

March 15, 1988

LB 1041

facilities have to either reallocate fund sources within their facility to pay that, or...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: ...they must have a reduction in force. Those are their options. We, on the other hand, can appropriate more than what the collective bargaining salary agreements call for. If we do that, then that is up to, I believe, either the collective bargaining positions at the state colleges or UN-O, or it is up to the regents or the state college boards in those areas that are not collectively bargained. They can appropriate those wherever they want to. But we have a reference point, those things have to be filled. I, quite frankly, would doubt that the collective bargaining people, after a bargain has been reached for salary, say, okay, you've got 11 percent, however, we've got some more money so we want to give you another 4 or 5 percent. I don't think that would happen, but I think it is possible. We'll be talking more about it at the university level.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner, please, then Senator Nelson.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would just address the broad issue that has been discussed, and I guess it would be relative to "peer" groups. At least as long as I've been here, I cannot ever recall that we appropriated funds "based on peer group". What peer groups are and have always been is a basis of comparison that is used as a guide for distribution. Now you are also going to find that percentages are going to be different from campus to campus, from time to time, for the simple reason that adjustments, over the past, have not been the same. So you don't start from the same base. If you don't start from the same base...it is indicative, for example, for years we have allocated funds for state employees, not higher education. Now the state employees have an equal percentage distribution. You will notice this year, in the negotiations contract, it ranged significantly from different kinds of groups. The reason it ranged significantly is that there were groups that were not compatible with the groups of people outside of state government, which comparisons were made and adjustments were made, as I recall it was as high as 9 percent under some of those contracts, as low as 3 for others. That was reflecting the same thing that in the past a flat equal