U. of A.

HB 144

Alaska Community Colleges
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

2533 Providence Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99504
279-6622

May 13, 1976

Anchorage
Juneau-Douglas
Kenai
Ketchikan
Kodiak
Kuskokwim
Matanuska-Susitna
Northwest
Sitka
Tanana Valley

Members, Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

Frequently in the past couple of months arguments made by University of Alaska President Robert Hiatt and his administration focused on the idea that "the University of Alaska and University of Hawaii statewide systems are the envy of the rest of the nation."

Apparently, that assessment is not as accurate as University officials would like the legislature to believe. Attached is an article written just this past Friday, May 7, which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser.

I hope you will take the time to review this piece as it does have clear implications for "autonomy" in the state. Again we urge your serious consideration of passage of legislation granting autonomy to community colleges.

Sincerely,

Ralph J. McGrath

Ralph J. McGrath, President

RJM/cjt

Attachment

A-8 Friday, May 7, 1976 HONOLULU ADVERTISER

UH tries to placate two-year colleges

By PETER ROSECG
Advertiser University Writer

In an attempt to deal with discontent in the community colleges, University of Hawaii President Fujio Matsuda and Vice President Durward Long have met with leaders of the community college faculty senates.

The Maui Community College faculty senate last week overwhelmingly approved a resolution of no confidence in the University chancellor for community colleges, Shiro Amioka.

The resolution called for Amioka's ouster. It accused him of hostility toward the faculty and of setting community college policies with little or no consultation with students and faculty.

Amioka, the resolution states, "has initiated efforts at reducing campus autonomy and establishing standardized educational policies, thereby precluding individual community colleges from responding to the special needs of their communities."

COMMUNITY college autonomy and the role of faculty members in policy decisions were the main topics of the Matsuda-Long meeting with faculty senate leaders Tuesday night, according to several community college faculty members who attended.

"The meeting was very cordial, conducted in a give-and-take manner," according to one. "Matters of personality were not discussed. We discussed things on the level of the issues."

Amioka did not attend the meeting in Matsuda's office, although he reportedly was waiting outside in case his presence was called for.

An Advertiser survey of the community colleges on Oahu indicates that no faculty senate is prepared to join Maui in the no-confidence vote. But several faculty senate leaders said the Maui resolution had been distributed and is being discussed on their campuses.

THE MEETING may have calmed the unrest at the community colleges and set a pattern for more open communications, according to the faculty senate leaders.

"We asked the administration to be open to invitations to visit each campus for meetings and discussions with the faculty at least once a semester," said Liz d'Argy, chairwoman of the Leeward Community College faculty senate and convener of a committee of all faculty senate leaders.

Another suggestion under discussion by the administration, according to Norman Hallet, Honolulu Community College faculty senate chairman, is for regular meetings that would include top University administrators, chancellors, faculty senate representatives and the faculty union, the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly.

The meeting was described by several of the faculty leaders as "positive." Said one: "We don't see any immediate solutions but there is now some hope."

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

March 5, 1976

The Honorable Frank R. Ferguson
Senator, Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Ferguson,

As a member of the Senate Health, Education and Social Services Committee, this is to inform you of a resolution passed this week by the Board of Directors of the University of Alaska Alumni Association. The resolution reads as follows:

> "We, the Board of Directors of the University of Alaska Alumni Association, resolve: Whereas the Association represents nearly 10,000 alumni of record from the University of Alaska and its Community Colleges since the inception of higher education in Alaska; and whereas the Association objects to the creation of two public higher education systems for a number of reasons, primarily on the grounds that the Alaska State Constitution established a single system of higher education, which system has become the envy of most states because they are saddled by the duplication, expense and in-fighting on all levels engendered by multiple systems, therefore the Association opposes Senate Bill 658, an act to separate the Community Colleges from the University of Alaska statewide system of higher education."
>
> Dated March 4, 1976
> University of Alaska Alumni Assn.
> Richard D. Reeve, President

Due to our constant interaction with the University and its Community Colleges, I might add, we are deeply aware of the problems which exist. The Board is generally agreed, however, that separation of the units is not the answer to those problems.

Thank you for your consideration of this resolution.

Sincerely,

Evy Walters

Evelyn "Evy" Walters
Executive Secretary

Alaska State Legislature

Senate

JUNEAU, ALASKA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Frank Ferguson

FROM: Dani Bowman, Admin. Asst.
Senate State Affairs Committee

In line with your request, I have researched the following:

1) Is the Kotzebue Extension Center, as currently functioning, meeting the educational requirements of the residents of that city and its service area?

2) If not, what specific actions are necessary to allow the center to meet those requirements?

In regard to the first item above, the size and growth characteristics of the area were considered. Kotzebue proper had a 1974 population of approx. 2,125; the figure for 1970 was 1,695, a difference of 430 in only four years, maintaining a steady upward trend since 1940.

The Kotzebue service area has a population of approx. 5,5200 according to figures from the Department of Community and Regional Affairs, and like the city itself, seems to be growing steadily.

I have been in contact with various individuals and groups in the Kotzebue area, including the Coordinator of the Extension Center, Mr. Brad Wilson, concerning the adequacy of the center and its present course offerings. It is the unanimous opinion of all with whom I spoke that there exist unmet needs in the community and the area which the center serves, in spite of the programs now offered.

There is a need for a facility close to home for local high school students, for very few continue on to college, and of those who do, the drop-out rate is exceptionally high, approaching 85%. These students, as well as those who choose not to leave their home to continue their education, are

in need of additional college preparatory courses. This type of assistance is not available within the confines of the present extension center curriculum. This situation can only be remedied by expanding the program to include a wider and more relevant course offering. The center should offer foundation courses in how to study, English as a working language, speech, social science, math, etc., enabling the youth of the area to reach competency levels which would give them the chance of competing with other students at the college level. Obviously, few of the students there possess this ability, as evidenced by the low continuance and high drop-out rates.

Para-professional training is needed for health aides, teacher aides, and social service aides. There is no continuing training program which insures certification for individuals in technical and job-oriented fields.

There is a need for adult educational programs for those who did not finish high school. There is no reason that we should have residents of the state who wish to finish their education in this area who are without access to programs which would allow them to do so.

Programs for training in self-employment are necessary in the areas of small business, independent contracting, and craft production and distribution.

All of the weaknesses stated in this memo can be remedied through additional staff and operating monies. In spite of the steady increase in area population and course needs, the University budget request for the coming year shows only a maintenance level budget for personal services, at the same time predicting a 35% increase in enrollment. The deficiencies outlined here will only be exaggerated by limiting so severely the instructional personnel.

The coordinator of the Extension Center, in consultation with other instructors and involved members of the community, has developed a staffing projection as follows of priorities for this coming fiscal year: one 12 month coordinator-instructor, one 9 month instructor in business administration and office skills, one 9 month instructor in English and communication skills, seven part-time instructors in such areas as math, science, and vocational education, one 12 month secretary, and one part-time maintenance person.

The center needs travel money with which to carry their educational program to the surrounding areas. For the coming year, it is suggested that the center

receive funds to carry out the following program: travel and per diem money for one instructor to make five trips per semester to two villages (same trip) for three days each trip.

I have attached a summary sheet reflecting the needs identified in this memo, listing staff requirements and travel monies. Each of the stated needs is justified for the Kotzebue Extension Center, and is in line with the educational goals of our university system.

$ 27,617	Coordinator-Instructor
21,517	Instructor
21,517	Instructor
48,400	Instructors (part-time x 5)
12,000	Supplies-Instructional
3,000	Supplies-Administrative
2,750	Travel*
7,500	Maintenance Person (part-time)
$ 166,350	

*Includes $1,000 for air fare, $375 for per diem, a total of $1,375 for one semester, $2,750 for the year

DIVISION OF ~~STATEWIDE SERVICES~~
Continuing Education and
Summer Sessions

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

February 17, 1975

TO: Senator Frank R. Ferguson

SUBJECT: Extension Centers, Kotzebue and Nome

As you are undoubtedly aware, planning for the extension center building for Kotzebue is in the final stages. The plans are scheduled to be advertised for bidding by the end of February. I believe we have the site cleared as far as it is legally possible to do so at this stage. The B.I.A. has issued a long-term use permit to the University for the site which the Extension Center Citizens Committee and the Kotzebue Advisory School Board designated.

NANA Corporation Officers have approved the site for extension center use as well as have administrators of the Kotzebue Native Corporation.

Brad Wilson has done a good job getting courses underway as you can tell by the program which I have enclosed. Brad Wilson, Alex Hill, and Mike Gaffney are all working full-time this semester. Some additional part-time instructors, employed locally, are also helping.

I assume the Kotzebue budget for next year will be in line with the one for the Nome Extension Center. This will be necessary with the building coming on line and the expanded programs which will be provided.

At Nome the new building was dedicated in November and was in full use immediately. Our problem there is just that the building is too small. This is not to be meant as a criticism, for it is a wonderful building. It is simply to state that I am glad that the building in Kotzebue will be somewhat larger. In Nome we have the Cooperative Extension agent located in the building, the Extension Center Coordinator, the instructor for the business administration courses and office administration courses. It is intended that Dave Hendrickson will be located some place in that building very shortly, if we can find space. Dave specializes in second class city government development. As you probably know, Dave grew up on Nunivak Island.

The Nome Advisory Committee is working with the University planning office to work out the use for the $80,000 which was provided in the last bond issue. I believe they intend to acquire a small bit of additional ground and to construct a parking lot, and provide an emergency generator.

We have programs going at Fort Yukon, Tok, Delta Junction, and Nenana-Clear-Healy with part-time coordinators and with varying success. The programs in all those communities should pick up considerably next year. I hope that sometime in the future similar opportunities can be provided at Galena, Tanana, and Unalakleet.

I hope we will have the Kotzebue building ready for use by the first of November.

Charles W. Lafferty

CHARLES W. LAFFERTY
Dean

CWL:co

Encl

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SCHEDULE
Register the 16th or 17th
of January, 1975

Listed below is the schedule of classes for Spring Semester at the Kotzebue Extension Center. The cost is $20.00 per credit hour. All credits are transferable to other colleges. Classes start the week of January 20 to 24th. Any questions may be answered by calling 3262 or contacting Brad Wilson at the U of A office in the Mauneluk building. Registration will be January 16 and 17 at the U of A office.

CLASS	CREDITS	COURSE TITLE	HOURS OF MEETING	DATES
Brd. 211	3	Intro. to Broadcasting	Tues. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 21 - April 29
Brd. 213	2	Announcing	Thur. 7:00-9:00	Jan. 23 - May 1
Brd. 215	3	Radio Broadcast & Prod.	Fri. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 24 - May 2
Econ. 101	3	Intro. to Economic Problems	Wed. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 22 - April 29
Eng. 067	3	Elementary Exposition	Mon. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 20 - April 28
Eng. 111	3	Methods of Written Commun.	Mon. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 20 - April 28
Geog. 105	3	Physical Geography	Thur. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 23 - May 1
Math 093	3	Intermediate Algebra	Tues. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 21 - April 29
Math 103	3	Concepts of Mathematics	M-W . 6:30-8:00	Jan. 20 - April 28
Math 108	3	Trigonometry	M-W. 8:00-9:30	Jan. 20 - April 28
O. A. 105	3	Intermediate Typing	T-Th. 6:30-8:30	Jan. 21 - April 8
O. A. 106	3	Advanced Typing	T-Th. 6:30-8:30	Jan. 21 - April 8
Sp. C. 111	3	Fund. of Oral Comm. (Speech)	Tues. 6:30-9:30	Jan. 21 - April 29

The courses listed below will be offered through the Cross-Cultural Education Development Program (X-CED) of the Department of Education, University of Alaska. You may register for any of these courses from January 13 - 22 in the University of Alaska office in the Mauneluk building. These courses have limited enrollment of a first come, first served basis. Any questions should be directed to Mike Gaffney at 3262.

CLASS	CREDITS	COURSE TITLE	HOURS OF MEETING	DATES
Anth/Ed 494/694	3	Issues in American Native Ed.	TO BE ARRANGED	
Ed. 294	3	Teaching Reading & Language Arts to Paraprofessionals	" " "	
Ed. 294	3	Video Methods in Rural Ed.	" " "	
Ed. 294/494	3	Rural Community as an Educational Resource	" " "	
Ed. 294/494	3	Classroom Planning, Organization and Management	" " "	
Ed. 627	3	Education Research	" " "	
Ed. 694	3	Curriculum Development in Cultural Perspective	" " "	
Eng. 349	3	Aleut, Eskimo and Indian Literature of Alaska in English Translation	" " "	
L. R. 102	3	Conservation & Management of Natural Resources	" " "	
Soc. 405	3	Social Change	" " "	

ROBERT W. HIATT
PRESIDENT

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

January 7, 1976

The Honorable Frank R. Ferguson
Member, Interim Subcommittee on Higher Education
State of Alaska
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Frank:

During the December 12-13 meeting of the Board of Regents, decisions were made with respect to salaries and related modifiers for University faculty and staff. The Regents have asked that I convey these to you with their strongest endorsement.

For several years the Regents have adhered to a very fair and reasonable policy regarding compensation levels which would peg University of Alaska salaries at the average paid by other state universities adjusted for the increased cost-of-living in Alaska. This policy would achieve high quality collegiate education in Alaska without imposing unreasonable expenditures on Alaskan taxpayers. The Regents' goal has never been achieved, although we came closer to it in FY'76 than ever before.

To keep current regarding salary levels in the "lower 48", Dr. Richard Solie has been asked to update his previous annual comprehensive salary reviews based on statistics collected nationally and published by the American Association of University Professors. A summary of this year's study is appended as Attachment 1, and the complete study is appended as Attachment 2. The most significant point in the Summary regarding the objective of this communication is Number 5.

The following actions were taken by the Regents, and I urge your most serious consideration of them:

1. Reaffirmed their long-established goal for the compensation of the University's professional personnel of maintaining such compensation at the average level for comparable public universities in the "lower 48", adjusted for cost-of-living differentials in Alaska.

2. Directed the Executive Officer to prepare a request, including back-up data, for submission to the Governor and the Legislature for compensation increases totalling $4,280,000 retroactive to 1 July 1975 to reach the average compensation level for comparable public universities in the "lower 48". This represents an average icrease of 14.9%. In addition to reaching comparability in salary levels, the 14.9% average increase will enable us to make several other desirable changes which are mentioned below.

3. Directed the Executive Officer to request that all authorized cost-of-living increases for state employees from 1 January 1976 be made available to the professional staff of the University, thus maintaining the professional employees' real income position at the Regents' goal.

4. Directed the Executive Officer to request an additional sum of $600,000 to provide on 1 July 1976 a longevity step increase for all professional staff and merit increments for those worthy. (Since 1973 there have been no funds for either of these.)

5. Directed the Executive Officer to request of the Governor and the Legislature that cost-of-living adjustments paid to bargaining unit employees of the State from 1 January 1976 be paid as well to all classified employees of the University. For the period 1 January to 30 June 1976 this amount would total $940,000 at the minimum anticipated COL increase of 9%. (This is expected to be adjusted upward as year-end analyses are completed.)

I should like to point out that these requested salary increases in no way represent efforts at preventing unionization, but rather represent compensation goals set long before collective bargaining occurred at the University. They are fair and equitable, and obviously do not attempt to acchieve a real income position comparable with the arbitrated salary settlement enjoyed by the community college faculty.

With an average increase of 14.9% in professional salaries we will be able to do the follow. g essential things:

1. Place all staff appropriately on the Regents salary schedule approved in 1974 (you should be aware that across-the-board salary increases authorized in 1974 and 1975 have precluded placing personnel appropriately on the schedule and have thus exacerbated present inequities);

2. Provide area cost-of-living differentials for all professional staff following the state pattern; and

3. Enable the University's professional salaries to reach the goal set by the Regents.

Your careful consideration of these requests of the Board will be most appreciated by them and the entire University staff.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Hiatt
President

RWH: dm; kj
Enclosures

Alaska Community Colleges
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
2533 Providence Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99504
279-6622

Anchorage
Juneau-Douglas
Kenai
Ketchikan
Kodiak
Kuskokwim
Matanuska-Susitna
Northwest
Sitka
Tanana Valley

May 6, 1976

Sen. Frank Ferguson
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Sen. Ferguson,

Today the State of Alaska Labor Relations Agency rendered its decision regarding the ACCFT Unfair Labor Practice Charge against the University of Alaska for failing to bargain in good faith. The decision and order states;

> THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA IS FOUND TO HAVE REFUSED TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY IN GOOD FAITH WITH LOCAL 2404 AND IS HEREBY ORDERED TO CEASE AND DESIST FROM SUCH REFUSAL AND TO TAKE SUCH AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO BARGAIN IN GOOD FATIH.

The findings of the Labor Relations Agency in reaching that decision were based on the following conclusions:

1. The University had competent legal counsel who were capable of determining what the Union's legal right to strike was, and when this could be exercised and under what circumstances. The same applies to interpretation of the clause in the Union's December 22 proposal for ground rules that included the statement that "This agreement will not prohibit an otherwise legal strike." The University's spokesmen were informed by legal counsel for the Union that he had advised them that they could not strike before July 1 and only then if certain procedures called for under PERA had been complied with. The University's insistence on a no-strike pledge when such was already contained in the collective bargaining agreement appears to have been confusing to the relatively inexperienced and non-lawyer members of the Union's negotiating team. The Union had not, at the very least at the first instance this pre-condition was made to further negotiations, made any threat to strike illegally. There appears to be no grounds for any fear on the part of the University that the Union could legally strike prior to July 1.

2. The first University proposal for a precondition of a no-strike pledge, cited in the findings of fact, does not put any time limit on the duration of the Union's waiver of the right to strike; to the contrary, it can be construed as a waiver without limit. Therefore, the conclusion is that this proposal, drawn up by an attorney specializing in labor law and in collective bargaining was not designed to be a simple

(over)

affirmation of what is already in the collective bargaining agreement.

The second proposal, also cited under findings of fact, asked the Union to agree that no deadlock required under 23.40.190 as a prerequisite for mediation should occur because of the inability of the parties to reach agreement. Since the parties must reach impasse before mediation, and must undergo the mediation process before taking a strike vote, and must pass a strike vote before striking, a plain reading of this proposal is that the University's chief negotiator was effectively asking for a total waiver of the right to strike without respect to the expiration date of the agreement, not to mention the waiver of the right to invoke third-party mediatory assistance. Here again the conclusion is that this proposal was clearly more than a request for written affirmation of the no-strike provision of the agreement.

3. The conclusion is reached that the University did agree to commence negotiations on December 22, 1975, and did in fact commence such negotiations by presenting the Union with University proposals for changes in the agreement.

4. After having commenced negotiations the University refused to negotiate further unless certain preconditions were agreed to by the Union. These preconditions had the effect of asking the Union to waive certain rights under PERA and were thereby unreasonable.

5. It is concluded that under PERA and the terms of the agreement between the parties the Union may not strike before July 1, 1976, and thereafter only if the preconditions set forth in PERA are met.

Also ruled on was the issue of jurisdiction. The University of Alaska at the hearing had challenged the jurisdiction of the Labor Relations Board to rule on issues of collective bargaining by University employees. In that matter the Labor Relations Board decision and order reads:

> THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA'S CONTENTION THAT
> THE STATE PERSONNEL BOARD/LABOR RELATIONS
> AGENCY DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION IS DISMISSED.

Now we hope you have a better appreciation of the obstacles the Union negotiating team has been confronted with since negotiations commenced in December, 1975.

Sincerely,

Ralph McGrath

Ralph McGrath, President ACCFT

Dr. Robert Hiatt, President
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Dear Dr. Hiatt:

I commend the University for developing a comprehensive academic development plan with recommendations to chart the future course of the State's higher education system. I appreciate the importance placed on "community understanding" of the plan in your preface (p. ii, paragraph 2, line 4) and as a member of the community I make the following comments.

Emphasis of subjects which can benefit from "natural educational resources close at hand" (p. iii, paragraph 2, line 4) is a good premise. It will enable the University to make outstanding achievements due to the proximity of certain human and natural resources not found elsewhere.

In a period of rapid economic development it is vital that the University respond positively to the occupational and leisure time needs of an increasing population. The recommended areas of "new emphasis" (p. 147, paragraph 3, lines 5-8) in the Southcentral Region (where the majority of the growth is occurring) do not include land use planning and management training - so essential because some of the most momentous land use decisions in human history will be made by personnel in federal, state, and private (native corporation) offices, most of which are based in Anchorage. This need and the methods for satisfying it should be added to Objectives and Recommendations, probably under Natural Sciences (pp. 166-168). In-service programs (p. 151, item 6-2-4) to meet this and other needs should include intensive short courses (5 days) for employed professionals in need of exposure to new information, etc.

Training for the management of physical resources must be balanced by education oriented to people's aesthetic and spiritual needs; needs which are prone to neglect in a period of rapid economic development. Therefore, the arts and humanities, whose objectives are well stated (p. 70, paragraph 1, lines 2-5), should join the list of areas of new emphasis in the Southcentral region (p. 147, paragraph 3, lines 5-8). The recommendation that "teachers in the performing arts be 'artist/performers'" (p. 73, item 5-2-8) is good because they directly benefit a large segment of the population as well as the students they teach.

The recommendation (6-4-6 on p. 163) that Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Music Education, and Bachelor of Arts with a major in Music "should be offered when justified" should be changed to Master's degrees in the three fields. Bachelor's degrees in the three fields are already given!

Expansion of these programs to include Master's degrees is now justified to serve the needs of the large and rapidly growing metropolitan area, the more than 600 enrollees in music courses, and the more than 60 music majors, and also to take full advantage of an outstanding "educational resource", namely the small (four full time) but highly qualified music faculty.

Considerable student dissatisfaction exists at the U.A.A. because Community College/Senior College organizational structure has impeded the development of four year programs, or at least obscured student awareness of them. Therefore, I concur with the finding (p. 156, paragraph 3) and the recommendation that "program personnel be organized as a single faculty across the lower division/upper division line (p. 147, paragraph 1, lines 1-4). However, I would amend the statement which follows to say, "Failing to achieve this unity in the academic track [HAS ALREADY] lead to the need for a four year university in addition to the community college."

The need for four year baccalaureate programs at U.A.A. has recently been accentuated by the extensive cut-backs (natural sciences, social sciences, and linguistics) and outright elimination (music and intercollegiate athletics) of programs at Alaska Methodist University. A.M.U.'s music ("Song of the Great Land" which achieved top honors in nationwide competition) and ski team (several of whose members won positions on the U. S. Olympic Ski Team) have not been replaced by commensurate program increases at U.A.A. Therefore, the statement, "Should A.M.U. cease operation, a void would be created..." (p. 149, paragraph 3, lines 1-3) should be changed to reflect the fact that certain voids already exist because of cut-backs and elimination of programs at A.M.U, and U.A.A. programs should be expanded to fill the voids immediately.

The crucial concept of optimum physical, social and educational carrying capacity is recognized: "Anchorage Community College has reached a maximum desirable size..." (p. 155, paragraph 1). This concept is essential for planning a high quality learning environment and should be used as a guide to growth and a ceiling for development on all campuses. Therefore, the optimum carrying capacity policy should be adopted in the section "Quality in Education" (pp. 13-21).

Essential to the implementation of this policy is early acquisition of land for the reasons given (p. 156, paragraph 1, lines 8-11). Based on enrollment projections the need for additional land at the U.A.A. Senior College will be a serious problem within a few years. Therefore, the Anchorage Senior College section of the plan should recommend the immediate acquisition of enough land to accommodate non-community college higher education programs (pp. 150-151).

It is gratifying to see an awareness of the natural as well as man-made aspects of the learning environment at Anchorage Community College (p. 156, paragraph 2, lines 6-9). This should be stressed in the section "Quality in Education" (pp. 13-21) because the contribution which natural

beauty can make to a high quality learning environment applies to all campuses.

The Academic Development Plan is an important document; I hope it is taken seriously.

Sincerely,

Nat Goodhue

Inupiat University of the Arctic

9 April 1976

Senator Frank Ferguson
Community and Regional Affairs
The Senate
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Ferguson:

It has come to our attention that the Rural Education Affairs - University of Alaska Center for Barrow calling for five computer terminals shared with the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory has been stricken from the budget (see attached addendum).

Since Inupiat University of the Arctic, Barrow, and the University of Alaska have agreed to develop a working relationship, all three institutions are in need of this service. The amount of $22,600 cut out of this budget should be restored.

Any help you can give us in accomplishing this budget restoration will be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Dorcas J. Thompson
Inupiat Council for
Postsecondary Education

IC:ft
Budget Addendum Proposal

P.O. Box 426 Barrow, Alaska 99723 · 907/852-6671

ADDENDUM TO BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR REA CENTER AT BARROW

COST ESTIMATES

Five Computer Terminals at Barrow
(sharing costs with N.A.R.L.)

(1)	Purchase five terminals ($2000 ea.) (these will last another 2.5 to 3.5 years, with annual maintenance costs of $500 each, or $2500 total	$10,000
(2)	Monthly leasing of a communications line from Fairbanks to Barrow (from January through June, at $1400/month for REA's share of the monthly cost of $2800	$ 8,400
(3)	Monthly leasing of a multiplexer at each end of the communications line. (REA share is half of total monthly cost of $1400, for six months)	$ 4,200
	TOTAL for F.Y. 1976-77	$22,600

TO: House Finance Committee

FROM: Elaine Ramos, Vice President
Rural Education Affairs Division
University of Alaska

RE: Return of funds for REA Vice President and secretary to STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATION, from RURAL AFFAIRS/CENTRAL SUPPORT UNIT

DATE: April 23, 1976

We request that the $75,000 which was moved from UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA/STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATION to RURAL AFFAIRS/CENTRAL SUPPORT UNIT be returned to STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATION.

All other University Vice Presidents' salaries, and the salaries of their secretaries, are covered by the appropriation for STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATION. Therefore, the change we are requesting will maintain consistency in the treatment of these items.

4-23-76

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
PROGRAM NARRATIVE INSTRUCTION/RESEARCH UNIT SUMMARY — Office of Budget Development

FY 77 (Budget Year) | Statewide Administration (Appropriation) | All Programs (Campus) | Appropriation Summary (Program Component/Element)

INFORMATION CURRENT YEAR

PROGRAM

I. GOALS/OBJECTIVES: Establish and maintain statewide leadership and direction for the effective implementation of the University goals in instruction, research and public service. Develope policies for the instruction of students and the efficient administration of the University system. Coordinate and continuously improve the communication of the University's goals and accomplishments to the public, legislature, students and staff.

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS & ACTIVITIES: This program component provides for the University's executive functions, and related support services, including:

- The Board of Regents
- Office of the President
- Statewide Management Services
- Institutional Services, Planning and Budget Development
- Statewide Computer Services
- Public Relations and Information
- Personnel Relations and policies
- Legal Services

Under the revised organizational structure of the University, these programs are maintained by the President, Executive Vice President, Vice Presidents for Finance, Rural Affairs, and Research, Executive Director for Institutional Studies, Physical Facilities Development and Budget Development, Assistant Vice President for Personnel, the University Counsel and the Chancellors of the Fairbanks, Anchorage and Juneau campuses.

NOTE:

III. DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- Preparation of the Academic Development Plan.
- Phase 1 of management systems contract for statewide computer network.
- Reorganization of office of the President to improve coordination and direction of programs, and to establish responsibilities and authority.
- Initial development of program budget concept, use of RRIM in budget development.
- Increase in the scope of participation of the University Assembly in policy development and administration of the University.

BUDGET YEAR WORKLOAD EXPLANATION: Providing for the costs incurred with the expansion of the Board of Regents from 9 to 11 members; effects of collective bargaining process, including additional staff in personnel and cost of contracted annual salary increment of 5%; expanded workload in computer services at Anchorage and Fairbanks; increase in publications for alumni magazine and other publications; increased costs involved with new computer management systems; increase in permanent fund based on additional income; and equipment allowance. The FY 77 request totals $6.6 million, an increase of $0.8 million over the revised FY 76 estimates. State General Funds comprise $5.3 million of our request, an increase of $0.7 million over revised FY 76 estimates.

BUDGET YEAR CHANGE EXPLANATION: Development of NODE operations with the computer systems tying Anchorage, Juneau and West Ridge into the system for instructional and financial use; establishing a Board of Regents staff, a President's Contingency Fund and a fund for non-sponsored faculty research; improving planning, budget development and internal audit operations; additional impact of collective bargaining; extending the operations of the University Assembly; establishing an Assistant Director position for University Relations, and moving planning staff from Bond Funds to General Funds for proper charge of their function. The change request totals $1.2 million, all of which in from State General Funds.

To: House Finance Committee

From: Elaine Ramos, Vice President
Rural Education Affairs Division
University of Alaska

Re: Justification of appropriations request of $381,500.00 for establishment of a Rural Education Affairs Central Support Unit.

Date: April 23, 1976

This Central Support Unit will be responsible for providing liason and direct delivery of support and academic services (fiscal management, registration, personnel management and instruction-academic program development) to four community colleges, 13 extension/learning centers, and to the new regional learning centers currently under consideration. The positions are:

Budget planning/business instructor	$35,000
Administrative Assistant to the Vice President	22,000
Coordinator, Central Support Unit	37,000
Secretary	13,000
Fiscal officer	24,000
Clerk	13,000
Personnel/EEO Liason	22,000
Clerk	13,000
Cross-cultural academic development/instruction in health education	30,000
Cross-cultural academic development/instruction in community college and adult education	37,000
SALARIES	$246,000
Fringe benefits - 18.5%	45,500
SUPPORT SERVICES (Travel, contractual, commodities and equipment)	90,000
GRAND TOTAL	$381,500

To: House Finance Committee

From: Elaine Ramos, Vice President
Rural Education Affairs Division
University of Alaska

Re: Priorities for new program funding

Date: April 23, 1976

Our priorities for new program funding were established for us by the Rural Education Task Force. Members of the Task Force are: Gordon Jackson, Robert Schaeffer, Emil Notti, Lucy Sparks, Dorcas Thompson, Don Dafoe and Jim Matthews. Roger Lang was a member of the Task Force when these priorities were established.

New program priorities are: Galena and Sand Point.

Priorities for expansion of currently existing extension programs are: Dillingham, Glenallen-Copper River, Ft. Yukon, and Barrow.

Rural Educational Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS ALASKA 99701
P.O. Box 297, Kotzebue, Alaska 99752

Senator Frank Ferguson
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska 99801

March 17, 1976

Dear Frank:

This letter is written to continue a flow of information to you about the University of Alaska Extension Center in Kotzebue.

About the new building, one facet of it is becoming more important as completion date and dedication ceremonies are discussed. I believe you know that the building will not have furniture and equipment, the planned home economics area will be incomplete; and interior walls will not be installed. Alternatives to resolve this situation immediately have been discussed, but nothing has been proposed formally.

This problem has been discussed in meetings of the Kotzebue Center Advisory Board. June Nelson (board member) and I discussed the matter today. The result has been a request that I write you and ask whether or not a special legislative appropriation to supply funds is possible. The amount needed is estimated to be between $25,000 and $35,000. Any amount would help.

I trust that the copy of the telegram sent March 16 to Mrs. Elaine Ramos reached your office in ungarbled and readable form.

Enclosed is a copy of the summary page of the semester statistics sent to you in February. I will attempt to offer a third semester (mini-semester) in April, May and June and will keep you informed.

Lastly, Alex Hills has stated that he will not be available next year unless a substantial increase in pay (gross $2,500 per month) is granted by the University. It will be difficult to reach the good results of this year without a full time instructor. It is doubtful

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

that a replacement can be recuited and hired unless University subsidized housing is available.

I hope that this legislative session has been interesting for you and I am looking forward to our next visit.

Sincerely,

Ed Bohnert

Edward A. Bohnert
Coordinator

STUDENT STATISTICS

Fall Semester 1974	Number of Students	40
	Student Credit Hours	120
	Student Course Hours	1800
Spring Semester 1975	Number of Students	40
	Student Credit Hours	120
	Student Course Hours	1800
Fall Semester 1975	Number of Students	44
	Student Credit Hours	137
	Student Course Hours	2055
Spring Semester 1976	Number of Students	110
	Student Credit Hours	120
	Student Course Hours	4143

April 12, 1976

TO: Members of Alaska State Legislature

FROM: Representatives of the Faculty Associations of the University of Alaska, Anchorage Senior College and the University of Alaska, Fairbanks

We urge your support of CSHB 661 which provides appropriation for cost of living increases for University of Alaska faculty for the year ending June 30, 1976.

We additionally request your support for the 14.9% salary increase (recommended in Richard Solie's report) to put University of Alaska faculty on a salary scale that is comparable (when adjusted for cost of living) to that of the average in the state universities of the rest of the United States.

These adjustments are essential if we are to attract and retain high quality faculty who are essential to the continued improvement of the quality of the programs at the University of Alaska.

Margaret S. Greer, Secretary,
Anchorage Senior College Faculty
Association

Donald A. Lokken, Chairman,
Fairbanks Faculty Association

Paul H. McCarthy, Board of Directors
Fairbanks Faculty Association

ROBERT W. HIATT
PRESIDENT

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

April 6, 1976

The Honorable Frank Ferguson
Chairman, Health, Education and Social Services
Alaska State Senate
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska

Ref: CS for SB 587

Dear Frank:

The referenced Bill providing for capital improvements for the community colleges and extension centers of the University of Alaska leaves only the Tanana Valley Community College out of consideration. There are, of course, reasons for this, since our regular Fairbanks campus classrooms service TVCC adequately except for vocational-technical shop-type facilities which have never existed on the Fairbanks campus. Expecting to use cooperatively the Hutchison Adult Career Center facilities adjacent to the campus, no request was made for shop facilities when TVCC was established. However, lack of cooperation and extensive use of these facilities during the daytime period by the North Star School District has made the Career Center shops and classrooms unavailable for TVCC's use.

To solve this problem the Regents approved as a high priority item a shop, laboratory and classroom building for TVCC ($6,650.0), but in meeting the Governor's reduced G. O. Bond project allowance the Regents had to choose between the Museum building and the TVCC shop building. For good reasons the Regents gave highest priority to the Museum building, and it is included in CS for HB 617. Thus, the TVCC major shop building has been eliminated. However, there is urgent need for a less costly and highly specialized facility - an Aviation Training Complex.

This facility would cost about $1.0 million, and would thus be in line with the allocations made to other community colleges in the Bill. The attached information describes the project, the need for it in terms of student registrations and a breakdown of the anticipated costs of construction and equipment.

I respectfully request your consideration in adding this project to the Bill so that time will not be lost in a program designed to fill an important need in interior Alaska. The Board of Regents endorse this request.

Sincerely,

Bob

Robert W. Hiatt
President

RWH:dm
Enclosure

March 25, 1976

N. M. Goodhue
3220 E. 40th
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

Senator Frank Ferguson
Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau Alaska 99811

Dear Frank:

Although I have frequently criticized the University of Alaska, these disagreements do not prevent me from supporting appropriations which will maintain or improve the quality of higher education in Alaska. The heart of the University is the congregation of people who are there to teach and learn, and in behalf of their educational environment and programs I make a couple of positive suggestions for your consideration as you work on the University budget and bond issue. The basis for these suggestions is found in the enclosed letters.

1) Add an additional item to the University of Alaska Bond Issue (HB 617): "Land Aquisition...Anchorage...$4,000,000." This is necessary to acquire the last remaining large tract of land adjacent to the university-medical complex(before it is irretrievably committed to other development) and thereby connect the limited existing institutional acreage north of Tudor Road with those which are being transferred to the State by the BLM south of Tudor Road.

2) Fund the University of Alaska, Anchorage Sr. College and Anchorage Community College Academic Transfer Studies at a level which will permit a well rounded four year liberal arts program that is commensurate with the enrollment. These presently underfunded and understaffed "sub-programs" need to receive the full funding "request" (copies of pages 189 & 197 are enclosed) in order to meet present enrollment needs.

UAA Support

I believe that advances can be made in the quality of higher education next fiscal year as a result of strategic funding such as that described above.

Sincerely,

Nat

Nat Goodhue

P.S. Neither of these items has been added to the respective bills. I thought you might be able to - with your positions on the Education and Finance Committees. It's been a few years since we talked about recreation projects in Kotzebue.

STATE OF ALASKA

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

COMMISSION ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Division of Student Financial Aid
Division of Postsecondary Education
Western Region Higher Education Compact

907-465-2855
Pouch F — State Office Building
Juneau 99811

TO: Members of Senate Health, Education, and Social Services Committee

Frank Ferguson, Chairman
W. E. "Brad" Bradley
Mike Colletta
George Hohman

FROM: Kerry D. Romesburg, Executive Director
Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education

DATE: April 16, 1976

Some time ago (as early as last October) it became evident that there were a number of potential problems developing between the sometimes overlapping academic programs of Sheldon Jackson College and the University of Alaska-Southeast. In particular, there seems to be a problem with teacher education programs. At its February meeting, the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education reviewed the existing conditions of both educational programs and called for a meeting involving representatives from Sheldon Jackson College, University of Alaska-Southeast, and the Commission to arrive at a solution to the problem. Now, through an expanded consortium agreement, it appears the difficulties have been resolved. The Board of Trustees of Sheldon Jackson has already approved the new consortial agreement and it is expected that the Board of Regents will do the same when they meet at the end of this month. The Commission has formally commended both the University of Alaska-Southeast and Sheldon Jackson College for their demonstrated willingness to work and plan cooperatively in Southeast Alaska. The actions of the respective faculty and administrative staff members can serve as a model for future planning and coordination for optional utilization of postsecondary educational resources in Alaska.

The Commission endorses this new consortium agreement and would appreciate any legislative support which may become available should issues arise which relate to this or similar consortial negotiations and efforts. A copy of the highlights of this consortium agreement and the proposed consortium budget is attached for your reference.

Attachment

1. Southeastern Senior College will continue to offer continuing education courses and other education degree programs throughout Southeast Alaska, subject to the provisions in items 2-5 below.

2. Courses leading to the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree in elementary education in Juneau and Ketchikan will be offered exclusively by Southeastern Senior College.

3. Courses leading to the Bachelor of Education degree in elementary education in all other cities and villages in Southeast Alaska will be offered exclusively by Sheldon Jackson College.

4. While this agreement is intended to be implemented as of July 1, 1976, it is understood that each college will have a period of one year additional to offer course work which will allow students to complete their courses of study or make a smooth transition to the other institution where this will be necessary.

5. Costs to the respective programs of the institutions coming as a result of this agreement will be borne by the respective institutions.

6. Sheldon Jackson College will have primary responsibility for, and will be enabled to offer a lower division teacher aide education program throughout all locations in Southeast Alaska.

A copy of the total consortial costs (in state funds) is attached.

Attachment

cc: President Merton D. Munn
Chancellor Charles O. Ferguson

1976-77 BUDGET REQUEST

SHELDON JACKSON COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, SOUTHEAST CONSORTIUM

A.	Library		
	Implementation costs (one-time)	$17,160	
	Library Services	11,450	
			$28,610
B.	Other facility utilization		
	Graduate courses	1,200	
	Summer school	5,400	
			6,600
C.	Instructional support services		41,598
D.	Administrative support (Sheldon Jackson)		8,377
			$85,185
E.	Administrative support (UA-Southeast)		6,500
			$91,685

Institutional Studies and
Physical Facilities Development
Box 95155

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS ALASKA 99701

April 15, 1975

Mr. Eric Echolm
413 W. 17th Street, Apt. #9
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Eric:

It was good talking with you and Judy about a systematic approach to operational funding for the small community colleges last Thursday.

You asked several questions about RRIM and I am pleased to send you our RRIM Issue Papers for 1973 and 1974, dealing with RRIM I and RRIM II.

I am also enclosing the paper setting forth the basis for faculty credit hour production for the various sizes of campuses in the University of Alaska System. I am also including a comparison of the Governor's recommendation with the RRIM submittal for instructional salaries and total costs for the six small community colleges in the University of Alaska System.

It is possible that the University of Alaska Office of Institutional Studies could be responsible for working with the Administration's Budget Office and the Legislative Finance for further development of a systematic model for funding different program areas within the University. This office could identify high cost program areas and follow up on budget data, submitting reports for the first semester of each academic year by February 15, and the second semester by July 15, and the summer session by September 15 of each year. This office could certify data if it had the prerogative of audit and could be responsible for keeping the respective branches of State Government fully informed in these matters.

Again, it was good talking with you and I look forward to continuing our work together.

Sincerely,

Donald C. Moyer
Executive Director

DCM:mo

Enclosure

cc: Don M. Dafoe

PLEASE REPLY BY AIRMAIL

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED AS
A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL FILE.

AN ISSUE PAPER FOR A RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTION MODEL

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

This paper is presented to further the discussion among those concerned with financing of higher education in Alaska with the desirability of a systematic approach to the creation and presentation of the budgetary request.

Introduction

The funding requests of higher education are now being developed on the basis of "cost study" techniques. Such systems are currently in use in the states of Oklahoma, Washington, Colorado, Texas, and Florida, to name only a few. These states have developed their approach over a period of years and are continually reviewing the process to improve their capabilities to present the needs of institutions as reliable and realistically as possible. The necessity for such processes is a result of the ever increasing needs of a system of higher education and the desire of the Legislative body to treat its institutions in an equitable manner while allowing for diversity in program and educational approach.

The University of Alaska with its wide range of services to a geographically dispersed and culturally diverse population recognizes the need to present to the Governor's Office and the Legislature a reasonable and comprehensible budgetary request that facilitates the review and analysis necessary to substantiate the validity of the funding requested. Such review and analysis will also reveal to what extent and manner the University is utilizing its allocated resources and allow a basis for testing the level of support required by the campuses and programs in each area of the state.

Basic Assumptions For a System of Resource Requirements

The underlying basis for a system of resource requirements is the assumption that it will provide an analytic capability which results in greater efficiency and effectiveness in the expenditure of funds. Further, such a system will increase awareness in those who wish to expand services as to the effects, both direct and indirect, on funding requirements.

The data gathered for use in such a resource requirement model should assist in making useful analyses of units within the system. These data should assist the University in presenting its budget request by showing current relationships that are consistent or that are markedly different with national trends. Thus, the University's presentation can be focused on justification of those areas requiring a modification of current funding levels, and the time span needed to achieve a more equitable relationship.

Assumptions Regarding Quality

The qualitative aspects of the educational environment are extremely difficult to express in quantitative terms. There are currently extensive efforts under way at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE to develop more acceptable indicators of quality (see the Technical Publications list of NCHEMS).

Many of the relationships expressed by a resource requirement model are based upon value judgements that imply a level of quality (average salaries to attract and retain good personnel, student-faculty ratios to provide the most effective classroom experience, departmental support, library support, etc.) While the level of financial support is used, at least in part, as an indicator of program quality, the use of quantitative indicators, either high or low, must be tempered with subjective qualitative judgements relative to the programs in question.

Qualitative outcomes can not be minimized due to lack of adequate measuring techniques. Intensive effort will be given to the identification and evaluation of program objectives and outcomes in studies that are currently under way. The learning environment as represented by the interaction between student and professor will be examined with the view of assessing outcome benefits as they relate to costs.

Attached are two papers from the University Assembly Policy and Programs Committee that are included to further elaborate on the qualitative aspects of higher education. These papers are labeled Attachment I.

Generic Units and Operational Level

It is proposed that the University initially use generic units and averages in a resource requirement model. This will allow for the flexibility within the units to permit internal planning and priorities, the detailed decisions relating to program objectives, implementation of the learning process, etc. to reside with those at the college, department or division level directly involved in the process. The resource requirement model envisioned would set the level of funding and would ask operating units to make the highest use of allotted funds in the realization of the educational task.

The current state of the art of resource models and simulation permits a level of operation that requires considerable time and money to implement. Systems of the complexity of Washington's (State of) Model Budget Analysis System, for instance, has been in process since 1967, consisting of some six or more program areas of which only four are currently implemented. Therefore, it must be realized that a highly sophisticated model is not possible to achieve in a short period of time.

A list of the generic units and averages with their definitions follows:

STUDENT (SEMESTER) CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION will record by course level (lower division, upper division, graduate, career-technical equivalent credit) and by semester (summer, fall, spring) the total student credit hours actually produced or projected by each instructional entity.

ANNUAL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT (AFTEE) is based upon dividing the "Student Credit Hour Production" by thirty (30) credit hours per year as a full load for Lower, Upper, and Career-technical division levels, and twenty-four (24) credit hours per year for the graduate level. The AFTEE provides a consistant measure of student course work that can be used by all the various instructional units. Many career-technical programs that the University offers may be included by using an equivalency conversion of two class hours to one credit hour.

STUDENT-FACULTY RATIO is the number of students per faculty on the average for a given division level. This ratio provides a basis for differences by level and differences in program offerings.

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT TEACHING POSITION is a mathematical equivalency representing nine (9) months of teaching activity which may be derived by dividing the FTE enrollment by the student-faculty ratio for each level; or it may be a known number of faculty FTE divided into the number of FTE students to arrive at a student-faculty ratio. Usually a full-time faculty teaching load is considered to be twelve (12) credit hours of course work each semester at the lower division level or nine (9) credit hours of teaching at the upper division or graduate level with three (3) equivalent credit hours of research. In addition to the class teaching, each full time faculty member gives an average of 45% additional time to advising, independent tutoring, scholarly and creative activities, public service, and other related activities.

AVERAGE SALARY - REGULAR RATE is the average salary paid for nine (9) month full-time equivalent faculty teaching at a full time employment rate.

AVERAGE SALARY - CREDIT HOUR RATE is the average salary paid for nine (9) month full time equivalent faculty teaching at a course by course rate.

BENEFITS are all fringe benefit costs representing additional compensation to each employee expressed as a percentage of average salary rates.

TOTAL TEACHING SALARIES is the sum of the teaching salaries plus benefits applied to teaching positions funded at the regular rate and those funded at a credit hour rate.

OTHER DEPARTMENTAL/DIVISION EXPENSES are salaries for support personnel, expendables, travel, equipment, organized activities,

departmental research, departmental administration, and other. These items can be dealt with in detail or at a summary level depending on the requirements of each entity.

TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTION BASE is the sum of total teaching salaries plus the other departmental/division expense. This item is generally referred to as the "direct instructional costs".

GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS are those areas supporting the instructional programs of an entity such as: general administration, student services, extension and public services, library, operation and maintenance of physical plant, and other. This item can be provided in detail or at a summary level depending on the requirements. This area of expense is generally referred to as the "indirect costs related to instruction".

ESTIMATED INCOME is the total estimated income for a unit or combination of units. It includes both an estimated amount for student fee income and other income, and an amount to be requested from the state appropriation, the latter usually being the difference needed to meet the resources required for the unit.

A PROPOSED RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL.

After extensive review of resource requirement (allocation) models used by other states, it seems desirable to use what might be designated a variable parameter system instead of a monolithic formula approach. It appears that only in those states where the educational system and its individual institutions are well established can the single formula approach not result in inequities for small, emerging or the "different" entity. An awareness of the wide range of sizes, kinds and "point in development" of University of Alaska campuses and programs must prevail if an adequate resource requirement model is to be developed.

The attached form will be used to present the proposed Resource Requirement Instructional Model. The definitions of the terms used are those given above. See FORM A, page 4A.

Actual data will not be used in describing how the process works; however the system must be understood as though actual data were available and being used. When actual data are available, internal relationships can be seen and their consistency and reasonableness examined. Short or long range adjustments in these relationships can be undertaken. Forecasted student credit hour and enrollment data then can be used with these relationship factors and the net effects on the financial needs observed. By "experimenting" with the relationship factors and running several simulations, an optimum request budget should develop. By placing a request budget within the context of two years prior and two

RESOURCE REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL

FORM A

Instructional Entity: _____

Entire Year: _____

ENROLLMENT PROJECTION:

Level:	STUDENT (SEMESTER) CR. HOUR PRODUCTION					ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Total		
Lower Division					÷ 30 =	
Upper Division					÷ 30 =	
Graduate					÷ 24 =	
PROJECTED TOTALS					=	Ⓕ
Non Cr.Equivalent						

TEACHING FACULTY NEEDS:

Level:	FTE Enrlmt	Stdt./Fac. Ratio & (Product.)	FTE Teach Positions	% Reg.Rate	% Cr.Hr.Rate
Lower Division					
Upper Division					
Graduate					
ALL LEVELS AVERAGE				No.Reg. Salary	No.Cr. Hr.Sal

FINANCIAL NEEDS:

	Reg.Rate	Cr.Hr.Rate	x	x	
Average Sal.					Tl.Teach. Salaries
Benefits					
Total Teaching Salaries					= Ⓢ

Other Department/Division:	Basis	Amount
Support Salaries		
Expendables		
Travel		
Equipment		
Organized Activities (Rel. Instr.)		
Departmental Research		
Departmental Administration		
Other		

TL.OTHER REQURMT.(_____% of Salaries or Amt.$_____p.full-t.Fac.) = Other Dept./Div Ⓞ

TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTION BASE (Salaries and Other) =

GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS:

	Basis	Amount
General Administration		
Student Services		
Extension & Public Services		
Organized Research & Development		
Library		
Operation & Maintenance of Physical Plant		
Other		

TL.GEN. REQURMT. (_____% of Direct or $_____per full-t.Fac.) = Ⓡ

TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL REQUIREMENT =

ESTIMATED INCOME:

	%	Amount
Fee and Other General Income		
State - Appropriated Funds		

TOTAL INCOME =

ahead, trends across the period can be studied and adjusted to develop the most effective relationships.

The process is started by gathering for each instructional entity the student credit hours for each semester by course level. These data are entered in their appropriate box under STUDENT (SEMESTER) CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION. The values are totaled both down for semester totals and across for division level totals. The division level totals are divided by their appropriate factor to determine the ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT by division level.

The ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENTS should be entered in their appropriate place in the section under TEACHING FACULTY NEEDS. From an analysis of employment records and the schedule of classes, the number of FTE TEACHING POSITIONS by level is determined and entered in the proper locations. The STUDENT-FACULTY RATIO is calculated by dividing the FTE TEACHING POSITIONS into the ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT. The STUDENT-FACULTY RATIO is one of the relationships that can be modified either up or down to evaluate the effect on number of FTE TEACHING POSITIONS during an "experimental" run for years beyond "actual".

From the analysis of the employment records and payroll reports the average salary and benefits are determined for both types of teaching faculty salary rates (regular or credit hour). The average salary and benefits figures should be entered on the form, summed and entered appropriately for the totals. The total salary dollars expended in each category is entered and summed to equal TOTAL TEACHING SALARIES.

OTHER DEPARTMENTAL/DIVISION EXPENSE amounts are entered from the fiscal year-end financial statement. The categories are generally consistant with the reporting procedures of the University except that the supporting salaries amount is determined by subtracting the TOTAL TEACHING SALARIES for the instructional departments/divisions only. The BASIS column can then be calculated as a percentage of the TOTAL TEACHING SALARIES or as an expense per FTE TEACHING POSITION. These relationships, also must be reviewed to evaluate their appropriate range among the various entities of the University and during simulation runs these factors can be varied to study the effect on fund requirement levels as the trends are projected.

The total OTHER DEPARTMENTAL/DIVISION EXPENSE is recorded as the sum of the above items. Salaries and the previous total are summed to record TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL BASE requirements.

GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS can be determined from the financial report with the exception of those entities that are served by regional or system-wide services and where a single accounting entity such as Physical Plant may serve several functions. It is at this point where cost study allocation techniques must be developed to refine the model. It is proposed at this time that

those areas such as Systemwide Institutional Services, Organized Research, and Statewide Public Service not be included in this model but that further study be undertaken to include those areas in a later model or models, perhaps by the next request budget cycle. (FY-76)

The appropriate expenses for each sub-area should be recorded and the basis calculated, again, on either the basis of a percentage of the TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL BASE or as an expense per FTE TEACHING POSITIONS. As with the factors above, these relationships can be reviewed for reasonableness and the simulation process used to explore the effect of various "realistic" modifications. The sum of the GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS is entered and added to the sum of the TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL BASE to obtain the TOTAL EDUCATION and GENERAL REQUIREMENT for that entity.

The ESTIMATED INCOME is determined from the financial report with the percentage of fee and other general income and state appropriation are of the total. The total state appropriated funds required is the difference between the TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL REQUIREMENT and the amount to be received from fees and other general income.

SUMMARY AND REVIEW OF THE RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL.

An overview of the five sections covered in the process as presented on the form follows:

I. ENROLLMENT PROJECTION
This section provides the basis for establishing current levels of activity from historical data and, in turn, provides the basis for projections of future instructional unit requirements and their budgetary implications.

II. TEACHING FACULTY NEEDS
This section shows the relationships between instructional faculty and instructional units from current data and provides for variation in projections by modification of relationships to establish improvements or changes in the units of "production".

III. FINANCIAL NEEDS
Using current salary average with current production factors, total teaching salary costs can be shown. Then by calculating desired new averages (based on cost of living differentials and the necessary competitive increases), and entering these with other new production factors, the impact of these variables on teaching salary costs can be analyzed.

Using the BASIS factors resulting from the analysis of historical financial data, the requirements for OTHER DEPARTMENTAL/DIVISION EXPENSE can be calculated. The total teaching salaries plus these expenses equal the total DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL BASE.

IV. GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS
This section relates all the "overhead" areas to the TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL BASE and shows the financial impact of these areas especially upon developing campuses as they begin the operation of new buildings and the other related services required to support their instructional programs.

V. ESTIMATED INCOME
This section relates student fees to student enrollment projections, and other general income can be related to total education and general expenditures to determine the amount of state appropriation funds to be requested.

AN APPLICATION OF THE RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTION MODEL.

To test the Resource Requirements Instruction Model the Initial Working Budget for 1972-73 was chosen because the supporting data (student semester credit hours and full-time equivalent faculty) did appear to be available in nearly actual form and the financial data should be more relevant than a previous fiscal year. It is stressed here: the data used are from the Initial Working Budget as dated 7/27/72. While the relationships developed are, hopefully, of a proper magnitude, data are to be considered estimates, in no way to be interpreted as anything but an example of the feasibility of using the modelling technique.

Student Semester Credit Hours for summer, first semester, and initial data for second semester were available in adequate detail and has been entered on each form for the three major campus entities. The Anchorage Community College and the Senior College are combined and the Juneau-Douglas Community College and the Senior College are combined and recorded as single entities.

In general, the process is followed as discussed in the preceding pages. There are certain assumptions and adjustments made that do effect the results and these variations are discussed as they relate to each campus presented.

FAIRBANKS CAMPUS

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTION MODEL

General assumptions and variations for this entity are as follow:

The Dean's Office of each college has been recorded as Departmental Administration. The Department Chairmen have been included with the teaching FTE.

Support salaries is the remainder from subtracting the total teaching salaries from the total Departmental salary budgets.

Summer Session teaching salaries are included in the total teaching salaries but the remaining expenses have been identified in the "Other" category.

General Administration includes all of the Northern Region Provost, Business, Registrar and Student Service offices. No allocation has been made for services to other campuses or other functions on the Fairbanks campus.

Only Northern Region Extension and Public Services expenses as identified in the budget have been recorded.

No Organized Research activities are recorded. Organized (Institute) Research is one aspect of the University's activities that will need further study before it can be included within a modelling framework.

Only 80% of the Library and Museum expenses are considered as a part of the Fairbanks instructional programs. The remainder would be allocated to other activities as other models are developed.

Only 45% of the expense for Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant is included. This reflects the approximate proportion or the total plant space assigned for instruction and instructional support use. The remainder of the operation and maintenance of the Physical Plant would be allocated to other activities as models for these activities are developed.

State appropriated funds is an amount equal to the difference between total expense and the amount estimated for Fees and Other General Income.

RESOURCE REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL — FORM B

Instructional Entity: Fairbanks

Entire Year: 1972-73

ENROLLMENT PROJECTION:

Level:	STUDENT (SEMESTER) CR. HOUR PRODUCTION					ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT	
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Total			
Lower Division	2,676	27,013	24,456	54,750	÷30=	1,825	
Upper Division	1,558	9,468	10,197	21,223	÷30=	707	(T)
Graduate	856	2,165	1,846	4,867	÷24=	202	
PROJECTED TOTALS	5,090	39,251	36,499	80,840	÷29.6 =	2,735	
Non Cr.Equivalent							

TEACHING FACULTY NEEDS:

Level:	FTE Enrlmt	Std./Fac. Ratio & (Product.)	FTE Teach Positions	% Reg.Rate	% Cr.Hr.Rate
Lower Division	1,825	18 (540)	96.9	95.4	4.6
Upper Division	707	9 (270)	78.6		
Graduate	202	7 (168)	28.9	No.Reg. Salary	No.Cr. Hr.Sal
ALL LEVELS AVERAGE	2,735	13.4(388)	204.3	195	9.3

FINANCIAL NEEDS:

	Reg.Rate	Cr.Hr.Rate	x	x	
Average Sal.	16,270	7,000	18,140	7,420	Tl.Teach. Salaries
Benefits	11.5%	6%			
Total Teaching Salaries			3,537.3	68.6	= 3,605.9 (S)

Other Department/Division:	Basis	Amount
Support Salaries	11.9	432.7
Expendables	5.0	183.4
Travel	1.6	57.9
Equipment	1.1	40.8
Organized Activities (Rel. Instr.)	2.8	102.9
Departmental Research	.4	15.5
Departmental Administration	10.0	361.4
Other	.9	33.2

TL.OTHER REQURMT.(34 % of Salaries or Amt.$_____p.full-t.Fac.) = Other Dept./Div 1,227.8 (O)

TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTION BASE (Salaries and Other) = 4,833.8

GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS:

	Basis	Amount
General Administration	17.0	822.1
Student Services	12.6	612.6
Extension & Public Services	5.2	252.3
Organized Research & Development		
Library	16.5	797.7
Operation & Maintenance of Physical Plant	38.0	1,858.9
Other		

TL.GEN. REQURMT. (89.8 % of Direct or $_____per full-t.Fac.) = 4,343.6 (E)

TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL REQUIREMENT = 9,177.3

ESTIMATED INCOME:

	%	Amount
Fee and Other General Income	8.5	786.7
State - Appropriated Funds	91.5	8,390.6

TOTAL INCOME = 9,177.3

ANCHORAGE CAMPUS

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTION MODEL

General assumptions and variations for this entity are as follows:

The non-credit equivalent student semester hours are recorded but are not included in any of the calculations. It is not apparent from the Initial Working Budget (7/27/72) data that any of this non-credit activity is supported by Current General Funds.

The assumption is that lower division student semester credit hours represent only work at the Community College and upper division and graduate student semester credit hours represent work only at the Senior College. Further, lower division FTE teaching positions are related to the Community College only and upper division and graduate FTE teaching positions are related only to the Senior College. The upper division and graduate level teaching positions are combined.

It is difficult to adequately determine FTE teaching positions from the Initial Working Budget. It is assumed, therefore, that there may be an understatement of the number of FTE teaching positions which overstates the student faculty ratio and faculty productivity.

Fifty percent of the Community College Director's Office expenses are considered as academic departmental administration, with all expenses for the Senior College Dean's Office included.

The remaining fifty percent of the Director's Office expense is included in general administration along with eighty percent of the Regional Provost's Office expense.

Community College student services expense are recorded along with eighty percent of the Regional Office Registrar and student service expense.

No other expenses of the Southcentral Regional Office are included in this analysis.

RESOURCE REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL — FORM C

Instructional Entity: Anchorage (Anchorage Community and Senior Colleges)

Entire Year: 1972-73

ENROLLMENT PROJECTION:

Level:	STUDENT (SEMESTER) CR. HOUR PRODUCTION					ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT	
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Total			
Lower Division	9,802	36,673	34,415	80,890	÷30=	2,696	
Upper Division	4,097	6,499	6,363	16,959	÷30=	565	(F)
Graduate	3,033	3,768	6,265	11,066	÷24=	461	
PROJECTED TOTALS	16,932	46,940	45,043	108,915	÷29.2 =	3,722	
Non Cr.Equivalent	915	11,853	2,447	15,214			

TEACHING FACULTY NEEDS:

Level:	FTE Enrlmt	Stdt./Fac. Ratio & (Product.)	FTE Teach Positions	% Reg.Rate	% Cr.Hr.Rate
Lower Division	2,696	24.4(731)	110.6	63.3	36.7
Upper Division	565			No.Reg. Salary	No.Cr. Hr.Sal
Graduate	461	11.6(317)	39.4		
ALL LEVELS AVERAGE	3,722	18.7(547)	199.0	126	73.0

FINANCIAL NEEDS:

	Reg.Rate	Cr.Hr.Rate	×	×	
Average Sal.	13,770	8,006	15,354	8,486	Tl.Teach. Salaries
Benefits	11.5%	6%	↓	↓	
Total Teaching Salaries			1,934.6	619.5	= 2,554.1 (S)

Other Department/Division:	Basis	Amount
Support Salaries	3.5	91.7
Expendables	2.2	56.3
Travel	0.7	18.6
Equipment	1.1	28.6
Organized Activities (Rel. Instr.)		
Departmental Research		
Departmental Administration	7.3	188.0
Other		

TL.OTHER REQURMT.(15.0 % of Salaries or Amt.$_____p.full-t.Fac.) = Other Dept./Div 383.2 (U)

TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTION BASE (Salaries and Other) = 2,937.3

GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS:

	Basis	Amount	Direct	80% Provost Of
General Administration	19.8	582.0	= 187.9 +	394.1
Student Services	16.6	487.7	= 125.3 +	362.4
Extension & Public Services	1.9	55.9		
Organized Research & Development				
Library	14.9	439.8		
Operation & Maintenance of Physical Plant	25.5	751.3		
Other				

TL.GEN. REQURMT. (78.8 % of Direct or $_____per full-t.Fac.) = 2,316.7 (K)

TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL REQUIREMENT = 5,254.1

ESTIMATED INCOME:

	%	Amount
Fee and Other General Income	22.1	1,158.2
State - Appropriated Funds	77.9	4,095.9

TOTAL INCOME = 5,254.1

JUNEAU CAMPUS

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS INSTRUCTION MODEL

General assumptions and variations for this entity are as follows:

Lower division student semester credit hours represent work at the Community College only, and upper division and graduate student semester credit hours represent work only at the Senior College. Further, lower division FTE teaching positions are related to the Community College only and upper division and graduate FTE teaching positions are related only to the Senior College. The upper division and graduate FTE teaching positions are combined.

Fifty percent of the Community College Director's Office expenses are considered as academic departmental administration. The remaining fifty (50) percent of the Director's Office expenses are included as general administration along with eighty (80) percent of the Regional Provost' Office.

No student services are identified specifically in the Initial Working Budget, these services are considered as included in the Provost Office expense.

None of the Southeastern Regional Center Extension and Public Service expenses are included in this analysis.

RESOURCE REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL — FORM D

Instructional Entity: Juneau (Juneau-Douglas Community and Senior Colleges)

Entire Year: 1972-73

ENROLLMENT PROJECTION:

Level:	STUDENT (SEMESTER) CR. HOUR PRODUCTION					ANNUAL FTE ENROLLMENT	
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Total			
Lower Division		1,075	1,468	2,543	÷30=	84	
Upper Division	20	301	198	519	÷30=	17	(T)
Graduate	328	468	325	1,121	÷24=	46	
PROJECTED TOTALS	348	1,844	1,991	4,183	÷ =	148	
Non Cr.Equivalent							

TEACHING FACULTY NEEDS:

Level:	FTE Enrlmt	Stdt./Fac. Ratio & (Product.)	FTE Teach Positions	% Reg.Rate	% Cr.Hr.Rate
Lower Division	84	14.0(424)	6.0	66.3	33.7
Upper Division	17	~~18.0(489)~~	~~3.5~~	No.Reg. Salary	No.Cr. Hr.Sal
Graduate	46				
ALL LEVELS AVERAGE	148	15.6	9.5	6.3	3.2

FINANCIAL NEEDS:

	Reg.Rate	Cr.Hr.Rate	x	x	
Average Sal.	15,702	8,225	17,508	8,719	Tl.Teach. Salaries
Benefits	11.5%	6%			
Total Teaching Salaries			110.3	27.9	= 138.2 (S)

Other Department/Division:	Basis	Amount
Support Salaries	7.8	10.8
Expendables	2.7	3.7
Travel	3.1	4.4
Equipment	0.1	.2
Organized Activities (Rel. Instr.)		
Departmental Research		
Departmental Administration	22.3	30.8
Other		

TL.OTHER REQURMT.(36.1 % of Salaries or Amt.$_____p.full-t.Fac.) = Other Dept./Div 49.9 (O)

TOTAL DIRECT INSTRUCTION BASE (Salaries and Other) = 188.1

GENERAL SUPPORT NEEDS:

	Basis	Amount	Direct	80% Provost O
General Administration		82.5	= 30.8 +	51.7
Student Services				
Extension & Public Services				
Organized Research & Development				
Library		32.9		
Operation & Maintenance of Physical Plant		31.7		
Other				

TL.GEN. REQURMT. (78.2 % of Direct or $_____per full-t.Fac.) = 147.1 (R)

TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL REQUIREMENT = 335.2

ESTIMATED INCOME:

	%	Amount
Fee and Other General Income	15.0	50.3
State - Appropriated Funds	85.0	284.9

TOTAL INCOME = 335.2

New Program Development Funding

It is proposed that provision be made in the Resource Requirements Instruction Model for new program development funding. The attached form suggests a generic format for funding of such development.

The start-up program development suggestion would have particular application to the Anchorage (S/C) and Juneau (S/E) Senior Colleges where added program breadth is likely to be needed in the years ahead.

When a campus reaches a minimum size, it is suggested that funding for Program Development for that campus be added separately and not be placed within the Resource Requirements Instruction Model until the class size of these developmental programs reaches a level whereby the credit hours and the faculty funding can be integrated into the regular Resource Requirements Instruction Model process without substantially affecting the trend in student-faculty ratios.

PROGRAM/FACULTY STAFFING ANALYSIS
Entity New Program Development
Entire Year Appropriate Years

START-UP PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAM	COURSES BY LEVEL BY SEMESTER	AVRG. CLASS SIZE	STDT. CR.HRS. 2 SMSTRS	POINTS. FULL-T. FACULTY 2 SMSTRS	SALARY BASIS REG.	SALARY BASIS CR.HR.
Possible Programs:	Upper Division					
Art) Journalism) Languages) Music) Chemistry) Physics) Biology) Nursing) Pre-Med) Engineering) Political Science)	10 Courses (2 courses per Full-Time Faculty)	6 (3hr)	360	5.0	80,000	
	Graduate					
Business) Education) Eng. Management) Public Administration)	4 Courses (2 courses per full-time Faculty)	5 (3hr)	120	2.0	32,000	

TOTALS:

	STUDENT CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION Summer	Fall	Spring	Total		FTE ENRLMT.	STDT. FACULTY RATIO	TOTAL FULL-T. FACULTY	FACULTY SALARY BASIS REG.	CR.HR.
Lower Division					÷30=					
Upper Division		180	180	360	÷30=	12.0	2.4	5.0 @16000	80,000	
Graduate		60	60	120	÷24=	5.0	2.5	2.0 @16000	32,000	
PROJECTED TOTAL		240	240	480		17.0			112,000	

Benefits 1:66 | 29,920

Minimal Staffing for Core Program in Small Community Colleges

Since there is another issue paper being addressed to the matter of minimal staffing for small community colleges, reference will be made here to the means of including the need for full-time teaching into the direct instructional costs.

The attached form outlines the general areas in which full-time faculty may be needed to handle day or evening offerings for full-time students who wish to progress on a regular two-year basis in the Associate Degree. A total of four (4) Full-Time Faculty Equivalents is seen as the necessary teaching staff to provide the basic core offerings. Additional faculty needed for other than core offerings would be funded at a credit hour rate, generally. However, if the postioning of full-time salary rate and credit hour salary rate teaching faculty will permit, more than four (4) full-time salary rates may be allowed.

Care should be given to phasing-in Core Program Staff into future budget requests. Some of the small community colleges might justify adding all four (4) of the Core Program Staff in the next budget request while others might justify only three (3) or less. This should probably be examined on the basis of the effect such additions of Core Program Staff have on the overall student-faculty ratio trends for that community college.

Resource Requirements
PROGRAM/FACULTY STAFFING ANALYSIS
Entity Small Community College Core Program Staffing
Entire Year to be phased into future budget requests

Core (Minimum) Program Teaching Staff

PROGRAM	COURSES BY LEVEL BY SEMESTER	AVRG. CLASS SIZE	STDT. CR.HRS.	FORMS. FULL-T. FACULTY	SALARY BASIS REG.	SALARY BASIS CR.HR.
Core Programs:						
	Written Communications					
	Fall Semester					
	3 Courses			.375		
	Spring Semester					
	3 Courses			.375		
	Oral Communications					
	Fall Semester					
	1 Course			.125		
	Spring Semester					
	1 Course			.125.		
	Humanitie , Social Sci., Natural Sci., Math.					
	Fall Semester					
	8 Courses			1.00		
	Spring Semester					
	8 Courses			1.00		
	Career Education (Credit Courses Applicable to Associate Degree)					
	8 Courses			1.00		

TOTALS:

	STUDENT CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION					FTE ENRLMT.	STDT. FACULTY RATIO	TOTAL FULL-T. FACULTY	FACULTY SALA BASIS REG.	FACULTY SALA BASIS CR.H
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Total						
Lower Division					÷30=			4.0		
Up · Division					÷30=					
Graduate					÷24=					
PROJECTED TOTAL										

Parameter Analysis, Trends and Results

The input parameters for Resource Requirements Instruction Model for each request year can be assembled on forms such as the ones attached. The estimates that were developed from the Initial Working Budget (7/27/72) for each campus have been included on these forms. It is again emphasized that these data are estimates.

The consolidation of these estimates allow inspection and study of the critical factors that comprise the funding variables for the instructional programs offered by each campus.

After comparison and back-up studies have been made, "trends" and "targets" can be formulated.

Proposed target parameters then can be run through the model on the computer and totals generated for aggregation into total instructional costs for campuses, regions, and the state-wide system. The results of a variety of variables can be examined through this process.

6-14-1973

FORM G

RESOURCE REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL
Parameters

ENTITY	YEAR	DIRECT INSTRUCTION: Cr.Hrs. (Entire Year)	FTE (Year)	Fac/St. Ratio	9 months Prod. Cr.Hrs./ FFTE	Teaching Faculty (9 months): % Reg.	% Cr. Hr.	Av. Salary Reg.	Av. Salary Cr.Hr.	Benefits Reg.	Benefits Cr.Hr.	(S) Total Teaching Salaries	(O) Other Dept. % (S)	(O) Other Dept. Tl.	(D) Total Direct (All Dept.)	INDIRECT: (N) General Support % (S)	(N) General Support Tl.	TOTAL: (T) Total Educ. & General	% Fee & Other Income	$ Per Stdt. FTE	Prgm Dvlp ment $
Fairbanks	1972-73	80,840	2,735	29.4	288	95.4	4.6	16,270	7,000	11.5	6	3,605.9	34.0	1,227.8	4,833.8	89.8	5,343.6	9,177.3	8.5	3,352	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Anchorage	1972-73	108,915	3 722	18.7	547	93.3	16.7	13,770	8,000	11.5	6	2,554.1	15.0	383.2	2,937.3	78.8	2,316.8	5,254.1	22.1	1,493	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Juneau-Douglas	1972-73	4,183	148	15.6	660	86.3	13.7	15,703	8,225	11.5	6	138.2	36.1	49.9	188.1	78.2	147.1	335.2	15.0	2,265	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
	1972-73																				
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				

6-14-1973

FORM II

RESOURCE REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL
Parameters

ENTITY	YEAR	DIRECT INSTRUCTION: Cr.Hrs. (Entire Year)	FTE (Year)	Fac/St. Ratio	9 months Prod. Cr.Hrs./ FFTE	Teaching Faculty (9 months): % Reg.	% Cr. Hr.	Av. Salary Reg.	Av. Salary Cr.Hr.	Benefits Reg.	Benefits Cr.Hr.	(S) Total Teaching Salaries	(O) Other Dept. % (S)	(O) Other Dept. Tl.	(O) Total Direct (All Dept.)	INDIRECT: (I) General Support % (O)	(I) General Support Tl.	TOTAL: (I) Total Educ. & General	% Fee & Other Income	$ Per Stdt. FTE	Prg Dvlmen $
Kenai Community College	1972-73	1,429	47	5.2	156	0	100		8,000		6	77.2	44.8	34.6	111.8	115.7	129.3	241.1	26	5,130	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Kodiak Community College	1972-73	1,264	42	5.7	173	34.2	65.8	14,910	8,000	11.5	6	82.4	94.6	78.0	160.4	69.9	112.2	272.6	10	6,430	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Ketchikan Community College	1972-73	1,426	47	10.0	303	85.8	14.9	13,050	8,000	11.5	6	64.1	48.8	31.3	95.4	93.6	89.3	184.7	9.9	3,930	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Kuskokwim Community College	1972-73	1,077	35	10.0	308	0	100		8,000	11.5	6	29.7	128.6	38.2	67.9	139.3	94.5	162.4	5.2	4,630	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Mat-Su Community College	1972-73	1,509	50	13.5	408	0	100		8,000	11.5	6	31.2	23.6	23.0	54.2	38.7	99.2	153.4	14.1	3,060	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				
Sitka Community College	1972-73	640	21	9	278	21.7	78.3	14,850	8,000	11.5	6	26.1	185.7	48.3	74.4	91.9	68.4	142.8	7.3	5,800	
	1973-74																				
	1974-75																				
	1975-76																				
	1976-77																				

Proposal and Next Steps

The Resource Requirement Instruction Model proposed in this issue paper is presented as a basis for discussion. It should be understood that this proposed model is an "umbrella" resource requirement system under which much individual program study and cost investigations are to be made for establishing individual program parameters which would be used to test the aggregated parameters for overall campus programs. This procedure would also include further study of general instructional support (indirect instruction resource requirements) programs and their allocations.

It is proposed that representatives from the State Management and Budget Office and Legislative Council meet with appropriate University persons to a) discuss the feasibility of Resource Requirement Instruction Model for Budget request purposes, b) consider alterations to its proposed design and c) decide what steps should be taken for its further development, if it seems to have viability.

ATTACHMENT I

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

June 21, 1973

TO:
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Director, Office of University Planning

Gentlemen:

One can define a university in any of many ways, however, I feel that any definition of the University of Alaska must include the ideas expressed by the Assembly Committee on Univeristy Policy and Programs in the attached papers, for these ideas are central to questions of educational priorities and the possiblities for measuring them.

The difficultics the definitions here attached present are various: (1) How, or can one, measure perspectives, talents, philosophies? (2) How does one determine "quality" in these areas? (3) How does one set priorities when comparing the mastery of technical skills with the mastery of theoretical and abstract foundations and assumptions in a discipline? (4) How does one determine which or what should be emphasized in terms of funding for the "good" of the University or the State when comparing technical training with the ability to analyze and criticize abstract ideas.

One can make none of these decisions wisely unless he begins with a definition of what "higher education" or "vocational education" or any other kind of education is---and what the University of Alaska should be in all of its aspects. One of the difficulties of relying totally upon citizen advisory groups is that the background these groups bring to their decisions are related closely to their own areas of interest---few citizens in the community are physicists, chemists, artists, anthropologists, philosophers, etc--- professions that are important in determining the quality of an institution of higher education.

I would ask that these two attached papers from the University Assembly Policy and Programs Committee be included in all discussions of planning and funding.

Sincerely yours,

Walter Benesch

Walter Benesch, Vice Chairman
University Assembly

PLEASE REPLY BY AIRMAIL

THE UNIVERSITY: A PHILOSOPHY AND A DEFINITION

The traditional definition of the university separates it in several ways from all other institutions in any given society:

1. No matter what form it has taken and regardless of size, the university has concerned itself primarily with learning, the "acquisition and dissemination of knowledge."

2. However, it is distinguished from other educational institutions by the level and breadth of its educational interests and by the philosophy of learning which unifies all of its aspects. The type of education which a university should provide, in contrast to other forms of training, is historically represented in the highest degree which it confers upon its scholars, i.e. the "doctor of philosophy," as opposed to the doctor of medicine, or the doctorate in some other specialized program offered by special training schools, e.g. "medical schools."

3. The university graduate is expected to possess not only a store of knowledge, data, facts, skills and techniques, but also a philosophical perspective within which such data and facts, skills, and techniques are defined. He has mastered the theories of knowledge as well as their contents. The professor professes both theory and fact.

4. The university is that educational institution which has always involved itself with the problems of knowledge, the epistemological questions implicit in the verification of facts, as much as with the facts themselves.

5. The "education" which the university has traditionally provided has been a humanistic one based on the understanding that all knowledge in whatever area is human knowledge, that facts are human interpretations of events placed into logical constructs, and on the clear awareness that the ultimate source and end to all values is man himself.

6 Finally, the university is a meeting place of men with the concerns. It can be no better than its faculty. A university has n philosophy beyond the philosophies which unite all its members who "profess." If there is no unity here, no common perspective, then there is no university. Neither a comprehensive administrative structure nor a student body alone can create a university. A university is above all an atmosphere in which an approach t learning is available to those who seek to know.

UNIVERSITY

Walter Benesch

1. First, perhaps, it would be worthwhile establishing what a university is not, so that later when one tries to define a university education he will have already excluded certain possibilities:

   a. A university is not a "vocational training center." A vocational training center certifies, i.e. grants certificates of competence in skills areas like building trades, typing, shorthand, electronics, etc. A university may include these areas, but "skills training" is not the reason for the existence of the University.

   b. A university is not a "research institute," or even a collection of research institutes. Research institutes are precisely that, institutes for research. Even where an institute may undertake to offer courses and degree programs, its primary objective is research. A university may contain such research institutes and it may use their facilities in its instructional programs. Institute staff may teach in the university, but the institutes do not define the university. The institutes are a subset of the university; the university is not a subset of the research institutes.

   c. A university is not a "public utility." It serves a public function but is not a "service agency" in the sense that federal service agencies distribute information, conduct special public seminars, support legislative bodies in their decision making processes, etc. Nor is it a service agency in the sense of a power and light company. A university may provide various services. The University of Alaska does so as the only statewide unit in Alaska at this time capable of doing so, but these services are not the reason for its existence and might someday better be performed by other agencies of state or federal government.

2. Now, perhaps, one is in a better position to start the definition of the university, recognizing it may undertake the three preceeding activities, but no one of them, nor all of them combined would give us a definition of the university.

3. What, then, can be affirmed of a university? As the word implies there is a unity or oneness in any institution we are going to call a university. And it is reasonable to suppose that this "oneness" would extend through all of the above mentioned possible adjuncts to a university. If there is not some sort of unity, then it would also be reasonable to assume that the university should carefully re-examine itself to see if it is perhaps taking on functions that are not its business. This is particularly important in cases where there is not unlimited funding. If there is a unity then a university should discover this unity and keep it clearly in mind when it determines its future courses of action. If there is no unity, then the term "university" is misapplied and can only serve to confuse the public, the funding source, the institutional staff, and the students in trying to establish goals.

4. It is obvious that the next step in our pr cess of definition is to discover, if possible, that aspect, activity, or philosophy which does provide the unity in the multiplicity we call a "university." It would seem to me that that which distinguishes the university from all other institutions and must unite its internal diversities is "education." This is as far as most overly simplistic definitions of the university go, e.g. "A university is a center of learning," or "The primary function of the university is to educate in all of its activities," etc... One does not have to reflect a great deal at the University of Alaska, or any university, to realize that the idea of a "university education" means one thing to the faculty teaching in a university, another thing to the carpenter who is sending his son there, and yet something else to his son.

5. One must now consider the term "university education" to see if it can be defined in a way that might be acceptable to all those connected with the university and at the same time give us a clear idea of what it unifies and how it unifies the organism we call the university. Again, it would probably be easiest to determine what a "university education" is not:

   a. A university education is not a "high school education," or a "junior college education." These kinds of education may well be a prerequisite for a university education, but a university education is more than or other than these.

   b. If the university is not , is other than, or more than the three aspects discussed in paragraph 1; then a "university education" will be other than, more than simply the education that may take place in a "vocational institute," a "research institute," a "public utility-service," though a university education may include all or some of these.

   c. A university education is not a method or a technique of educating. This is an oft confused distinction. Neither the lecture nor the lab define a university education. They are tools, but a tool is not the thing upon which it is employed, nor the thing we seek to attain with it. I believe a university education might take place even with inadequate labs, and might not take place with superior ones.

   d. A university education is not a body of men and women. It is not a faculty body, a student body, a janitorial body, a research staff, nor even an administration. All of these, like lectures and labs, are involved in a university education, but they are not its definition. A university education could not exist without them, but their presence does not necessarily assure a university education.

   e. A university education is not a certain specified number of credits, nor a specific minimum grade point average. These may be indications that a university education is taking place, but they can be present when there is no university education, e.g. a student with 130 credits and a "2." may well leave an institution without a university education, even perhaps uneducated.

f. A university education is not a major nor a minor, nor an infinite combination of same. It may be related to course content, but it is not the course content. This is a common mistake made by departments and divisions in naming courses, and students in taking courses. For example, a "humanities requirement" won't give one a university education any more than a "physics requirement" will.

g. A university education is not the professor's salary, the student's tuition, the administrator's travel budget. It is not the university budget in whole or in part.

h. A university education is not the parking lots, paved or unpaved; it is not the library building, the books, the dorms, the student center, the quality of the meals in the food centers. It is not a bookstore, an audio-visual service, a museum, nor the cleanliness of each and all of these.

i. A university education is not the name of the institution, the prestige of its leading academicians, nor the quantity of publications they may produce.

Then what is it? All of the preceeding are relevant to a university education and their deficiencies can make it impossible for a university education to take place. But, the presence of all of these does not equal a university education. Nor do they even guarantee that one can "take place." It is important to again emphasize what I originally suggested, that it is a "university education" which unites all the activities of that institution we call the university. It is the "university education" which unites all these other aspects which make up a university, but which are not a university education.

Perhaps one way to now positively define a university education might be to try and decide what an individual possesses who has one. I have already listed many of the things one may acquire after a time spent at a university, e.g. grades, credits, diplomas, friends, sexual maturity, debts, a wife, the animosity or respect of the administration and faculty. These are not a university education.

An individual who possesses a "university education," as distinct from one who has graduated from a university, possesses two things (1) an attitude or perspective and (2) a store of knowledge, data, facts, etc. We tend to emphasize the latter and ignore the former. This is why so many universities, and the University of Alaska is no exception, may be "knowledge factories" but are woefully deficient in any broader framework of understanding for said "knowledge." Courses, tests, diplomas are geared to "fact acquisition" and not to that kind of introspection which provides a context for "thinking about" the skills one has acquired.

THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED AS
A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL FILE.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

ATTACHMENT C

OPERATING RESOURCES REQUIREMENT INSTRUCTION MODEL FOR ALL CAMPUSES (RRIM II)

Description & Procedural Guide

GENERAL METHOD:

Resource Requirements for operations are computed in terms of faculty positions by instructional program groups plus add-ons for departmental support services for each program group, with further add-ons for institutional support services.

The model is a procedural guide for generating and summarizing the funding needs in broad instructional program areas plus Library and Audio-Visual, Plant Maintenance and Operations, Student Services, Computer Services, and Administration and General Expense. A schematic presentation of the format of the components and their interrelations is attached, Attachment C1.

The process for calculating the funding for the program areas is as follows:

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS:

Direct Instructional Resource Requirements

a) STUDENT UNITS (FTE) BY PROGRAMS:

The full-time-equivalent (FTE) student enrollment for each Instructional Program Grouping is estimated for the budget year. This is accomplished by listing the courses in each program grouping by level with the estimated total student contact hours involved (See Schedule S1). A full-time-equivalent (FTE) student for the Academic Course Group is defined as 400 contact hours or 30 credit hours. A full-time-equivalent (FTE) student for the Vocational Course Group is defined as 800 contact hours or 30 equivalent credit hours. These defined numbers of contact hours per FTE student are then used as divisors for arriving at the estimated number of FTE students by program grouping.

b) PROGRAM GROUPINGS:

The program groupings are a result of a combination of considerations; namely the learning delivery mode, costs and discipline relationships, with the most weighting given to learning delivery mode. These groupings have no relationship to present organization on any campus and are in no way intended to suggest organizational structure. Separate program groupings have been established for academic and vocational occupations categories. The program and course groupings for each of these categories are as follows:

Arts and Communications	Business & Commerce
Business, Computer Sc. & Math.	Data Processing
Engineering Sciences	Health Related
Health & Physical Education	Mechanical & Engineering
Humanities, Social Sc. & Education	Natural Science Technology
Physical & Life Sciences	Public and Community Service Related

Further detail of the above program groupings is outlined in Attachment C2.

c) DETERMINATION OF FACULTY NEEDED BY PROGRAM AREA:

The relationship of Students to Faculty is seen as a basic consideration to the learning situation in a resource requirement and allocation system. The relationship for this purpose is expressed in Program Student/Faculty Ratios.

1) Student/Faculty ratios are to be established for each of the instructional program groupings on Schedule S3. The planning of courses to be offered in the program groupings with the teaching faculty need is set forth in Schedule S1. The course planning for each program on Schedule S1, and the student/faculty ratio that results, is compared to the basic Student/Faculty Ratio standard established for that particular program grouping in Schedule S3. Weightings in Student/Faculty Ratios by program groupings are established or adjusted in the setting of an Effective Student/Faculty Ratio for each program for a given Resource Requirement Request. Target ratios will be established for future years. See forms S3t and S3at.

2) The Effective Student/Faculty Ratio for each program becomes the divisor used with the number of student FTE for the program (this is accomplished on Summary Form S for a campus) to give the number of FTE faculty needed to teach the learning units projected for the program. Academic and Vocational Occupations programs are dealt with on this basis, separately.

d) DETERMINATION OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY:

The portion of full-time and part-time faculty for Academic and Vocational Occupational program faculty positions is established in the teaching faculty position planning on Schedule S2. This is reviewed and the number of full- and part-time faculty is determined by a review committee.

e) DETERMINATION OF TEACHING FACULTY SALARY AMOUNTS:

1) The number of full-time faculty multiplied by the average faculty salary for the program grouping (established by listing out current faculty salaries for the program in Schedule S2, plus new faculty proposed for the request year at current year rates); these salaries projected forward to year of the request with prescribed adjustments, are totaled and averaged. Faculty benefits are also computed at appropriate rates.

2) Same procedure followed f calculating part-time faculty salaries and benefits as full-time above on Schedule S2. Note: The established cr . hour rate for part-time faculty is multiplied by 24 credit hours for lower division level teaching, and by 18 credit hours for upper division and graduate level to establish the average part-time salary per FTE teaching faculty.

f) DETERMINATION OF PROGRAM SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS:

Each category of program support - (See Schedule S4)
Salaries: Secretarial and other
Expendables: travel and other
Equipment
Program Administration
will be established on any one or a combination of factors; namely, amount per student, amount pe faculty or percent of total teaching salaries for the program.

The Program (Direct) Support Requirements by program are totaled and a per FTE student and per FTE faculty unit cost and percentage of total teaching salaries comparison made. (Schedule S)

Indirect Institutional Support Resources

a) DETERMINATION OF LIBRARY AND MEDIA RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

Schedules A and A1 are used to establish the number of library units needed based on appropriate library standards. Schedule A1 follows the HEGIS (Federal) format for arriving at the present count of library units for each library in the University of Alaska System. Schedule A then shows the targets set for each library collection based on an appropriate standard.

Schedule A2 is used to compute the other library costs, including staff salary costs plus other operational costs. These requirements are incorporated on Schedule A and a total library requirement is summed.

b) DETERMINATION OF PHYSICAL PLANT REQUIREMENTS:

Schedule B establishes the unit costs for utilities, custodial, maintenance & operations, plant administration and other, per gross square feet of building on each campus. These unit costs are multiplied by the gross building square footage to arrive at total requirement for Plant Operations.

c) DETERMINATION OF STUDENT SERVICES REQUIREMENTS:

Schedule C is the basis for determining these requirements. The number of Personnel Services positions times an average salary plus an operational support factor establishes this requirement.

d) ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

Schedule D is the basis for determining these requirements. The number of administrative and business staff personnel is determined. This is multiplied by an average salary plus benefits. Salaries plus operational support and other expense factors result in a total resource requirement for this activity.

e) COMPUTER SERVICES REQUIREMENTS:

Schedule E is the basis for determining these requirements.

All Institutional Support Requirements are entered into Schedule S and totaled. The percent that the Indirect Requirements are of the Direct Requirements is calculated, as is the amount per Student FTE and per Faculty FTE.

OTHER SPECIAL SUPPORT:

Amounts for Departmental Research, activities relating to Instruction and Curriculum Development, are developed on a separate basis and added into the Institutional Support Requirements, on Schedule S. Justifications for these amounts are developed on separate supporting schedules.

The total Direct and the total Indirect requirements are combined to give a total of Resources Required for the functioning of all instructional programs within the campus unit.

An estimate of the income from fees is made on a supporting schedule and entered in the frame below the Total Resources Required on Form S, in order that an Appropriation Request Amount might be developed in the bottom frame on that form.

7.42

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

ISSUE PAPER ON OPERATING RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS
FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

RRIM II

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS:

There is a need for a systematic approach in determining Instructional Resource Requirements and Resource Allocations by campus and by program grouping among the instruction units of the University of Alaska Statewide System. The beginning of the systematic approach was started with Resource Requirement Instruction Model (RRIM I). This was submitted in an Issue Paper to Alaska's Office of Budget & Management, June 1973, and was used by the University of Alaska for direct cost only, in the 1975 Operating Budget Request.

This Issue Paper now presents the next step and further development in a systematic method of determining and allocating instructional operating resources in a RRIM II (A full description of RRIM II is in Attachment C). RRIM is the product of much review of the practices of the other states in the use of Resource Requirement Formulas. RRIM II uses the same operational concepts and definitions as RRIM I in order that continuity in concepts and parameters might be maintained. RRIM II is a further refinement of RRIM I in that it develops resource requirements by instructional program groupings, and provides for an adjustable formula approach by program grouping by campus, with capability for adjustments due to "economies of scales" and other variables. Further, RRIM II envisions a multiple factor formula approach in determing and allocating resources for Indirect Instructional Resources - Library and Audio-Visual, Student Services, Physical Plant, Administration and General, and Computer Services. Also, RRIM II has been designed to be compatible with

NCHEMS Information Exchange and Reporting Procedures to permit comparisons with the cost data that is being generated by that program.

The RRIM II presentation in this paper deals with concepts and procedures in a "model" format. Actual formula "factors" for FY 76 and subsequent years are under development at present with the use of "simulation techniques" to determine validity of factors.

The components of the formula process which will be used with the "simulation" are:

1. Estimation of full-time equivalent students by program area
2. Use of student/faculty ratios
3. Use of average faculty salaries
4. calculation of percentage or unit factor for
    a) other personnel salary costs
    b) travel
    c) other supplies and expense
    d) equipment
    e) program administration
5. Development of separate formulas for
    a) Library and Media
    b) Plant Maintenance and Operations
    c) Student Services
    d) General Administration and Services
    e) Computer Services

These components will aggregate to the total budgetary needs of a campus entity.

The University plans to continue "follow-up" studies on RRIM II and the development of subsequent generations of this model. There seems to be no alternative to this plan since an intricate and ultimate system capable of reflecting the many complexities of a University operation is hardly attainable.

BACKGROUND:

This paper is presented as part of the ongoing effort to establish a systematic approach to the development and presentation of the University of Alaska budget request. The paper submitted in June 1973 outlined a systematic resource requirements process, which was called RRIM I. This paper continues the development of this model, building upon the experience gained, further developing cost funding procedures in program groupings and support activities. This expanded model has been "dubbed" RRIM II.

The prospect of increase in higher education enrollments and expansion in programs to serve a growing population in Alaska, will necessitate corresponding increase in State appropriation for programs in its University System. The many needs for funds and the increased need for accountability to the taxpayer in the years ahead, establish a need for a systematic and objective approach in determining and justifying operational resource requirements.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The problem to be dealt with in this paper is to survey the existing budget formula approaches used by the other states for justifying budget requests and for allocating funds for the operating expenses of State supported institutions, and from these systems to extract and develop an operating budget process (formula system) most suited to the University of Alaska. This implies a continuing search for and development of further adjustments and modifications in a formula system which would bring about an equitable and objective process for the request and allocation of resources among the programs and entities of the University of Alaska.

This paper will propose the procedures and methodology for an expanded formula system. It will not address itself to the formula factors at this time, these to be developed in the FY 76 budget request submittal.

OBJECTIVES TO BE OBTAINED:

The objectives of the study are these:

1. To develop a systematic basis - in essence a formula - for accurately determining operational resource needs for the programs on the various campuses of the University of Alaska system.
2. To develop a system of comparative analysis for instructional programs and organizational units, with consistent definitions, data and policies across instructional units within the University of Alaska System.
3. To determine at the earliest date the optimum procedures, parameters and formula factors, which best support the operating needs and funding guidelines for the planning and management of instructional programs.

ALTERNATIVES IN THE PROBLEM SOLUTION:

In developing an operational resource requirement system appropriate for all the instructional units of the University of Alaska System, the following alternatives present themselves:

1. Disregard any use of formulas and use add-on increments on an existing budget base, thus develop resource requirements on a non-systematic request basis; or,
2. Use a simplistic unit cost formula which allows a flat rate per unit for the combination of all programs; or,
3. Attempt a resource requirement procedure which involves a recognition of the basic structure of the learning process and develop a funding system that supports "learning".

In reviewing these alternatives, several documents were used, among which are:

"A Comparative Analysis of the Existing Budget Formulas Used for Justifying Budget Requests or Allocated Funds for Operating Expenses of State Supported Colleges and Universities", by Francis M. Gross; Dissertation Summary, Knoxville, Tennessee;*

"State Funding Formulae for Public 2-Year Colleges", by James L. Wattenbarger, Paul M. Starnes; Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville. October 1973

In addition to the above, numerous reports of the formula procedures used by other states; namely Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado and Florida. The publications of NCHEMS and the Systems Development Laboratory of Toronto also served as basic documents to this investigation.

CONSTRAINTS OR LIMITATIONS TO PROBLEM SOLUTION:

The limitations to the study of the problem are those of time (limited staff with many other tasks), limited firsthand discussion and experience with the formula procedures used in the other states (literature is limited in this area). Also, a severe limitation and restriction to this analysis is the complexity of the undertaking, coupled with the lack of accurate available data.

DATA SOURCES:

The processes relating to a budget formula system have been investigated in the above mentioned references. The development of factors to be used in the formula for the FY 76 Budget Request will come from:

1. University of Alaska budget documents and financial statements;

*A synopsis of this study is included as Attachment A.

2. NCHEMS studies dealing with cost data and descriptive information gathered under its RRPM Model, as follows:

Pomona College	(October 1973)
University of North Colorado	(July 1973)
Central Washington State College	(Novembe 973)
Fullerton State University	(October 1972)
Triton College	(May 1973)

3. University of Alaska's developing Management Planning Information System.

We will continue to investigate parameter and budget factors developed in other states. To date, however, the most promising data for comparative purposes is that of the NCHEMS studies, as these data will be generally comparable with data generated by RRIM II.

ANALYSIS & EVALUATION OF DATA:

There are a variety of Resource Requirement formats used in other states. In the development of RRIM I and II, we have tried to follow funding classifications and terms that will allow comparison with NCHEMS cost studies, the State of Washington and other states, with which we might wish to make data comparisons.

The following budget areas have been recognized by many states and will be assumed as viable accounting groups for this study. These are:

1. Instructional Programs

   The costs here include teaching salaries directly related to the different instructional programs, the non-teaching salaries which include academic administration, secretarial, laboratory assistants; and non-salary instructional program expense,

including expendables (travel, supplies and other) and program equipment.

2. Departmental Research

This includes unsponsored research conducted by faculty members involved in the instructional program and/or the departmental level.

3. Organized Activities Related to Instruction

Includes expenditures for activities conducted in connection with instructional programs and/or departments for the primary purpose of providing experience or field training to students.

4. Instructional Support Services

a) General Administration and General Expenses.

Includes all expenditures for administrative offices and officers which serve the total institution, and other expenditures of general nature which are only indirectly related to instruction at the program or departmental level.

b) Student Services.

Includes expenditures for student counseling, orientation programs, placement and other student services.

c) Library and Audio-Visual Expenses.

Includes expenditures for central campus library and satellite libraries and consists of expenditures for books, periodicals, government documents, library media and audio-visual instructional materials, expenditures for salaries, and other operational expenses.

d) Computer Services.

Includes all expenditures for computer services for instructional, administrative support and research programs. This would include costs for computer hardware purchases and rentals, as well as staffing and other operating expenses.

e) Physical Plant Operations and Maintenance.

Includes all expenditures for building and grounds, including utilities, custodial, maintenance and repair, salaries, wages, supplies, materials and other expenses.

5. Organized Research

Includes expenditures for research projects which are organized, budgeted and financed separate from instructional departments. Resources required for these programs are not covered in this issue paper and are to be dealt with under a separate study.

6. Extension and Public Services

Includes expenditures for programs designed to serve special continuing program interests and the general public. These include correspondence, programs, adult education programs, public lectures, institutes, workshops, demonstration centers, special library and museum projects. Wherein the instructional portion of these programs can be integrated within the instruction programs dealt with under regular instruction, they will be so included and so noted. Only those programs oriented toward public service and delivered outside a scheduled class format, will be included in this category.

A general definition of terms useful in analysis and evaluation of Resource Requirement data can be found on pages 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the RRIM I Issue Paper, June 1973. (See Attachment B)

INTANGIBLE & TANGIBLE FACTORS

Education by its nature, primarily involves intangible factors. The output from instructional activities for the student relates to individual learning, involving career/professional preparation, personal development and social benefits as final products, all of which are intangible in nature. These are in need of resolution and agreed-upon measures which NCHEMS and other study groups are attempting to undertake. There are, of course, some tangible factors, such as certificates, degrees, job placement, job remuneration, etc., which accrues to the student through education.

There are other factors which relate to the institution. These are also of intangible and tangible nature. On the intangible side, and perhaps most significant is the quality of the learning environment, created in the institutional setting for the nourishment of the institution's primary goals. The enrichment of the learning situation, created in the institutional setting, is of great significance to the total learning process for the student, as well as for the faculty. Tangible factors involved in the institution's development include, for example, its facilities, the number and credentials of its faculty, and the size of its operating resources.

There are also factors relating to the faculty, both intangible and tangible, which relate to the attitudes, intellectual achievement and emotional maturity and enthusiasm of the faculty and staff in developing the Institutional learning climate and in advancing the goals of the institution.

Any resource requirement and allocation system must be directed by the prospect of development in these tangible and intangible factors which advance the goals and objectives of the entire enterprise.

ASSUMPTIONS:

The underlying assumption relating to a resource requirement system is that an adequate level of funding, if properly administered, will develop an acceptable level of quality of instruction that exceeds in benefit the value of the dollar input and that, when the funding adequacy level is adjusted for different program and volume considerations, these adjustments can and will meet these standards of quality.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The description and instructions for use of Resource Requirement Instruction Model (RRIM II) are attached and constitute the basic process which the University of Alaska proposes to use in developing its FY 76 budget submittal. RRIM II represents a second generation development of RRIM I, which was used in the FY 75 budget request. The basic format and process between the two generations of RRIM are similar. RRIM II initiates resource requirements by six academic program areas and six vocational occupations areas, in contrast to RRIM I, which dealt with the aggregate instructional program costing by total campus. RRIM II also deals with the process for resource requirements for the institutional support programs, which was not implemented in RRIM I. RRIM II provides, as did RRIM I, for program development, resource requirements and core staffing considerations for small community colleges. RRIM II provides for departmental research and activities related to instruction. Neither model deals with organized research. Description & Procedural Guide for RRIM II is Attachment C.

This Issue paper deals with the structure and process for using formula factors, but does not deal with formula factors per se. These will be developed in connection with the FY 76 budget request and will undergo continuous study and revision as subsequent budget requests are developed.

Attachment A

SYNOPSIS OF FRANCIS M. GROSS STUDY OF USE OF FORMULAS

An overview of the "state of the art" of budget formulas can be presented by a synopsis of Section III, Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations of Francis M. Gross' Dissertation summary.

1. Budget formulas are used in 25 states.
2. Formulas are used for developing or justifying operating budget requests.
3. Zero-based budgeting (the operating budget is developed anew each year) works the best with a formula approach.
4. A budget formula consists of several components or separate formulas.
5. The formula components used two approaches in the calculations. An all-inclusive approach where the total amount for a functional area was determined through one calculation or an itemized approach where the results were the sum of several calculations.
6. Many budget formulas differentiate among academic areas and instructional levels.
7. A majority of formula-states use budget formulas that differentiate among types of institutions.
8. There are three basic computational methods used in the formula calculations. They are a) a rate per base factor unit; b) a percentage of base factor; and c) a base factor-position ratio with salary rates. Base factors are items such as: FTE enrollment, total Instructional budget, student credit hours, FTE faculty, Academic salaries, etc.

The use of formula funding is viewed to have both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages appear to be:

1. A formula process can provide guidelines and measures for budget preparation.
2. Most functional areas of operations can be included in the calculations.
3. An objective means for allocating funds may reduce open competition for funds among institutions.
4. There is the potential of assuring a base appropriation assuming the legislature accepts the formula and base factors.
5. A formula provides a reasonably simple and understandable basis for deciding upon and presenting the financial requirements of the state institutions.
6. A budget formula represents a compromise between state control over line-item budgeting and institutional fiscal autonomy.

The disadvantages can be listed as:

1. A formula can not predict or judge community needs.
2. The process can not define policy though it may help identify areas in need of policy statements.
3. Formulas do not recognize or evaluate quality education.
4. The formula may have a great leveling effect upon quality. While it may raise low-quality programs, it may do so at the expense of the higher-quality programs.
5. The budget formula may perpetuate all ready inadequate appropriation levels.
6. The formula process may entice the institutions to attempt to increase enrollments in specific categories or otherwise manipulate data to maximize income.

Dr. Gross developed performance criteria to apply to the evaluation of a budget formula. His criteria are:

1. Clear and comprehensible by straightforward and simple application of base and formula factors.
2. Flexible by provisions for modified treatment or supplemented by special requests and that the formulas be reviewed and/or modified annually.
3. The formulas are not to be used for detailed budgetary control.
4. There is recognition of diverse financial needs.
5. Similar programs and similar institutions are treated equitably.
6. The process should be broad based and addressed to total operating needs of the institutions.
7. There should be provisions for recognizing varying instructional costs.
8. A budget formula be considered objective since it is based upon quantitive data.

We believe that the resource requirement model that is being developed can meet these criteria.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS ALASKA 99701

BOX 95151

May 7, 1975

The Honorable George H. Hohman
Alaska State Senate
Pouch V, State Capitol Bldg.
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Senator Hohman:

Attached is a report recently done by David Hendrickson, local government coordinator for Cooperative Extension Service. I wrote to you in late March about this program and the services we provide to rural Alaskans establishing second class cities.

The report enclosed is a synopsis of the local government program from 1969 to 1975. I would like to bring your attention to the focus and results of this program.

Sincerely,

James W. Matthews

James W. Matthews
Director

JWM/ba

Enclosure

cc: David Hendrickson
Dr. Don M. Dafoe, Executive Vice President, U of A

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
University of Alaska
April 1975

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM
1969 - 1975

The Local Government Program was started in 1969 under Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska. The program has been primarily funded from Title I Federal funds of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The primary mission and thrust of the program has been an educational one, directed to elected and appointed officials of communities that have, or are in the process of incorporating as cities under State law. Under the repealed law, Title 29, Municipal Corporations, the programming was mainly directed to fourth class city officials. The seventh legislature repealed third and fourth class cities and came up with first and second class cities. All former fourth class cities became second class cities under the new law. The program now has been primarily directed to officials of second class cities. The contents of programming has been as follows:

(1) Transitions
(2) Incorporation
(3) Ordinances
(4) City Council
(5) Annual Reports
(6) Taxes
(7) Mayor and City Manager
(8) Elections
(9) Appointed City Officers
(10) Recall
(11) Powers
(12) Initiative and Referendum
(13) State Revenue Sharing

At the time the program started in 1969 we had about 50 fourth class cities. Since then forty-five new municipalities have incorporated as second class cities, bringing the total of such cities to 95 in five years. More communities are expected to incorporate as second class cities due to the requirement of the Land Claims Act. Secondly, the State law requires 400 permanent residents and educational responsibilities in first class cities. Most of our rural communities have a population of less than 400. Whether they incorporate to satisfy and meet the requirements of the Land Clains Act or to have more local control within the proposed municipality, they will have to incorporate as second class cities.

Thus, due to emerging new second class cities and the continual turnover in election years, educational efforts directed to local government officials will be needed, and are needed. Meeting the challenge and filling the need is going to require expanded efforts across the State.

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Dr. James W. Matthews, Director, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska.

In meeting part of the educational needs of local government officials, a publication, "What's a Second Class City" has been written, published and sent to all second class cities across the State. The contents of the publication were taken out of Alaska Statutes, Title 29, Municipal Government, and rewritten on the level of laymen's language, focused mainly to our rural elected officials.

In addition to the publication, a monthly newsletter - Local Government Hi-lites - is published and seven copies are sent to all second class cities across the State. The contents of the newsletter center on subjects relative to second class city municipal government and related matters. In addition to the two publications, a film was made entitled "It's Your Council". This was filmed at Bethel, and focuses on adopting ordinances under State law, using established procedures in any meeting, regardless of location.

Since the program started in 1969 the following villages and incorporated communities have participated in local government training workshops, usually with two representatives from each community.

Because of limited financial resources we were not able to include Bristol Bay and Southeastern regions.

1969

*Site of Workshop

Grayling *	Emmonak *	Nunapitchuk *	Kipnuk *
Anvik	Sheldon Point	Atmautluak	Kongiganak
Shageluk	Kotlik	Kasigluk	Kwigillingok
Holy Cross	Fortuna Ledge		Chefornak
Aniak	Alakanuk		
Russian Mission			
Napakiak *	Bethel *		
Oscarville	Kwethluk		
Napaskiak	Akiachak		
	Akiak		
	Eek		
	Tuntutuliak		
	Tuluksak		

1970

*Site of Workshop

Tuntutuliak	Holy Cross	Nunapitchuk	Galena *
Bethel *	Hooper Bay	Quinhagak	Koyukuk
Chefornak	Kwigillingok	Toksook Bay	Hughes
Eek	Kongiganak	Kalskag	Huslia
Emmonak	Kasigluk	Aniak	Nulato
Grayling	Mekoryuk		
Goodnews Bay	Newtok		

1970

*Site of area-wide Workshop

McGrath *	Unalakleet *	Golovin*	Kotzebue *	Kotzebue *
Nikolai	Shaktoolik	Elim	Deering	Kivalina
	Stebbins	Koyuk	Buckland	Shungnak
	St. Michael	White Mount'n	Selawik	Kiana
		Brevig Mission	Point Hope	Noatak
			Shishmaref	Kobuk
			Noatak	Ambler

1971

Individual Community Visits

Delta Junction	Mountain Village	Toksook Bay
Dot Lake	Emmonak	Mekoryuk
Tanacross	Tanacross	Toksook Bay
Tanana	Copper Center	Napakiak
Marshal	Napaskiak	Akolmiut
Anvik	Mentasta	Napaskiak
Holy Cross	Fortuna Ledge	Goodnews Bay
Russian Mission	Shageluk	Mt. Village (requected 2nd visit)
Aniak	Napakiak	Pilot Station
Kotlik	Anvik	

1972

Individual Community Visits

Nome	Kotlik	Pilot Station
Hooper Bay	Sheldon Point	Napakiak
Napakiak	Sheldon Point	Mekoryuk
Shageluk	Mtn. Village	Aniak
Port Heiden	Egegik	Dillingham
Aleknagik	New Stuyahok	Delta Junction
Kotzebue	Anderson	

1973

Individual Community Visits

Mekoryuk	Huslia	Aniak
Delta Junction	Delta Junction (Borough hearing)	

1974

*Site of area-wide workshop

**Individual Visits

Kodiak *	Port Lions	Akhiok	Bethel *	Newtok
Old Harbor	Egegik		Mekoryuk	Chevak
Larsen Bay	Akutan		Fortuna Ledge	Akolmiut
Chignik	Ouzinkie		Kwethluk	Kalskag
Minto **	Barrow **		Pilot Station	Kotlik
Delta Junction **	Nome **		Emmonak	Akiak
Mekoryuk **			Red Devil	Russian Mission
			Atmautluak	Akiachak
			Napakiak	Tuluksak
			Goodnews Bay	Platinum
			Hooper Bay	Scammon Bay
			Napaskiak	Kipnuk
			Quinhagak	Eek

1975

*Site of area-wide Workshop

Nome *	Koyuk	Noatak	Golovin	Kivalina
Unalakleet	White Mtn.	Kobuk	St. Michael	
Elim	Bethel	Shungnak	Deering	
Stebbins	Kotzebue	Kiana	Buckland	
Shaktoolik	Selawik	Noorvik	Shishmaref	

Report by David Hendrickson
Coordinator - Local Government Program

School Financing Study 1.02

(907) 479-7143

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

April 1, 1975

Senator George Hohman
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Hohman:

A proposed Operating Budget Request for the Alaska School Finance Study is attached for your information. The first six pages of the document are the same as those sent to you earlier by Dr. Darnell, except that reference has been added to explain the introduction of bills proposing a legislative appropriation in support of this study. The second portion of this document (pages 7 through 16) present the request for State appropriations on regular State Budget Request forms. This budget detail is presented for Fiscal Year '76 and for Fiscal Year '77.

Please let me know if additional information is needed. We would be happy to explain the study to members of your committee.

Thank you for your interest and support.

Sincerely,

E. Dean Coon

E. DEAN COON
Assistant Director
Center for Northern Educational Research

EDC/hg

Encl.

c.c.: Marshall Lind

MEMORANDUM State of Alaska

TO: Sue Green, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

DATE: April 3, 1975

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Judy Crondahl, Budget Analyst
Division of Budget and Management
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: FY 76 Governor's Budget
University of Alaska

In line with our March 27 meeting, let me clarify some points on the rationale and methodology of the formula basis for the University's FY 76 budget.

For several years we have been heading toward a formula approach with the University system. There have been two issue analyses plus the stated intent of the 1974 Legislature Free Conference Committee on the budget. Until the FY 76 budget, all efforts have been in the direction of using a model -- that is showing the relationships between funding and SCH (student credit hours) without any attempt to make funding fit any pre-determined level per SCH. RRIM (Resource Requirement Instructional Model) worksheets were not included with the University's FY 76 budget submission, although they had been in the FY 75 budget submission. For this reason, until rather late in the process, I did not have adequate information on numbers of FTE (full time equivalent) instructional positions, or University productivity projections. In fact, as I have only recently discovered, the University apparently has two different levels of productivity projections. The first is shown in column 3 below and was given to me on December 3 by Don Moyer, Director of Institutional Studies, in response to my request for the levels they had used in the RRIM. The second is shown in column 4 and the source for that is information compiled by Moyer on the Budget and Management formula worksheet. Column 5 shows the productivity levels used in the Governor's budget. With only two exceptions they are the same as the FY 75 Working Budget. The two exceptions are Fairbanks which expects a slight increase in enrollment with no increase in instructors and Ketchikan which is experiencing a decrease in student credit hours with a less-than-corresponding decrease in FTE instructors.

	FY 75			FY 76	
	UA Request	Working Budget	RRIM	UA Request B&M Worksheet	Governor's Budget
Fairbanks	424	338	424	340	341
Juneau Campus	356	333	322	322	333
Ketchikan	359	291	300	176	250*
Sitka	300	290	265	293	290
Anchorage	511	511	456	458	511
Kenai	360	222	300	252	222
Kodiak	360	286	300	275	286
Mat-Su	270	271	265	242	271
Kuskokwim	300	371	300	318	371

* Due to decrease in total Student Credit Hours

The basis for my recommendations on the University's budget was that because productivity levels in the University system are low when compared to almost any standard, and because costs per full-time equivalent student are the highest in the country; insofar as possible, productivity levels should not be reduced in the FY 76 budget. On the other hand, balancing out inequities (raising some, lowering others) could cause unforseen problems. For FY 76 I felt it would cause fewer problems and disruptions within the University system to simply establish a basis for increases from FY 75 based on increases in student credit hours, without making changes in current productivity levels. Since it is based on the FY 75 working budget it is based on the University's judgment of best allocation of resources for FY 75.

Clearly there exists the problem that current inequities are being continued. However, as a basis for arriving at a total figure for the University budget, I believe it has been a very useful method. It has been a big step forward in the process of tying the budget to some type of output. Additional progress can be made in FY 77 to arrive at standards which can be applied uniformly, taking into account conditions which may be unique to certain campuses. Unless the Legislature becomes impatient with the pace that formula budgeting is being applied, the University will have the opportunity to initiate change in the next year. If they fail to do so, the ball will again fall, by default, into the lap of the State Administration.

Some of the areas which must be considered, as we attempt to correct present inequities are as follows:

1. Level of Student Credit Hour productivity

2. Percentages of full time to credit hour instructors

3. Ratio of support costs (other instructional costs, administrative, libraries, physical plant, etc) to instructional salaries

4. Present levels of basic library resources

5. Fixed costs unrelated to student credit hour levels -- such as physical plant requirements.

All of the above are variables which, by themselves, can affect funding requirements. Additionally, some of them are inter-related so that changes in one will affect the others. As the system was used in the Governor's budget, student credit hour productivity is the single most influential determinant of funding level. It influences not only total number of instructors but also level of support costs which are a percentage of instructional costs. Another strong determinant is the ratio of credit hour (part-time) instructors to full-time instructors. Since salaries for full time instructors can range as high as twice that of part-time instructors, a high ratio of full-time instructors will amount in a higher expenditure for instructional salaries.

The ratio of support costs to instructional salaries also varies from one campus to another. Existing variations range from total budgets of 186% of instructional salaries at Kenai to 345% of instructional salaries at Fairbanks. There can be several reasons for this: fixed costs on physical facilities; area cost of living differences which, until the recent negotiated salary increases, were not completely reflected in instructional salaries; services included in budgets at main campuses, such as student services, safety and security and also basic inequities in funding which have continued through the formative years of the University system.

In summary, I would like to make two facts clear:

1. Yes, there were inequities in previous University budgeting processes.

2. No, formula budgeting is not a panacea will can or will solve all inequities. However, formula budgeting does help to reduce some inequities and draws attention to others, thereby creating incentives for eliminating them.

cc: Andrew S. Warwick, Commissioner
Department of Administration

V. Kent Dawson, Directer
Division of Budget and Management

JC/lw

MEMORANDUM State of Alaska

TO: Rich Guthrie, Fiscal Analyst
Legislative Finance

DATE: April 7, 1975

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Judy Crondahl, Budget Analyst
Division of Budget and Management
Department of Administration

SUBJECT: FY 76 Budget/Community Colleges

The information shown in the "Legislative Appropriation" columns on the attached has been provided at the request of Eric Eckholm, Legislative Assistant to Senator Hohman. His request was to compute FY 76 Community College budgets on the basis of the productivity levels as established in the RRIM (Resource Requirements Instructional Model) by the University. The differences in productivity are as follows:

	Governor's Budget	RRIM*
Ketchikan	250	300
Sitka	290	265
Kenai	222	300
Kodiak	286	300
Mat-Su	271	265
Kuskokwin	371	300

Variations from the standard computation have been footnoted. The most prevalent of these is that Physical Plant has not been cut from the level of the Governor's budget since many of these community colleges will have new buildings to maintain in FY 76.

I am pleased to know that a formula approach is receiving the serious consideration of the Legislature. Because it is new to the State of Alaska's budgeting process, it is still in need of many refinements, but these can come only as the approach is used and methods to include refinements become apparent. Not only now, but during the interim, formula budgeting needs to be analyzed and refined by all concerned. The Legislature, the State Administration, and all levels of the University System must work together on this issue.

The attached information is provided in response to a legislative request. It does not reflect any change in the Governor's budget request.

cc: Sue Greene, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

V. Kent Dawson, Director
Division of Budget and Management

* Shown in "Legislative Appropriation" column attached.

	SCH	÷ PROD.	= FTE Teach.		%		Average Salary & Benefits	= Total Teach.	
FY 75 Working Budget	3,288 (1)	291	11.3	Reg. Rate	71%	8.0	18,649 (3)	149.2	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	29%	3.3	6,895 (4)	22.8	172.0
FY 75 Maintenance	2,651 (2)	291	9.1	Reg. Rate	71%	6.5	18,929 (5)	123.0	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	29%	2.6	6,949 (5)	18.2	141.2
FY 76 Governor's Budget	2,651	250	10.6	Reg. Rate	71%	7.5	18,929	142.0	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	29%	3.1	6,968	21.7	163.7
FY 76 Legislative Appropriation	2651	300	8.8	Reg. Rate	71%	6.2	15,929	117.4	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	29%	2.6	6,949	18.2	135.6

	FY 75 Working Budget		FY 76 Maintenance		FY 76 University Request		FY 76 Governor's Budget		FY 76 Legislative Approp'n		+ (−) UA Request	
											Governor	Legislature
Teach. Salaries	% of Salaries	172.0	% of Salaries	141.2	% of Salaries	196.0	% of Salaries	163.7	% of Salaries	135.6		
Other Req.	16%	27.3			31%	61.7	21%	33.8	21%	25.0		
Total Inst(6)		199.3				257.7		197.5		163.6	(60.2)	⟨94.1⟩
Admin.	26%	61.9			35%	68.2	37%	61.3	37%	50.8	(6.9)	⟨17.4⟩
Student Serv.												
Public Serv.												
Library	20%	33.8			22%	43.2	21%	34.0	21%	28.2	(9.2)	⟨15.0⟩
Physical Plnt	25%	42.7			26%	50.0	30%	49.0 (7)	36%	49.0 (7)	(1.0)	⟨1.0⟩
Total	196	337.7			214	419.1	209	341.8	215	291.6	( )	⟨127.5⟩

1. FCC: 2220 SCH plus 1068 SCHE Voc. Ed.
2. UA maintenance estimate: 1530 SCH plus 1121 SCHE Voc. Ed.
3. Reference memo to Bgt. & Mgmt. from UA Office of Budget Director, 1-7-75
4. UA RRIM
5. FY 75 plus 1-1/2% maintenance
6. Includes Instruction & Voc. Ed. Does not include Learning Ctr.
7. Allows 15% for new facility

BRU KETCHIKAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRU CODE 45-12-1-08-00-00 REVISED 1-29-75

7 EXPLANATION

1315

Explanation

	SCH	÷ PROD.	= FTE Teach.				Average Salary & Benefits	= Total Teacher Salaries	
FY 75 Working Budget	1,828 (1)	290	6.3	Reg. Rate	65%	4.1	16,269 (2)	66.7	87.7
				Cr. Hr. Rate	35%	2.2	9,546 (2)	21.0	
FY 76 Maintenance	2.073 (3)	290	7.1	Reg. Rate	65%	4.6	16,513 (4)	75.9	100.2
				Cr. Hr. Rate	35%	2.5	9,546 (4)	24.3	
FY 76 University Budget				Reg. Rate					
				Cr. Hr. Rate					
FY 76 Legislative Appropriation	2073	265	7.8	Reg. Rate	65%	5.1	16,513	84.2	110.4
				Cr. Hr. Rate	35%	2.7	9,546	26.2	

	FY 75 Working Budget		FY 76 Maintenance		FY 76 University Request		FY 76 Governor's Budget		FY 76 Legislative Approp'n		+ (-) Diff Request	
											Governor	Legislature
Teacher Salaries	% of Salaries	87.7	% of Salaries	100.2	% of Salaries	103.4	% of Salaries	100.2	% of Salaries	110.4		
Other Req.	17%	15.1	22%	21.7	34%	35.5	19%	19.4	22%	23.9		
Total Inst.		102.8		121.9		138.9		119.6		134.3	(19.3)	(4.6)
Admin.	129%	113.5	134%	134.4	116%	119.7	119%	119.7 (5)	105%	119.7 (7)	-0-	-0-
Student Serv.												
Public Serv.												
Library	16%	13.7	17%	16.7	15%	15.5	17%	16.7	42%	46.8 (7)	1.2	31.3
Physical Plnt	16%	14.0	17%	16.7	41%	42.1	25%	25.1 (6)	23%	25.1 (8)	(17.0)	(17.0)
Total	278%	244.0	289%	289.7	306%	316.2	281%	281.1	295%	325.9	(35.1)	9.7

1. FCC: 1340 SCH plus 488 SCHE Vocational Education
2. UA RRIM
3. 1585 SCH plus 488 SCHE Vocational Education
4. FY 75 plus 1-1/2% merit increase
5. University request
6. Regular increases plus 50% for new facility
7. 28.4 Admin allotment allocated to library
8. Regular Increases plus 36% for new facility

SITKA COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRU CODE 45-12-1-09-00-00 REVISED 1-29-75

7 EXPLANATION

01429

Explanation

	SCH	÷ PROD.	= FTE Teach.
FY 75 Working Budget	4,080	22[illegible]	18.4
FY 76 Maintenance	4,760	222	21.4
FY 76 Governor's Budget			
FY 76 Legislative Appropriation	4760	300	15.9

	%	x	Average Salary & Benefits	= Total Teach. Salaries	
Reg. Rate	47%	8.6	15,717 (1)	[illegible]	
Cr. Hr. Rate	53%	9.8	8,426 (2)	82.6	243.6
Reg. Rate	47%	10.1	18,0[illegible] (3)	191.0	
Cr. Hr. Rate	53%	11.3	8,552 (3)	[illegible]	288.5
Reg. Rate					
Cr. Hr. Rate					288.5
Reg. Rate	47%	7.5	18,998	142.5	
Cr. Hr. Rate	53%	7.4	8,552	171.8	214.3

	FY 75 Working Budget		FY 76 Maintenance		FY 76 University Request		FY 76 (5) Governor's Budget		FY 76 Legislative Approp'n		+ (-) Maint. Request	
											Governor	Legislature
Teacher Salaries	% of Salaries	243.6	% of Salaries	288.5	% of Salaries	256.5	% of Salaries	288.5	% of Salaries	214.3		
Other Req.	10%	25.2	14%	41.5	30%	76.4	14%	41.5	14%	30.9		
Total Inst.(4)		268.8		330.0		332.9		330.0		245.2	(2.0)	(87.7)
Admin.	35%	84.8	36%	105.0	41%	104.0	36%	104.0 (6)	36%	78.0	-0-	(26.0)
Student Serv.												
Public Serv.												
Library	14%	33.5	15%	42.0	15%	37.2	15%	42.0	15%	31.2	4.8	(6.0)
Physical Plnt	17%	42.5	18%	51.0	33%	84.6	21%	61.2 (7)	29%	61.2 (8)	(23.4)	(23.4)
Total	176%	429.6	183%	528.0	218%	558.7	186%	537.2	194%	415.6	(21.6)	(143.1)

1. Reference memo to Bgt. & Mgmt. from UA Office of Budget Director, 1-7-75
2. From UA RRIM
3. Includes 1-1/2% merit increase
4. Includes Instruction, Voc. Ed. & non-credit instruction
5. Increases proportional to teachers' salaries plus overall 4%
6. University Request
7. Regular increases plus 20% for Phase III
8. FY 75 plus 40% - 20% inflation & Phase II

KENAI PENINSULA COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRU CODE 45-12-1-12-00-00 REVISED 1-22-75

Explanation

	SCH	÷	PROD.	=	FTE Teach.		%	=	Average Salary & Benefits	=	Total Teacher Salaries	
FY 75 Working Budget	2,760 (4)		271		10.2	Reg. Rate	13%	1.3	16,951 (1)		[illegible]	
						Cr. Hr. Rate	87%	8.9	8,360 (2)		74.5	96.5
FY 76 Maintenance	3,400 (5)		271		12.5	Reg. Rate	13%	1.6	17,205 (3)		27.5	
						Cr. Hr. Rate	87%	11.9	8,445 (3)		92.6	120.1
FY 76 Governor's Budget						Reg. Rate						
						Cr. Hr. Rate						
FY 76 Legislative Appropriation	3400		265		12.8	Reg. Rate	13%	1.7	17,205		29.2	
						Cr. Hr. Rate	87%	11.1	8,445		94.3	123.5

	FY 75 Working Budget		FY 76 Maintenance		FY 75 University Request		FY 76 Governor's Budget		FY 76 Legislative Approp'n		+(−)UA Request	
											Governor	Legislature
Teacher Salaries	% of Salaries	96.5	% of Salaries	120.1	% of Salaries	162.7	% of Salaries	120.1	% of Salaries	123.5		
Other Req.	34%	32.6	39%	47.3	28%	[illegible].5	28%	47.3	39%	48.6		
Total Inst.		129.1		167.4		208.2		167.4		172.1	(40.8)	(36.1)
Admin.	70%	67.5	73%	87.4	68%	111.4	73%	87.4	73%	59.9	(24.0)	(21.5)
Student Serv.												
Public Serv.												
Library	32%	30.8	33%	40.0	23%	37.3	33%	40.0	33%	41.1	2.7	3.8
Physical Plnt	32%	30.7	33%	40.0	32%	52.5	40%	48.0 (6)	39%	48.0 (7)	(4.5)	(4.5)
Total	257%	258.1	279%	334.8	252%	409.4	285%	342.8	284%	357.1	(66.6)	(58.3)

1. Reference memo to Bgt. & Mgmt. from UA Office of Budget Director, 1-7-75
2. UA RRIM
3. FY 75 plus 1-1/2% merit increase
4. FCC: 1960 plus 800 Vocational Education
5. Includes 1200 Vocational Education
6. Regular increases plus 20% for new facility
7. Regular increase plus 17% for new facility

RU MAT-SU COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRU CODE 45-12-1-13-00-00 REVISED 1-28-75

7 EXPLANATION

92173

Explanation

	SCH	÷ PROD.	= FTE Teach.		%	#	Average Salary & Benefits	= Total Teacher Salaries	
FY 75 Working Budget	3,950	286	13.8	Reg. Rate	34%	4.7	21,152 (1)	99.2	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	66%	9.1	9,371 (2)	85.3	184.7
FY 76 Maintenance	4,800	286	16.8	Reg. Rate	34%	5.7	21,469 (3)	122.1	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	66%	11.1	9,512 (3)	105.6	227.0
FY 76 Governor's Budget				Reg. Rate					
				Cr. Hr. Rate					228.0
FY 76 Legislative Appropriation	4800	300	16.0	Reg. Rate	34%	5.4	21,469	115.9	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	66%	10.6	9,512	100.8	216.7

	FY 75 Working Budget		FY 76 Maintenance		FY 76 University Request		FY 76 Governor's Budget		FY 76 Legislative Approp'n		+(-)UA Request	
											Governor	Legislature
Teacher Salaries	% of Salaries	184.7	% of Salaries	228.0	% of Salaries	226.3	% of Salaries	228.0	% of Salaries	216.7		
Other Req.	9%	16.6	13%	30.5	30%	66.8	14%	31.7 (4)	16%	34.2		
Total Inst.		201.3		258.5		293.1		259.7		250.9	(33.8)	(42.2)
Admin.	42%	77.7	44%	99.6	40%	89.4	39%	89.4 (4)	41%	89.4 (6)	-0-	-0-
Stude Serv.												
Public Serv.												
Library	22%	40.2	23%	52.2	21%	46.4	23%	52.2	23%	49.6	5.8	3.2
Physical Plnt	29%	53.8	30%	68.8	37%	82.9	36%	82.6 (5)	35%	82.6 (7)	(.3)	(.3)
Total	202%	373.0	210%	479.1	226%	511.8	212%	483.9	218%	472.5	(27.9)	(39.3)

1. Reference memo to Bgt. & Mgmt. form UA Office of Budget Director, 1-7-75
2. UA RRIM
3. FY 75 plus 1-1/2% merit increases
4. 1.2 of Admin allotment added to instruction
5. Regular increases plus 20% for Phase III
6. 5.3 of Admin added to Instruction
7. Regular increases plus 26% for phase III

BRU KODIAK COMMUNITY COLLEGE BIU CODE 45-12-1-10-00 REVISED 1-28-75

7 EXPLANATION

C2236

Explanation

	SCH	÷ PROD.	= FTE Teach.		%	÷	Average Salary & Benefits	= Total Teacher Salaries	
FY 75 Working Budget	3,900 (1)	371	10.5	Reg. Rate	63%	6.6	19,203 (3)	127.0	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	37%	3.9	9,817 (4)	32.8	159.7
FY 76 Maintenance	5,980 (2)	371	16.1	Reg. Rate	63%	10.1	19,203 (5)	194.0	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	37%	6.0	9,817 (5)	58.9	252.9
FY 76 Governor's Budget				Reg. Rate					
				Cr. Hr. Rate					
FY 76 Legislative Appropriation	5980	300	19.9	Reg. Rate	63%	12.5	19.203	240.0	
				Cr. Hr. Rate	37%	7.4	9.817	72.6	312.6

	FY 75 Working Budget		FY 76 Maintenance		FY 76 University Request		FY 76 Governor's Budget		FY 76 Legislative Approp'n		+ (-) UA Request	
											Governor	Legislature
Teacher Salaries	% of Salaries	158.7	% of Salaries	252.9	% of Salaries	290.7	% of Salaries	252.9	% of Salaries	312.6		
Other Req.	40%	63.9	46%	115.3	40%	116.3	58%	115.3	46%	142.5		
Total Inst.(6)		222.6		368.2		407.0		368.2		455.1	(38.8)	48.1
Admin.	55%	87.3	57%	144.7	39%	114.3	45%	114.3 (7)	37%	114.3 (8)	-0-	-0-
Student Serv.												
Public Serv.												
Library	7%	10.7	7%	18.4	17%	48.0	10%	48.8 (7)	25%	87.3 (3)	.8	39.3
Physical Plnt	9%	13.8	9%	23.7	11%	31.0	9%	23.7	9%	29.3	(7.3)	(1.7)
Total	211%	334.4	219%	555.0	207%	600.3	219%	555.0	219%	686.0	(45.3)	85.7

1. FCC estimate plus 600 SCHE non-credit
2. UA estimate 5,030 plus 950 SCHE non-credit
3. Refernce memo to Bgt. & Mgmt. from UA Office of Budget Director, 1-7-75
4. UA RRIM
5. FY 75 plus 1-1/2% merit increase
6. Includes Instruction & Vocational Education
7. 30.4 from Admin added to Library
8. 64.5 " " " " "

BRU KUSKOKWIM COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRU CODE 45-12-1-15-00-00 REVISED 1-28-75

7 EXPLANATION

02294

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

April 11, 1975

Ms. Danny Bowman
Senate State Affairs
1st Floor-Old Library
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Danny:

Kotzebue Extension Center Priorities for 1975-76.

Funding for:

1-Coordinator
2-Full time Instructors

(One should be in office or Business Administration and one in English/Speech)

1-Full time Secretary
1-Half time Custodian

Travel money and per diem for one Instructor to make five trips per semester to two villages (same trip) for three days each trip.

Travel 5 X $200.00	=	$1,000.00
Per diem 5X3X $25	=	375.00
Per Semester		$1,375.00
For year (2X $1375	=	$2,750.00

Sincerely,

Brad Wilson

Brad Wilson
Coordinator, Kotzebue Extension Center
University of Alaska
Kotzebue, Alaska 99752.

BW:elc

TELEGRAM

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
PHONE: 586-6440
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

1976 APR 30 PM 8 42

#

12076 POM FAIRBANKS ALASKA 15 04-30 355P AST

PMSSEN FRANK FERGUSON

JUN 5761

STRONGLY URGE YOU TO FINANCIALY SUPPORT COLLEGE

OF NURSING TRANSFER TO UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA IMMEDIATELY

LORNA NELSON SR BOX 50505 FAIRBANKS ALASKA 99701

TELEGRAM

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
PHONE: 586-6440
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

#

12090 NL FAIRBANKS ALAKA 50 04-30 400P AST

PMS FRANK FERGUSON

JUN 5770

URGE ABSORBING COLLEGE OF NURSING INTO UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SYSTEM IMMEDIATELY. CLASSES MUST RESUME IN SEPTEMBER IF POSSIBLE KEEP THE SAME UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA BUSGET KEEP BACCALAUREATE EDUCATION ALIVE IN ALASKA

MARLA SANTORA PRES FAIRBANKS DISTRICT IV NURSES ASSOCIATION REPRESENTING 76 MEMBERS

1976 APR 20 PM 8 42