UW System)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 627, #19]

#### CURRENT LAW

Three GPR appropriations within the UW System's budget provide funding specifically for programs for minority and disadvantaged students. In 1998-99, the total amount provided for these programs is \$13.6 million. Current law requires that the funds provided in the largest of these appropriations (\$7.1 million in 1998-99) be allocated for recruitment of minority and disadvantaged students and for programs for minority and disadvantaged students already enrolled in the System. Annually, by April 15, the Board of Regents is required to: (a) adopt a precollege, recruitment and retention plan for minority and disadvantaged students enrolled in the System; and (b) submit a report to the Governor and Legislature which includes the UW System's plan, information on financial aid distributed to students, by ethnicity, class level and dependency status, financial need and the percentage of need satisfied by loans and grants.

The remaining two appropriations provide funding for two financial aid programs that are administered by the UW System. The Lawton minority undergraduate grant program provides need-based grants to minority resident and Minnesota reciprocity students enrolled as upperclassmen. Eligible students can receive up to \$2,500 per year for a maximum of four years. In 1997-98, 1,712 students received grants averaging \$1,278 per grant. In 1998-99, base funding for the grants is \$2,406,900 GPR. The advanced opportunity program (AOP) provides grants to minority and disadvantaged graduate students. Both residents and nonresidents are eligible for the grants which are primarily based on financial need and/or academic performance. Specific eligibility requirements vary by campus. In 1997-98, 502 students received grants averaging \$6,969 per grant. In 1998-99, base funding for AOP is \$4,065,500 GPR.

## GOVERNOR

Provide \$476,200 GPR and \$256,400 PR in 2000-01 to increase the number of precollege programs at UW campuses and expand some programs to provide year-round follow through experiences for students.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. There are currently over 400 precollege programs offered in Wisconsin. While a majority of the programs, which enroll pupils in age groups from prekindergarten to 12<sup>th</sup> grade, are offered by UW System institutions, the programs are also provided by private colleges and Wisconsin Technical College System institutions. The programs vary widely in content and structure and may be targeted to students of one or the other gender or certain races or ethnic groups. Most are offered as residential or commuter "camps" during the summer months while others take place during the academic year. Typically, the programs provide experience or instruction in sports, academic subjects, fine arts, leadership skills or college preparatory study and test-taking skills. While some precollege programs are free, students are typically charged a fee ranging from \$5 to over \$400.

2. A principal goal of most academic precollege programs is to motivate K-12 students to graduate from high school and pursue a college education. The programs attempt to accomplish this by providing exposure to the college atmosphere as well as a sampling of the type of activities that would be expected of a college student. As noted, some programs are designed to improve students' study or test-taking skills in direct preparation for college. Increasing minority student participation in precollege programs has been identified as a significant factor in increasing the number and percentage of students of color who graduate from high school and enroll in college.

3. A survey conducted by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) in 1990 revealed that, of the students who received the agency's minority precollege scholarships, which pay for a students' enrollment in academic precollege programs, approximately 92% graduated from high school and 65.5% of those graduates subsequently enrolled at postsecondary institutions. However, it is difficult to assess the current impact of precollege programs on high school graduation rates and postsecondary recruitment since more recent data is not available.

4. A total of 11,630 students of color are currently enrolled in the UW System, comprising 7.7% of total enrollment. Of the 150,574 students enrolled in the System, 2.6% are African Americans, 2.5% are Asian Americans, 1.9% are Hispanic/Latino and 0.7% are Native Americans. About 62% of all students of color enroll at either Madison or Milwaukee. The UW System has attempted to increase diversity and improve educational quality and access for targeted racial/ethnic groups through two ten-year plans. The first plan, called "Design for Diversity," extended from 1988 through 1997 and consisted of seven objectives including a goal to double the number of new freshmen and transfer students of color by 1998. While the University met some of the goals, the number of new undergraduate students of color increased by only 849 students (67%).

During this period, while total enrollment decreased by 7.0%, the total number of students of color increased by 53.8%. However, the increase was not consistent across all race/ethnic groups. For example, the number of Asian Americans increased by 89.3% while the number of African Americans increased by 25.5%.

5. In May, 1998, the Board of Regents adopted "Plan 2008: Educational Quality Through Racial and Ethnic Diversity" for the succeeding ten-year period. Plan 2008 includes seven goals, the first of which is to increase the number of Wisconsin high school graduates of color who apply, are accepted, and enroll at UW System institutions. Strategies for achieving this goal include: increasing and expanding precollege programs; developing recruitment programs targeted to adult students of color; increasing recruitment efforts for traditional-age students of color; and increasing participation in precollege programs by American Indian students. The other six goals included in Plan 2008 are as follows:

- a. Encourage partnerships that build the educational pipeline by reaching children and their parents at an earlier age;
- b. Close the gap in educational achievement, by bringing retention and graduation rates for students of color in line with those of the student body as a whole;
- c. Increase the amount of financial aid available to needy students and reduce their reliance on loans;
- d. Increase the number of faculty and staff of color so that they are represented in the UW System workforce in proportion to their current availability in relevant job pools. In addition, work to increase their future availability as potential employees;
- e. Foster instructional environments and course development that enhance learning and a respect for racial and ethnic diversity; and
- f. Improve accountability of the UW System and its institutions.

6. For the most part, UW precollege programs are funded through GPR, federal programs, tuition paid by students and scholarships. Most of the GPR funds are included in the UW System's appropriation for programs for minority and disadvantaged students. These funds are distributed to the campuses which in turn, determine their allocation among various programs serving the targeted population of students. Of the \$5.8 million expended for these programs in 1997-98, 64% supported activities aimed at retention of minority and disadvantaged UW students while 36% was divided evenly to support precollege programming and recruitment efforts. These percentages have remained relatively stable for the last several years. Campuses may supplement the GPR funds using base reallocations, federal and private monies. UW System does not collect data on the total amount spent for precollege programming for minority and disadvantaged students. However, according to the University's most recent annual report to the Governor and Legislature

on programs for minority and disadvantaged students (hereafter referred to as the M/D report), which was submitted on April 12, 1999, approximately \$1.0 million GPR, excluding fringe benefits, from the minority/disadvantaged appropriation was expended for precollege programs and activities. Excluding financial aid provided to students, UW institutions expended a total of \$18.1 million in 1997-98 for programs targeted to minority and disadvantaged students.

7. UW System staff indicate that the increase in funding for precollege programs that would be provided under the bill would be used to develop new programs and to expand some programs to provide year-round experiences. For example, a student may attend a week-long summer program at a UW campus, then return for a weekend in the fall and spring semesters. The proposed funding would be aimed at programs serving minority and disadvantaged students and the GPR funds would be placed in the University's appropriation for programs for minority and disadvantaged students. It is estimated that the proposed amount would provide precollege opportunities for approximately 750 students. However, since the funds would be used for program development and implementation, rather than scholarships, students filling those new slots would be expected to pay tuition.

8. In its 1999-01 budget submission, the UW System requested \$476,200 GPR and \$256,400 PR in 1999-00 and \$952,400 GPR and \$512,800 PR in 2000-01 for precollege programs. It is estimated that these amounts would have allowed 1,500 additional students to enroll in precollege programs by the end of the biennium. In public testimony on the budget bill, many students cited funding for the University's diversity initiative as a high priority and indicated support for additional funding for the initiative.

9. The Legislature last increased funding for precollege programs for minority and disadvantaged students in 1997 Act 27 (the 1997-99 state budget). A total of \$450,000 (\$292,700 GPR and \$157,300 PR) over the biennium was provided in the UW System's general program operations appropriations and the appropriation for tuition and fee revenues. Of the amount provided in Act 27, \$200,000 was allocated to UW-Milwaukee to fund a precollege program coordinator position and to provide year-round programs. The remaining \$250,000 was awarded on a competitive basis to ten UW institutions, including the UW-Colleges, to fund a variety of precollege programs targeted to minority and disadvantaged students. Total base funding resulting from the Act 27 provision is \$266,500 (\$173,300 GPR and \$93,200 PR). Since the additional funds were provided specifically to expand precollege programs for minority and disadvantaged students, it would be appropriate to transfer the base GPR funds from the University's general program operations appropriation to the appropriation for programs for minority and disadvantaged students.

10. Of the approximately 375 precollege programs offered by UW System institutions each year, about 88 are targeted to serve students of color. The University's 1998 M/D report notes that UW precollege programs served a total of 3,808 students in 1997-98, of which 2,416 (63.5%) were students of color. These students represent approximately 1.4% of all K-12 students of color.

11. UW System staff indicate that during the development of Plan 2008, increasing the number of precollege programs was one of the three highest priorities identified by UW System



faculty, staff, students of color and communities of color. The other two priorities were additional financial aid for students of color and increases in the number of students, faculty and staff of color in the UW System. In its 1999-01 budget submission, the University requested a total of \$10.4 million GPR over the biennium to increase funding for the Lawton undergraduate minority retention grant and the advanced opportunity program, the two financial aid programs administered by the UW System that are specifically targeted to minority and disadvantaged students. Under the bill, funding for these programs as well as the financial aid programs administered by the Higher Educational Aids Board (HEAB) and targeted to minority and disadvantaged students would remain at the 1998-99 base level. However, in executive action on the budget bill on April 20, 1999, the Joint Finance Committee adopted a motion to increase funding for the talent incentive grant program (TIP), which is administered by HEAB and provides grants to the state's most needy students, by 4.92% in 1999-00 and 4.97% in 2000-01. Slightly over half of the students who receive TIP awards are students of color. The same motion reduced the proposed funding increases for the Wisconsin higher education grant (WHEG) program and the tuition grant (TG) program from 6% annually to 4.92% in 1999-00 and 4.97% in 2000-01. The authors of the motion, Representative Gard and Senator Moore, publicly expressed the intent to use the resulting GPR savings of \$974,300 over the biennium to provide identical percentage increases in funding for the Lawton grant program and the AOP program.

12. One could argue that although both precollege and financial aid programs play a significant role in increasing the number of students of color pursuing postsecondary education, financial aid programs aimed at minority and disadvantaged students may have a greater impact due to their dual effect as recruitment and retention tools. As currently administered, the Lawton grant program provides awards only to sophomores, juniors and seniors and is therefore, not considered a recruitment program. However, in its biennial request, UW System indicated that a portion of the requested increase in funding would be used to expand the program to freshmen. The \$476,200 GPR that would be provided to increase funding for precollege programs could be used to provide a 19.8% increase in the Lawton grant program which would fund approximately 375 grants to freshman students at the current average award of \$1,278. The Lawton grant program is currently 100% GPR funded. If a tuition component were to be added at the amount that would be provided for precollege programs (\$256,400), an additional 200 grants could be awarded. It has been suggested that it would be more appropriate to use tuition revenues to increase financial aid than precollege programs since the tuition dollars would directly benefit existing UW System students, rather than K-12 students who may enroll in an out-of-state college or a private college or choose not to attend college at all.

13. Using the proposed funds for financial aid would ensure that those dollars benefit students with financial need. One of the principal barriers to higher education for low-income students is the relatively high proportion of loans to grants. The UW System reports that, on average, the amount of debt incurred by students of color (\$13,493) is only slightly higher than the amount for all students (\$13,332). However, 69% of undergraduate students of color graduate with debt as compared to 58% of all students.

14. On the other hand, if the goal is to use the proposed funds to reach the largest

number of students, expanding precollege programs would serve an estimated 750 students while increasing funding for the Lawton program would potentially provide grants to 575 students.

15. A portion of the funding for precollege programs offered by UW System institutions as well as other postsecondary institutions in the state comes from scholarships awarded to students. The minority precollege scholarship program, administered by DPI, provides scholarships to students of color in grades six through twelve to enroll in academic precollege programs at UW campuses, technical colleges and private colleges. The scholarships, which averaged \$310 each in 1997-98, support the cost of a student's tuition, books, supplies and room and board for residential programs. While financial need is not an eligibility requirement of the program, DPI staff state that most scholarship recipients do demonstrate need. In the 1995-97 state budget, annual GPR funding for this program was reduced from \$1,000,000 to \$900,000. The 1997-99 budget adjustment act provided an additional \$150,000 beginning in 1998-99, resulting in the current appropriation amount of \$1,050,000. In its 1999-01 biennial budget submission, DPI requested \$950,000 GPR annually to increase funding for the scholarships to \$2,000,000. DPI staff indicate that the additional funding would permit the agency to award approximately 3,500 additional scholarships per year. However, the bill as recommended by the Governor would maintain funding for the program at the 1998-99 base level. In executive action on the budget bill on May 20, 1999, the Finance Committee increased funding for the minority precollege scholarship program by \$950,000 GPR annually.

16. It has been argued that increasing funding for DPI's minority precollege scholarship program would be a more efficient way to increase participation by minority and disadvantaged students in precollege programs. It is estimated that the total funding amount provided in the bill to expand UW precollege programs could serve an additional 750 students. This estimate is based on an average cost of \$1,000 per student for recruitment, program implementation and evaluation. The same amount of funding, if provided to the minority precollege scholarship program, would permit approximately 2,365 additional students to attend precollege programs. However, since \$256,400 of the proposed \$732,600 would be derived from UW tuition revenues, the GPR funding provided in the bill would actually support approximately 1,540 additional scholarships.

17. UW System staff contend that comparisons of the number of students served based on the University's use of the funding and the minority precollege scholarship program are inappropriate since the DPI scholarships may not represent the per pupil cost to implement the programs, which may be funded from a variety of sources. In addition, since the year-round programs would result in more services to the students, it should be expected that the cost of these programs would be higher.

## ALTERNATIVES

### A. Funding for Precollege Programs

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$476,200 GPR and \$256,400 PR in 2000-01 to increase the number of precollege programs at UW campuses and expand some programs to provide year-round follow through experiences for students.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$476,200 GPR and \$256,400 PR in 1999-00 and an additional \$476,200 GPR and \$256,400 in 2000-01, to provide the amount requested by the University to expand precollege programs.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$952,400	\$512,800	\$1,465,200

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation. Instead, provide \$476,200 GPR in 2000-01 to increase funding for the minority precollege scholarship program administered by DPI. Funding for the program would increase from \$2,000,000 to \$2,476,200, an increase of 23.8% over the funding level previously established by the Finance Committee.

<u>Alternative A3</u>	<u>PR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$256,400

4. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative A4</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$476,200	-\$256,400	-\$732,600

### B. Transfer 1997-99 Funding for Precollege Programs

1. Transfer \$173,300 GPR in base level funding for precollege programs for minority and disadvantaged students from the University's general program operations appropriation to the UW appropriation for programs for minority and disadvantaged students.

2. Maintain current law.

**C. Funding for Lawton Grants and Advanced Opportunity Program**

1. Provide \$476,200 GPR in 2000-01 to increase funding for the Lawton minority undergraduate grant program in order to begin awarding grants to freshmen.

Alternative C1	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$476,200

2. Provide \$476,200 GPR in 2000-01 to increase funding for the Lawton minority undergraduate grant program in order to begin awarding grants to freshmen. In addition, provide \$256,400 PR in 2000-01 in a new, annual appropriation to supplement funding for the Lawton grant program.

Alternative C2	GPR	PR	TOTAL
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$476,200	\$256,400	\$732,600

3. Provide \$118,400 GPR in 1999-00 and \$243,900 GPR in 2000-01 to increase funding for the Lawton minority undergraduate grant program by 4.92% and 4.97%, respectively, to reflect the intent of a motion previously adopted by the Committee.

Alternative C3	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$362,300

4. Provide \$200,000 GPR in 1999-00 and \$412,000 GPR in 2000-01 to increase funding for the advanced opportunity program by 4.92% and 4.97%, respectively, to reflect the intent of a motion previously adopted by the Committee.

MO# A460132214

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PORTER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
HUBER	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RILEY	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Proposed by: M. arsen

AYE 1 NO 5 ABS 0

Alternative C4	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$612,000

MO# 0-1,0-3+4

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PORTER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RILEY	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

**(Gov) Agency:** UW -- Advising and Student Services

**Recommendations:**

**Paper #997:** A2 + 3(b)

*Handwritten:* B-1 + 3(a)

**Comments:** Students and administrators agree that better access to advising would help everybody. Students make better choices and probably graduate sooner. Having students more focused and graduating sooner frees up additional resources.

The gov's proposal is OK, but it makes student pay the freight. The preferred alternative would reinforce the 65/35 GPR/PR split.

Alternative 3 (b) deletes evaluation money which UW says it doesn't need and will request later. 3 (a) is the companion for option A1.

Prepared by: Bob



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #997

### Advising and Student Services (UW System)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 627, # 21 and Page 628, #22]

#### CURRENT LAW

While there is no standard structure for advising that is used by all UW System institutions, campuses generally follow either a centralized or decentralized structure, or a combination of the two. Centralized advising is characterized by a central advising office staffed by professional advisors who serve undergraduate students who have not declared a major and other groups of students with special needs such as athletes and students on academic probation. After a student has declared a major, he or she is usually assigned a faculty advisor in the appropriate department. Campuses with decentralized advising structures primarily use faculty members to provide both general academic advising and advising in the student's major. Campuses that have a combined structure usually rely on faculty to provide most individual advising services but also have a central advising office.

#### GOVERNOR

Provide \$2,000,000 PR and 28.5 PR positions in 2000-01 to improve academic, career and transfer student advising efforts at all UW System institutions.

In addition, provide \$121,700 GPR and \$65,500 PR in 1999-00 and \$203,300 GPR and \$109,500 PR in 2000-01 and 5.5 GPR positions beginning in 1999-00 to expand student services, including recruitment, admissions, advising and counseling, at the UW Colleges.

#### DISCUSSION POINTS

##### Systemwide Advising Initiative

1. Of the \$2,000,000 provided in the bill for Systemwide advising efforts, \$1,273,400

would support the cost of salaries and fringe benefits for the 28.5 FTE advising staff positions. According to DOA and UW System staff, the positions would be allocated among the UW institutions as follows: 3.0 FTE positions at UW-Madison; 2.5 FTEs at UW-Milwaukee; 1.5 FTEs at each comprehensive campus; and 0.5 FTE at the each of the UW Colleges. In addition, \$676,600 would be used for faculty and staff development, such as workshops and training programs, and to purchase advising software. Expenditure of these funds, which would be allocated to each campus based on its share of the total number of student credit hours, would be determined at the campus level. The bill would also provide \$50,000 for an evaluation of the advising initiative.

2. Over the biennium, the bill would provide 50% of the funding and approximately 80% of the position authority requested by the UW System in its 1999-01 budget submission. The University requested \$866,700 GPR and \$466,600 PR and 35.5 GPR positions beginning in 1999-00 and \$1,733,500 GPR and \$933,200 PR in 2000-01 for its advising initiative. The additional 7.0 FTE positions would have been allocated to the institutions as follows: 1.0 FTE position at Madison; 0.5 FTE at Milwaukee; and 0.5 FTEs at each comprehensive campus. The amount requested included \$1,520,400 over the biennium for faculty and staff development in advising and to purchase advising-related software. In the second year of the biennium, \$100,000 would have been used to evaluate the effectiveness of the campuses' advising efforts.

3. The University included a similar request in its 1997-99 budget proposal. While the Governor's budget recommendations for that biennium did not include funding for advising, the Legislature provided an additional \$400,000 and 6.0 FTE positions for a pilot program at two campuses to improve academic and career advising efforts. However, the Governor's veto reduced the amount provided to \$80,000 and 2.0 FTE positions annually and specified that the pilot program be implemented at a comprehensive campus. The University subsequently awarded these funds and positions to River Falls for a collaborative project with the Colleges aimed at improving advising services for transfer students.

4. The University's 1997-99 budget request was submitted partially in response to a 1995 student satisfaction survey commissioned by the UW System and conducted by a private corporation. The survey was designed to assess the views of degree-seeking undergraduates in the UW System on their educational experience in a number of broad areas including the quality of instruction, the accessibility of faculty, the availability and quality of advising and the availability of required courses. Of the students surveyed, 95% reported that they were satisfied with their overall experience in the UW System and 95.7% indicated that they were satisfied with the quality of the instruction they received. Some of the lowest student satisfaction ratings were reported in the areas of availability of academic advising and the quality of academic advising. Of the students in the survey who had sought advising services, 73% responded that academic advising was always or usually available, 23% reported that it was sometimes available and 2% stated that it was never available. In response to a question about the overall quality of the academic advising services they received, 75% of the students were somewhat or very satisfied and 23% were somewhat or very dissatisfied. The only survey area that received a lower satisfaction rating from students was the availability of courses, where 33% of the students indicated that they were sometimes or never able to register for the courses they needed in order to meet their degree requirements. Because the



survey did not collect information for individual campuses, it is difficult to assess whether the need to improve advising efforts is equivalent across all campuses in the System.

5. In 1996, a working group consisting of faculty, staff, students and administrators representing all of the UW institutions was appointed to identify state and national "best practices" in advising in order to target funding requested in the 1997-99 state budget to meet the most urgent needs of the campuses. The report of the working group stated that all campuses indicated that improved advising was a "high priority...as an essential part of their efforts to increase student retention." However, the campuses differed in the specific categories of advising requiring the most improvement. These categories included advising for precollege students, freshmen, high-risk students and transfer students. Other areas reported as needing improvement were career advising, professional development for advisors, coordination of services, evaluation of advising efforts and advising technology such as degree audit systems, compressed video, interactive computer programs in career advising and CD-ROMs.

6. While most UW undergraduate programs require students to complete 124 credits, in recent years, the average number of credits attempted by students prior to graduation has been 143 to 145. The large number of students taking excess credits results in some students having difficulty enrolling in required courses, reduces access to the University for other students and increases costs. Improvements in academic and career advising are often cited as a way to encourage better credit management by students, thus reducing the number of excess credits and shortening the amount of time students take to graduate. The University indicates that increases in the enrollment of transfer and nontraditional students and the proliferation of distance education courses also contribute to the need to increase the number of advisors and improve advising efforts.

7. Typically, funding for instruction-related initiatives in the UW System's budget is provided through a combination of 65% GPR and 35% program revenues derived from tuition. This proportion was followed for all but two of the education initiatives in the bill, funding for UW-Madison and the advising initiative. While 50% of the funds for the Madison item would be derived from tuition revenues, all of the funding provided for the advising initiative would come from tuition.

8. Funding an educational initiative solely with tuition is not without precedent. For example, in the 1995-97 biennium, tuition was increased by 1% in 1995-96 and by an additional 1% in 1996-97 to pay for improvements in instructional technology services which benefited students and, to a lesser extent, staff. The average increase in tuition that would result from the advising initiative proposal is estimated at 0.5%, or about \$12 per year for a resident undergraduate at one of the comprehensive campuses. According to DOA staff, the advising initiative would be funded exclusively with tuition because it would directly benefit UW students and students would be more likely to be involved in decisions regarding the expenditure of tuition monies. In addition, it could be argued that if students are required to pay for improvements in advising, they may be more likely to take advantage of the advising services available to them.

9. The bill would provide \$50,000 for an evaluation of the campuses' advising efforts.



However, when the University included funding (\$100,000) for an evaluation in its budget request, it was under the assumption that the advising initiative would begin in the first year of the biennium and the evaluation would be conducted in the second year of the biennium to assess the impact of the added positions and funding on the quality of services provided to students. Since, under the bill, the initiative would not begin until 2000-01, the evaluation could only assess current advising efforts rather than the impact of the budget increase. Therefore, one could argue that this funding should be deleted from bill. The University could include a request for additional funds in its 2001-03 budget submission when the results of an evaluation would be more instructive.

10. In public testimony on the bill, UW students cited advising as a high priority and expressed their opposition to both the reduction in funding from the requested amount and the exclusive use of tuition revenues to support the initiative. Further, UW System staff indicate that there would be no logical way to provide for student involvement in the expenditure of the funds as suggested by DOA, since the planned expenditures would simply represent a scaled back version of the University's request, which was widely supported by student groups. An option which would provide some GPR support, but at a lower cost than that requested by the University, would be to provide the same total amount of funding as the Governor's recommendation but according to the usual 65%/35% GPR/PR split. To accomplish this, \$1,300,000 of the tuition revenue expenditure authority provided would be replaced with GPR. Since the University has the ability to pool its GPR and tuition revenues, positions funded using 35% PR are typically designated as GPR positions. Therefore, if GPR funds would be provided for the initiative, it would be consistent with current practice to shift the 28.5 positions to be GPR positions.

11. UW System staff indicate that the proposed positions would be allocated relatively evenly among the campuses because all campuses indicated a need for additional positions. However, it is not clear that all campuses have the same level of need. For example, the University's 1996 report on best practices in advising recognized a number of campuses as having "outstanding" programs for advising in certain areas such as the use of technology in advising (Eau Claire, Madison and Extension), precollege advising (Superior and Rock County), professional development (Eau Claire, Madison, Milwaukee and Whitewater) and transfer advising (Milwaukee, Oshkosh, Eau Claire, Barron County, Marathon County, Marshfield/Wood County and Fox Valley). Further, as previously noted, River Falls received 2.0 positions under the pilot program implemented in 1997-98.

12. According to UW System staff, ACT, Inc. (formerly the American College Testing Program) recommends a ratio of 300 students for each full-time advisor. Since all campuses use faculty advisors to a greater or lesser extent, it is difficult to evaluate the campuses' success in achieving this goal. However, seven of the four-year institutions rely primarily on academic staff, rather than faculty, to provide general education advising. These institutions and their advisor to student ratios are: Madison (1:570 for freshmen and sophomores); Milwaukee (1:607); Eau Claire (1:270-340); Green Bay (1:650); Oshkosh (1:950); Parkside (1:200-250); and Stevens Point (1:270). As these ratios show, Eau Claire, Parkside and Stevens Point appear to be near the recommended ratio.

13. A lower cost option than the Governor's recommendation would be to provide a total of \$1,000,000 (\$650,000 GPR and \$350,000 PR) in 2000-01 which would provide sufficient funding for 15.0 GPR positions and \$327,700 for professional development and advising technology. The UW System could determine the institutions to which the positions would be allocated based on demonstrated need.

#### **Student Services at UW Colleges**

14. The bill would provide a total of \$500,000 over the biennium and 5.5 GPR positions beginning in 1999-00 to the 13 two-year UW Colleges to expand student services with a particular emphasis on serving nontraditional students. In its 1999-01 budget request, the UW System included funding for 11.0 FTE positions for this purpose. The University had initially planned to hire five admissions professionals who would operate regionally to recruit students from high schools, businesses, social service agencies and the community. Of the five positions, one individual would have been located at the central office in Madison to oversee and coordinate recruitment efforts and the other four would each have been responsible for recruiting efforts within an area encompassing three or four Colleges. The remaining six positions would have been allocated to campuses based on the demonstrated need for additional positions in the area of advising and counseling nontraditional students.

15. Of the 28.5 FTE positions provided in the bill for the Systemwide advising initiative, the University plans to allocate 6.5 positions to the Colleges, bringing the total number of student services positions allocated to the Colleges under the bill to 12.0 FTEs. If the Governor's proposal is approved, UW System staff indicate that the Colleges would reallocate 1.0 FTE for a total of 13.0 student services positions, and provide 1.0 FTE to each campus. Given the current plan to combine the proposed positions, it would be appropriate to consider both items together.

16. Each of UW Colleges has a student services office which provides both academic and career advising, although some Colleges also assign students to faculty advisors. Unlike other UW campuses which have staff positions devoted exclusively to certain student services functions such as advising or admissions, the UW Colleges employ student services staff whose responsibilities include a variety of activities related to recruitment, admissions, testing, financial aid, advising and counseling. According to UW System staff, excessive workload for these positions has resulted in high turnover rates. Over the past five years, 50 individuals have left positions in the student services at the Colleges.

17. In the fall semester of 1998, a total of 6,933 FTE students were enrolled at the Colleges. Over the last five years, enrollment at the UW Colleges has been significantly below the targets set under the UW System's enrollment management plan. Instead of increasing, as expected, in 1995-96 and 1996-97 enrollment actually declined, and rose by only 1.7% in 1997-98. While enrollment at the Colleges increased by 13.1% (803 FTE students) in the fall semester of 1998, the Colleges were still 8.03% below their enrollment target.

18. In addition to workload considerations, the additional student services positions are

intended to help increase enrollment at the Colleges. A marketing survey conducted in January, 1998 by a private firm found that high school seniors had a lower awareness of the UW Colleges (47%) than both technical colleges (79%) and UW four-year campuses (95%). The University indicates that additional student services positions are needed to increase potential students' awareness of the Colleges as an educational option. The positions would also help the Colleges to meet the special needs of older, nontraditional students and to provide enhanced services to all types of students with the goals of increasing enrollment and retention rates and providing better preparation for transfer to the System's four-year institutions.

19. For each College, the following table shows the number of full-time equivalent student services positions, the number of students (headcount) and the resulting ratio of student services staff to students.

<u>Campus</u>	<u>GPR Funded Student Services Positions</u>	<u>Fall 1998 Headcount</u>	<u>Staff to Student Ratio</u>
Baraboo/Sauk County	3.10	605	1:195
Barron County	2.33	491	1:211
Fond du Lac County	2.00	485	1:243
Fox Valley	3.70	1,326	1:358
Manitowoc County	1.80	512	1:284
Marathon County	3.47	1,022	1:295
Marinette County	2.00	486	1:243
Marshfield/Wood County	3.06	546	1:178
Richland County	2.85	397	1:139
Rock County	2.75	763	1:277
Sheboygan County	2.00	674	1:337
Washington County	2.00	762	1:381
Waukesha County	3.95	1,774	1:449
Total	35.01	9,843	1:281

As indicated in the table, the statewide average ratio of student services staff to students is 1:281. However, this ratio varies from 1:139 at Richland County to 1:449 at Waukesha County. The University's proposal to provide 1.0 additional FTE position to each campus would not address this discrepancy; Richland County's ratio would decrease to 1:103 while Waukesha County's ratio would be 1:358, which is less favorable than the current ratios at all but two campuses (Fox Valley and Washington County). Distributed differently among the campuses, the 6.5 FTE positions that would be allocated to the Colleges under the statewide advising initiative, would be sufficient to ensure that all campuses would be at or below the current statewide ratio of 1:281.

20. The funding provided in the bill would include a total of \$69,200 in 1999-00 and

\$76,600 in 2000-01 for supplies and services related to the 5.5 positions, or an annual, ongoing amount of \$13,900 per FTE position. DOA staff indicate that the relatively large amount provided for supplies and services for these positions was intended to cover the costs associated with extensive travel by the regional recruitment and admissions personnel. While it may be assumed that some travel would be required of these positions under the University's current proposal to provide 1.0 position to each campus, the amount of travel would be less than originally envisioned. In light of the revised plan, it could be argued that the higher funding amount for supplies and services would not be necessary. According to staff at the Department of Public Instruction and the Wisconsin Technical College System, these agencies typically budget between \$5,000 and \$6,000 annually for supplies and services for positions that entail extensive travel throughout the state. Since the travel required for the student services positions is not likely to be as frequent or extensive, an annual budget of \$5,000 for each FTE may be a more reasonable amount. Reducing the supplies and services budget for each position to \$5,000 would result in savings of \$41,700 in 1999-00 and \$49,100 in 2000-01.

21. While the positions for the Colleges would be funded at the usual 65% GPR/35% PR split, the amount provided for the statewide advising initiative would be funded solely with tuition revenues. Given that the proposed funding for each item would support essentially the same types of activities, one could argue that if tuition revenues alone are an appropriate means to fund the statewide initiative, they should also be used for the student services initiative for the Colleges.

**ALTERNATIVES**

**A. Systemwide Advising Initiative**

1. *Governor's Recommendation.* Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$2,000,000 PR and 28.5 PR positions in 2000-01 to improve academic, career and transfer student advising efforts at all UW System institutions.

2. *Modify to be Typical 65% GPR/35% PR Split.* Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$1,300,000 GPR and 28.5 GPR positions and deleting \$1,300,000 PR and 28.5 PR positions in 2000-01 to provide the funding based on a 65% GPR/35% PR split.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$1,300,000	-\$1,300,000	\$0
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	28.50	-28.50	0.00

3. *Delete Evaluation Funding.* In addition to Alternatives #1 or #2, delete funding for an evaluation of the advising initiative from the appropriate source as follows:

a. Delete \$50,000 PR in 2000-01 from Alternative #1; or

<b>Alternative A3a</b>	<b>PR</b>
<b>1999-01 FUNDING</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>-\$50,000</b>

- b. Delete \$32,500 GPR and \$17,500 PR in 2000-01 from Alternative #2.

<b>Alternative A3b</b>	<b>GPR</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1999-01 FUNDING</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>-\$32,500</b>	<b>-\$17,500</b>	<b>-\$50,000</b>

4. *Provide 50% of Governor's Recommendation with Typical 65% GPR/35% PR Split.* Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$650,000 GPR and 15.0 GPR positions and deleting \$1,650,000 PR and 28.5 PR positions in 2000-01 to provide a total of \$1,000,000 and 15.0 FTE positions funded at the usual 65% GPR/35% PR split.

<b>Alternative A4</b>	<b>GPR</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1999-01 FUNDING</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>\$650,000</b>	<b>-\$1,650,000</b>	<b>-\$1,000,000</b>
<b>2000-01 POSITIONS</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>15.00</b>	<b>-28.50</b>	<b>13.50</b>

5. *Provide UW System's Requested Positions and Funding.* Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$866,700 GPR and \$466,600 PR and 35.5 GPR positions beginning in 1999-00 and \$1,733,500 GPR and -\$1,066,800 PR in 2000-01 to provide the amount and number of positions requested by the University to improve advising.

<b>Alternative A5</b>	<b>GPR</b>	<b>PR</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1999-01 FUNDING</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>\$2,600,200</b>	<b>-\$600,200</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>
<b>2000-01 POSITIONS</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>35.50</b>	<b>-28.50</b>	<b>7.00</b>

6. Maintain current law.

<b>Alternative A6</b>	<b>PR</b>
<b>1999-01 FUNDING</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>-\$2,000,000</b>
<b>2000-01 POSITIONS</b> (Change to Bill)	<b>-28.50</b>

**B. Student Services at the UW Colleges**

1. *Governor's Recommendation.* Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$121,700 GPR and \$65,500 PR in 1999-00 and \$203,300 GPR and \$109,500 PR in 2000-01 and 5.5 GPR positions beginning in 1999-00 to expand student services at the UW Colleges.

2. *Shift Funding to be 100% PR.* Modify the Governor's recommendation by deleting \$121,700 GPR in 1999-00 and \$203,300 GPR in 2000-01 and 5.5 GPR positions and providing an additional \$121,700 PR in 1999-00 and \$203,300 PR in 2000-01 and 5.5 PR positions beginning in 2000-01 to shift the increased funding for student services from GPR to PR tuition revenues.

<u>Alternative B2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$325,000	\$325,000	\$0
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	-5.50	5.50	0.00

3. *Reduce Part of Funding for Travel.* In addition to Alternatives #1 or #2, modify the Governor's recommendation by deleting a portion of the amount provided for supplies and services from the appropriate source as follows:

- a. Delete \$27,100 GPR and \$14,600 PR in 1999-00 and \$31,900 GPR and \$17,200 PR in 2000-01 from Alternative #1; or

<u>Alternative B3a</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$47,800	-\$25,700	-\$73,500

- b. Delete \$41,700 PR in 1999-00 and \$49,100 PR in 2000-01 from Alternative #2.

<u>Alternative B3b</u>	<u>PR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$90,800

4. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative B4</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$325,000	-\$175,000	-\$500,000
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	-5.50	0.00	-5.50

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# A-2

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

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

**(Gov) Agency:** UW – Early Writing and Mathematics Placement

**Recommendations:**

**Paper #998:** A1 + B1 (gov's proposals, no action needed).

**Comments:** The math part helps kids prepare more effectively for college. The writing part has the same goals, but will use a computer to assess essays. What's with that?

Prepared by: Bob





## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #998

### Early Writing and Mathematics Placement (UW System)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 628, #23]

#### CURRENT LAW

In 1998-99, the adjusted base budget for the UW System totals approximately \$2,771.1 million, of which \$911.0 million or 32.9% is funded from state, general purpose revenues. Approximately 80.7% of the University's GPR budget is provided under an appropriation for general program operations for University education, research and public service. The UW system has the ability to combine the GPR general program operations funds with monies received from tuition and certain federal indirect cost reimbursements, creating an approximate \$1.2 billion pool of funds that it may use to run its operations.

#### GOVERNOR

Provide \$126,800 GPR and \$68,200 PR annually for the administration of the early mathematics placement testing program and for the development of an early writing assessment program.

#### DISCUSSION POINTS

##### Early Mathematics Placement Test

1. The UW System has administered the early mathematics placement testing program (EMPT) since 1996-97. The test, which is a shortened version of the University's mathematics placement test that is required of all entering students, is offered on a voluntary basis to high school juniors. Based on his or her test score, a student is placed in one of four skill levels, representing the level of math course at which the student would likely start if he or she were to enroll in college at that time. Along with their test score, each student receives a Majors Requirements Book which

includes, for each UW System and Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) institution, a list of the major courses of study available at the institution and the math courses required for each major. The math courses are categorized by levels that correspond to the test score levels, allowing the student to assess his or her proficiency in relation to the requirements of particular majors at institutions they may be interested in attending. Since the test is taken in the junior year of high school, students can use this information to select their senior year math courses in order to better prepare for college. In 1997-98, the total number of students taking the test was 9,736, approximately 13% of the total number of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolled in public and private high schools in Wisconsin.

2. Administration of the EMPT is partially funded through the assessment of a \$3 fee per student tested. The school is billed directly, based on the number of tests scored, and may pay the fee or collect it from the students. While the program was originally intended to be self-supporting through the fee, the number of students taking the test has not been sufficient to enable the University to recover the entire cost with the current \$3 fee. In 1997-98 the total cost to administer and score the test, including publication of the Majors Requirements Book, was approximately \$45,350. However, the \$3 fee covered only \$29,200, leaving \$16,150, which was paid by UW System, UW-Madison and WTCS. For 1998-99, costs are estimated at \$46,000. Funding for the EMPT was not included in the University's 1999-01 budget request. However, UW System staff indicate that if the proposed funding is not approved, the program may be discontinued.

3. DOA and UW System staff argue that the test is beneficial for both the students and the higher education institutions. By taking appropriate math courses in the senior year of high school, a student may avoid having to take high school-level courses in college, and therefore paying tuition for a course for which they would not receive credits toward their degree. Students may also require less time to complete their degree programs, which would result in tuition savings for the student and a reduction in costs for the institution. A reduction in the number of remedial courses offered would also free up institutional funds for other purposes. However, one could argue that since the test is voluntary, the students who take it are likely to be those that are planning ahead for college, and therefore, are less likely to need remediation. The institutional benefits of the program would probably not be realized unless the program's participation rate would increase significantly.

4. The bill would provide \$70,000 (\$45,500 GPR and \$24,500 PR from tuition revenues) annually for the EMPT program. This amount is intended to cover the entire estimated costs to administer the program in the 1999-01 biennium. The current \$3 fee per test would be eliminated and UW System, UW-Madison and WTCS would not be expected to cover any costs. The amount provided in the bill is based on the assumption that if the EMPT were to be offered free of charge, the number of students taking the test would increase from 9,736 to an estimated 73,310 students. This is roughly the total number of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students in the state and would represent a nearly seven-fold increase in the number of students taking the test. UW System staff indicate that this estimate was used because some schools may choose to administer the test to all students and students may decide to take the test more than once.

5. Under the bill, the costs of the EMPT would be supported through a combination of GPR and program revenues derived from tuition. One could question the use of tuition dollars to fund a test which provides no benefit to current UW students but directly benefits high school students who may choose not to attend a UW institution at all. In this case, the \$24,500 PR annually provided under the bill could be shifted to GPR.

6. On the other hand, if it is determined that the program provides a significant benefit to the postsecondary institutions attended by the participating students and that continuation of the program is a priority for those institutions, it could be argued that the UW System and WTCS should pay the cost of administering the EMPT. The UW System could also continue to charge high schools on a per-test basis, and adjust the amount of the fee to attempt to recover a larger percentage of costs.

### **Early Writing Assessment Program**

7. The bill would provide \$125,000 (\$81,300 GPR and \$43,700 PR) annually for the development of an early writing assessment program for students in grades 9 to 12. Funding for this purpose was not included in the University's 1999-01 budget request. The proposed program is intended to allow high school students to evaluate their writing ability in comparison to college-level work using automated scoring software. It is anticipated that the program would be implemented by the fall of 2000.

8. The software that the University intends to use for the program is the Electronic Essay Rater (e-rater), developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and first tested by the company in the fall of 1997, when its performance in scoring the essay portion of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) was compared to that of human readers. E-rater was also tested on two essay prompts from the ETS' Test of Written English. The software is designed to automatically analyze the features of an essay using writing characteristics specified in a scoring manual. The scoring guide developed for e-rater's test in the GMAT used a six-point scoring scale. An essay receives a higher score (five or six) if it focuses on the topic of the essay question or "prompt", is well-organized with a strong, coherent argument structure, and includes a variety of syntactic structure and vocabulary usage. In the tests, e-rater's accuracy was evaluated by measuring the incidence of agreement between its scores and those of two human readers. "Agreement" occurs when there is no more than a single point difference between the scores on the six-point scale. Typically, when scores assigned by two human readers do not agree, the essay is scored by a third reader. The tests revealed that e-rater agreed with the human readers between 87% and 94% of the time across 15 essay prompts for average agreement rates of 88% and 89%. In comparison, the two human readers achieved an agreement rate of 90%. According to UW System staff, the software has also been used by the California State University System in its placement tests. However, there is no known data regarding the success of e-rater as used by the California System.

9. Under the University's proposal, high school students, either on their own or as part of a class exercise, would submit essays on specific prompts by typing the essays directly into a

computer. E-rater would automatically grade each essay and provide some type of feedback information on the meaning of the student's grade. The student could revise and resubmit their essay as many times as the student or his or her teacher deems appropriate. Information about each of a student's submissions would be summarized and provided to the teacher.

10. Before e-rater can be used to score an essay written for a particular prompt, it must be "taught" using essays scored by humans. The software would "learn" to grade essays for each prompt by analyzing 200 to 300 human-graded essays. While ETS has agreed to charge the UW System a flat rate of \$30,000 in 1999-00 for the software license, license fees for future years have not yet been determined. In addition, the funding provided in the bill would pay for honoraria and travel expenses for UW faculty to grade the essays and for high school teachers and UW faculty to develop instructional materials to assist teachers in interpreting student scores. Additional expenses include UW staff (a 0.5 FTE assistant scientist and a 0.5 FTE graduate assistant), programming costs, supplies and maintenance. The proposed budget for the first two years of the program is shown in the following table.

	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
<b>Software (ETS)</b>	\$30,000	\$35,000
<b>Grading</b>		
Honorarium	17,000	6,200
Travel	<u>11,300</u>	<u>4,100</u>
Subtotal	28,300	10,300
<b>Instructional Materials</b>		
<b>Development</b>		
Honorarium	9,600	4,800
Travel	<u>3,200</u>	<u>3,600</u>
Subtotal	12,800	8,400
<b>UW System Staff</b>	47,500	48,000
<b>Programming</b>	6,500	8,300
<b>Supplies &amp; Maintenance</b>	<u>0</u>	<u>15,000</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$125,100	\$125,000

11. The University's plan would be to develop five different prompts in the first year and two additional prompts in the second and each subsequent year. However, since future ETS charges for the software are unknown, ongoing costs could be significantly higher than the amount estimated for 2000-01.

12. The programming costs are based on 300,000 high school students participating, approximately the total number of students enrolled in public and private schools in grades nine through 12. The number of schools and students that would actually participate will not be known

until the program is implemented. According to executive budget documents, the proposed program is intended to "encourage high school students to develop the basic ... writing/literacy skills they require to succeed in college." However, one could question the need for such a program. If the program is voluntary, it is likely that most of the students participating would be those already planning to attend college. Arguably, one of the responsibilities of high school English and composition teachers, as well as guidance staff members, is to ensure that their students' writing ability is appropriate to the level of their postsecondary aspirations.

13. An alternative to state funding for the development and administration of the program would be for the UW System to attempt to recover these costs through a charge to the school districts. This option is available to the University under current law. The charge could be a flat rate or could be assessed on a per student basis. However, the University would have to reallocate base resources to pay for the initial development costs of the program until it is actually implemented.

14. Several issues could be raised regarding the Governor's proposal. First, e-rater's performance has yet to be evaluated by a user other than ETS and the tests that have been conducted by ETS appear to have been relatively limited. Therefore, the only research reports available on the software were prepared by the company that created it, rather than an objective third party. Since the University did not include the proposed funding in its 1999-01 budget request, there does not appear to be an urgent need for the program. Finally, given the relatively high development costs and the uncertainty of the potential benefits, one could argue that it would be more sensible to delay implementation of the proposed program until e-rater has been used by another educational institution and additional information on its performance in that capacity has been further evaluated.

15. Of the amount provided for the proposed program in the bill, \$43,700 annually would be derived from tuition paid by current UW students who would not receive any benefit from the program. While the program may prove to be a valuable diagnostic tool for high school pupils, one could argue that UW students should not be required to pay for it, particularly at a time when resources for instructional items that directly benefit UW students are scarce.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

### **A. Early Mathematics Placement Test**

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$45,500 GPR and \$24,500 PR annually to support the costs of administering the early mathematics placement test without charge to school districts, students or higher education institutions.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by shifting \$24,500 annually from PR tuition revenues to GPR.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$49,000	-\$49,000	\$0

3. Maintain current law. The UW System could continue to charge a fee for the tests.

<u>Alternative A3</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$91,000	-\$49,000	-\$140,000

**B. Early Writing Assessment Program**

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$81,300 GPR and \$43,700 annually for the development of an early writing assessment program.
2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by shifting \$43,700 annually from PR tuition revenues to GPR.

<u>Alternative B2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$87,400	-\$87,400	\$0

3. Maintain current law. The UW System could charge school districts for the use of the assessment program.

<u>Alternative B3</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$162,600	-\$87,400	-\$250,000

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

**(Gov) Agency:** UW – Consolidation of Appropriations

**Recommendations:**

**Paper # 999:** Alternative 1 (gov's proposal, no action needed)

**Comments:** Some could argue that this erodes legislative oversight (point 7), but how much do you really want to know about Farm Safety Grants?

Prepared by: Bob



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #999

### Consolidation of Appropriations (UW System)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 631, #32]

#### CURRENT LAW

The 1998-99 adjusted base budget for the UW System totals approximately \$2,771.1 million, of which \$911.0 million or 32.9% is funded from state, general purpose revenues. The UW System currently has 29 separate GPR appropriations. However, approximately \$735.1 million (80.7%) of the University's GPR budget is provided under the appropriation for general program operations for University education, research and public service.

The Board of Regents is required to award grants totaling not more than \$500 annually per county to sponsors of farm safety education, training or information programs.

The Board of Regents is required to appoint AODA program counselors for UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee. The counselors are required to develop AODA programs and train faculty, academic staff and classified staff in the prevention and early intervention of alcohol and other drug abuse.

#### GOVERNOR

Eliminate three GPR appropriations and transfer the funding currently provided in these appropriations to the appropriation for general program operations for University education, research and public service, [20.285(1)(a)]. The three appropriations that would be eliminated are: (a) UW-Extension outreach [(1)(eo)]; (b) farm safety program grants [(1)(fs)]; and (c) alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA) prevention and intervention [(1)(fx)]. In addition to total annual funding of \$368,900, 1.0 position currently funded under the AODA appropriation would be transferred to the general program operations appropriation.



## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The appropriations that would be consolidated into the general program operations appropriation under the bill, as well as the annual funding amount for each of these appropriations, is shown in the following table.

(1)(eo)	Extension Outreach	\$298,200
(1)(fs)	Farm Safety Program Grants	20,000
(1)(fx)	Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Prevention and Intervention	<u>50,700</u>
Total		\$368,900

2. The Extension outreach appropriation is used to fund the nutrient and pest management program which assists Wisconsin farmers and other agricultural professionals to increase profitability and decrease non-point pollution problems through better management decisions. Extension uses on-site demonstrations and informational materials to help farmers reduce nitrogen fertilizer and herbicide applications while maintaining yields.

3. Current law requires the Board of Regents to award grants to sponsors of farm safety education, training or information programs. In order to be eligible, a sponsor must: (a) provide equal matching funds from private or public sources; (b) demonstrate the need for the program; and (c) demonstrate that the program for which the grant is sought was developed in consultation with UW-Extension personnel, public health personnel, vocational agriculture instructors or other persons with expertise or interest in farm safety topics. Annual grant amounts may not exceed \$500 per county. The UW currently gives priority to counties applying for grants to update tractor and machinery certification programs in response to state training requirements for youth operating farm equipment on public roads. Examples of other purposes for which the grants are used include: farm safety day camps or school programs for youth; emergency personnel training for farm accident rescue; and farm hazard inspections for farmers and farm employees. In 1998-99, grants were awarded to 40 of the 42 applicants.

4. The AODA prevention and intervention appropriation was established in the 1989-91 state budget (1989 Act 39) when funding and position authority for two AODA counselors, at UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee, was provided. A separate appropriation was created for the positions because they were funded with SEG monies from the pari-mutuel tax. However, a provision in the 1991-93 state budget (1991 Act 39) transferred the funding for the AODA counselors from SEG to GPR, but maintained the separate appropriation.

5. The total amount currently provided in the three appropriations is less than 0.1% of the total GPR budget for the University. According to UW System staff, consolidating these appropriations into the general program operations appropriation would increase administrative efficiency by providing additional flexibility in the management of the funds. However, staff also indicate that there are no plans to alter the amounts allocated for the programs.

6. Two of the three appropriations that would be consolidated have associated statutory language which would be unchanged under the bill. However, this language does not specify the amounts to be allocated for these purposes. Therefore, if the appropriations were to be consolidated into the larger GPR appropriation, the Board of Regents would be under no obligation to continue to allocate the same level of funding that is currently provided for these purposes under the separate appropriations.

7. In the 1993-95 budget bill, the Governor proposed consolidating a number of the UW System's GPR appropriations with the goal of moving towards a "unified" budget for the University. Under the unified budget concept, the Board of Regents would request funds for a single, continuing GPR appropriation, indicating general System priorities. The Legislature would then approve a funding level within which the Board would determine the allocation of the funds among those priorities. At the time, it was argued that the unified budget proposal represented a shift in oversight from the elected Legislature to the appointed Board of Regents and the provision was deleted by the Legislature. While the total dollar amount of the appropriations that would be consolidated under the bill represents only a small portion of the System's total GPR budget, one could view the Governor's proposal as a step towards the creation of a unified budget for the University.

## ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to eliminate the current GPR appropriations for UW-Extension outreach, farm safety program grants and AODA prevention and intervention and transfer the funding and position currently provided in these appropriations to the appropriation for general program operations for University education, research and public service.

2. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# Alt. 2

1	BURKE	Y	N	A
	DECKER	Y	N	A
	JAUCH	Y	N	A
	MOORE	Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
	PLACHE	Y	N	A
	COWLES	Y	N	A
	PANZER	Y	N	A
2	GARD	Y	N	A
	PORTER	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	DUFF	Y	N	A
	WARD	Y	N	A
	HUBER	Y	N	A
	RILEY	Y	N	A

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

**(Gov) Agency: UW – Depreciation Offset for GPR Funds**

**Recommendations:**

**Paper #1000: Modification**

**Comments:** Adjusts funds to reflect revenues generated by depreciation charges related primarily to new building construction.

Prepared by: Bob



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 25, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1000

### Depreciation Offset for General Purpose Revenue Funds (UW System)

---

#### CURRENT LAW

Depreciation costs for instructional buildings represent part of the costs which are funded through GPR and tuition. The UW System' GPR budget was last adjusted in 1997-99 to reflect revenue from depreciation charges.

#### GOVERNOR

No provision.

#### DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In the UW System, instructional costs are shared between GPR (65%) and tuition (35%). The Board of Regents sets tuition based on a calculation of total instructional costs which include direct and indirect costs.

2. Because debt service is funded solely through GPR, students do not share in these costs, even for instructional facilities. Therefore, a depreciation charge for new buildings is included in total instructional costs, and thus, in the calculation of tuition. The total depreciation charge, which is based on the expected useful life of an instructional building, is equal to 3.5% of the value of new facilities. The 35% student share of instructional costs is then applied to the total depreciation charge.

3. In each biennium, as new buildings are completed, the depreciation charge generates additional tuition revenues for the UW System. Because these funds are not set aside for depreciation-related items such as building maintenance, these revenues represent an increase in the amount of monies available to support the University's budget.

4. The tuition revenues generated by the depreciation charge and corresponding PR funding increase are taken as a direct GPR offset to instructional funding because the costs of depreciation are not included in the University's operating budget.

5. While a charge for depreciation will be assessed to students in the 1999-01 biennium, the bill does not include additional tuition revenues which will be generated from such a charge, nor have such funds been used to offset GPR. Since the charge to students and related PR funding increase for the UW system is intended to be a GPR offset, it would be appropriate to reduce the GPR instructional budget for the UW System by an equal amount. This type of adjustment has been made in each biennial budget since 1983-85.

6. The estimated value of the new instructional buildings expected to come on line in the 1999-01 biennium is \$31,902,800 in 1999-00 and \$35,366,000 in 2000-01. This increased value will generate additional tuition revenues of approximately \$390,800 in 1999-00 and \$824,000 in 2000-01, which would fund corresponding PR increases. Consequently, an equivalent amount of GPR can be deleted from the University's budget.

**MODIFICATION**

Reduce the University's budget by \$390,800 GPR in 1999-00 and \$824,000 GPR in 2000-01 and provide \$390,800 PR in 1999-00 and \$824,000 PR in 2000-01 to reflect the application of revenues to be received in 1999-01 from depreciation charges assessed to students.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$1,214,800	\$1,214,800	\$0

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

*MO# Modification*

1	BURKE	Y	N	A
	DECKER	Y	N	A
	JAUCH	Y	N	A
	MOORE	Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
	PLACHE	Y	N	A
	COWLES	Y	N	A
	PANZER	Y	N	A
2	GARD	Y	N	A
	PORTER	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	DUFF	Y	N	A
	WARD	Y	N	A
	HUBER	Y	N	A
	RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

UW SYSTEM

Study on Expanding UW System's Overseas Presence

Motion:

Move to provide \$250,000 GPR in one-time funding in 2000-01 and require the UW-Milwaukee to undertake a market research and feasibility study relating to expanding the University's programming and presence overseas. Specify that the study would not examine the purchase of overseas real estate. Require the Board of Regents to submit a report on the results of the study to the Governor and Legislature.

[Change to Bill: \$250,000 GPR]

MO#				
1	BURKE	Y	N	A
	DECKER	Y	N	A
	JAUCH	Y	N	A
2	MOORE	Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
	PLACHE	Y	N	A
	COWLES	Y	N	A
	PANZER	Y	N	A
	GARD	Y	N	A
	PORTER	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	DUFF	Y	N	A
	WARD	Y	N	A
	HUBER	Y	N	A
	RILEY	Y	N	A
	AYE	9	NO 7	ABS

UW SYSTEM

UW-Extension SHWEC -- Additional Recycling and Pollution Prevention Staff

Motion:

Move to create 8.0 PR positions (6.0 specialists and 2.0 program assistants) at the UW-Extension for the Solid and Hazardous Waste Education Center (SHWEC) funded from the Wisconsin Development Fund (WDF). Direct the Department of Commerce to make grants from the WDF to UW Extension in the amount of \$600,000 PR annually to fund the 8.0 PR positions at SHWEC. Provide that the positions would assist businesses and manufactures on regulatory controls, pollution prevention, waste reduction and recycling issues.

---

Note:

This motion would provide funding of \$600,000 PR from the WDF to support 8.0 PR positions under the UW-Extension SHWEC. SHWEC provides statewide information on hazardous pollution prevention and educational and technical assistance related to recycling. In addition, SHWEC, provides information on waste reduction, produces written materials, educational teleconferences network program, satellite conferences and video productions; and offers technical assistance to local governments and businesses on recycling, hazardous waste management, pollution prevention, source reduction and other cost effective waste reduction programs.

The WDF is funded through both a general purpose revenue (GPR) and program revenue appropriation. Annual base level funding for the program is \$7,803,800 GPR and \$1,500,000 PR.

[Change to Bill: \$1,200,000 PR and 8.0 PR positions]

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 5 NO 11 ABS



UW SYSTEM

Stray Voltage Research

Motion:

Move to provide \$200,000 PR annually in a new, biennial appropriation within the UW System for research relating to stray voltage. Specify that the funding would be used for the following projects: (a) continued research recommended in the Minnesota Science Advisors Report to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; (b) field and economic performance analysis of electrical mitigation devices and systems; (c) electrical conditions on farms with potentially unique stray voltage concerns; and (d) continuation and verification of studies regarding the nature of animal responses to stray voltage.

---

Note:

This motion would provide \$200,000 PR annually in a new, biennial appropriation under the UW System for specified research relating to stray voltage. The program revenues would be generated by increasing the assessment on public utilities administered by the Public Service Commission.

Currently, the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection is provided \$291,600 PR annually and 4.0 PR positions to develop and provide informational and educational materials on stray voltage and to study the need for state action on stray voltage. The Public Service Commission is also provided \$200,000 annually and 1.5 positions for regulation, education, inspection and investigation relating to stray voltage.

[Change to Bill: \$400,000 PR]

MO#

2 BURKE	Y	N	A
1 DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 19 NO    ABS

UW SYSTEM

Ginseng Research Grants

Motion:

Move to provide \$125,000 SEG annually in a new, biennial appropriation within the UW System for UW-Madison for grants to research the properties of Wisconsin ginseng. Specify that the funds, which would be derived from the agrichemical management fund, would be provided on a one-time basis in the 1999-01 biennium only. In addition, specify that the funds would be placed in unallotted reserve to be released by DOA upon receipt by the UW System of a 20% match from the Ginseng Board of Wisconsin.

---

Note:

This motion would provide \$125,000 SEG annually in a new, biennial appropriation within the UW System for grants to research the properties of Wisconsin ginseng. The funding, which would come from the agrichemical management fund within the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection, would be provided in the 1999-01 biennium only and would be placed in unallotted reserve. The funding would be released by DOA upon the University's receipt of matching funds from the Ginseng Board of Wisconsin equal to 20% of the amount provided.

[Change to Bill: \$250,000 SEG]

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS 0

UW SYSTEM

Study on UW-Marathon County

Motion:

Move to require the Board of Regents to conduct a study of the feasibility of expanding the offering of four-year and graduate degree programs in Marathon County. Require the Board of Regents to conduct the study when sufficient private and/or local government funds have been raised to pay for the cost of the study and to provide a copy of the study to the Legislature.

MO#				
	BURKE			
2	DECKER	(Y)	N	A
	JAUCH	(Y)	N	A
	MOORE	(Y)	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N	A
	PLACHE	(Y)	N	A
	COWLES	(Y)	N	A
	PANZER	(Y)	N	A
	GARD	Y	(N)	A
	PORTER	Y	(N)	A
	KAUFERT	Y	(N)	A
	ALBERS	(Y)	N	A
	DUFF	Y	(N)	A
	WARD	(Y)	N	A
1	HUBER	(Y)	N	A
	RILEY	(Y)	N	A

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS 0

UW SYSTEM

Great Lakes Indian Research Center

Motion:

Move to provide \$400,000 PR in 2000-01 in tribal gaming revenue to create a research and study center in Madison for Native Americans and other scholars. Specify that no monies could be expended from this appropriation until the Joint Committee on Finance approves a UW planning and feasibility study in the spring of 2000. Specify that the UW System would cooperate with the State Historical Society and the Great Lakes Tribal Council in planning, creating and operating this center.

Note:

This motion would provide \$400,000 PR in 2000-01 in tribal gaming revenue to fund a proposed research center.

[Change to Bill: \$400,000 PR]

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
2 DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
1 HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

UW SYSTEM

Student Representatives on UW Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

Motion:

Move to allow the chairman of any UW System standing committee or ad hoc committee with a student representative position to remove any student appointed by the student government or administration that fails to attend any two consecutive committee meetings, unexcused. In addition, allow the chairman of such a committee to solicit and directly appoint another student from that UW System school, at large, after removing the previously appointed student representative or, for standing committees, in cases where no student representative is appointed by November 1. Specify that no committee approval would be required for these appointments.

Note:

Under current law, students have primary responsibility for the formulation and review of policies concerning student life, services and interests. In addition, the statutes specify that the students of each UW System institution or campus have the right to organize themselves in a manner they determine and to select their representatives to participate in institutional governance.

MO#	BURKE	DECKER	JAUCH	MOORE	SHIBILSKI	PLACHE	COWLES	PANZER	GARD	PORTER	KAUFERT	ALBERS	DUFF	WARD	HUBER	RILEY	AYE	NO	ABS
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N			
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	15	

**UW SYSTEM**

Director of the Wisconsin Public Utility Institute

**Motion:**

Move to provide \$49,500 GPR annually and 0.5 GPR position beginning in 1999-00 in the University's general program operations appropriation for University education, research and public service for the Wisconsin Public Utility Institute.

**Note:**

This motion would provide \$49,500 GPR annually and 0.5 GPR position beginning in 1999-00 for the Wisconsin Public Utility Institute (WPUI), which is attached to the UW-Madison School of Business. The funds would support 50% of the salary and fringe benefit costs for the Director of the WPUI. The Institute, which provides educational services and research regarding public utilities, is currently funded through membership dues and fees.

[Change to Bill: \$99,000 GPR and 0.5 GPR position]

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

BURKE	(Y)	N	A
DECKER	(Y)	N	A
JAUCH	(Y)	N	A
MOORE	(Y)	N	A
SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N	A
PLACHE	(Y)	N	A
COWLES	Y	(N)	A
PANZER	Y	(N)	A
GARD	Y	(N)	A
PORTER	Y	(N)	A
KAUFERT	Y	(N)	A
ALBERS	Y	(N)	A
DUFF	Y	(N)	A
WARD	Y	(N)	A
HUBER	(Y)	N	A
RILEY	(Y)	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS 0



# UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

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

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
9	Graduate Student Tuition Remissions
10	Reestimate Special Fee Revenues
12	Full Funding of 1997-98 Compensation Adjustments
18a, c & d	State Laboratory of Hygiene
20	Remove 1997-99 Budget Reduction from Base
24	Tuition Remissions for Relatives of Certain Protective Services Officers
25	UW-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics
26	Reestimate Gift and Trust Fund Appropriations
27	Auxiliary Enterprises and Building Projects
28	Reestimate General Operating Receipts
30	Solid and Hazardous Waste Education Center
33	Tuition Award Program
34	Pilot Minority Student Tuition Award Program

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

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
14	Debt Service Reestimate
35	Elimination of Public Broadcasting Duties
36	UW-Madison Vehicle Fleet Transfer

## LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
29	Exempt UW Faculty and Academic Staff From Dual Employment Statute

# Veterans Affairs

## General Agency Provisions

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 634)

### LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1(part)	Technical Change - Standard Budget Adjustments for Veterans Home (Paper #1010)
1(part)	Technical Change -- Standard Budget Adjustments for Grants to CVSOs (Paper #1011)
3	Debt Service Reestimate (see Paper #245--Debt Service Estimates)
4	Service to American Indian Veterans (see Paper #173--Tribal Gaming Revenue Allocations)
5	Transfer of Veterans Education Approval Board Functions (see Paper #572--Higher Educational Aids Board)
8(part)	Technical Change -- Transfer of Staff Between Programs (Paper #1012)
9	Veterans Museum - Integrate Museum Activities (Paper #1013)
11(part)	Veterans Museum - Operating Cost Increases (Paper #1014)
15	Home Loan Program Bonding Authority (Paper #1015)

**Gov Agency:** Veteran's Affairs—General Agency Provisions—Technical  
Change

**Recommendations:**

**Paper No. 1010** Approve Modification

**Comments:** This just fixes an error in the governor's budget regarding salary and fringe benefits funding for the Veterans Home.

Prepared by: Julie