

# Designated Programs TF

REVISED DRAFT MINTUES 03012019

Meeting Date 12/14/18 | Meeting location District Office Classroom B

Meeting called by	PBC & Desig. Program TF	Attendees: Jeff Drouin, Natasha Lang, Rajinder Samra, Turner Zischka, Barb Yesnosky, Diane Brady, Dale Wagoner, Miguel Colon
Type of meeting	SCFF related	
Facilitator	Yesnosky & Wagoner	
Note taker	Neideffer	
Timekeeper	Neideffer	

## AGENDA TOPICS | MEETING COMMENCED AT 9:45

Time allotted | 15 | Agenda topic Step 3A Expenses | Presenter Barb

Discussion	Barb reviewed a list of step 3A expenses. Rajinder asked about the cost of the other Designated Programs (Programs).
Conclusion	Are there other programs we can put under the Designated Programs umbrella?

Action items Person responsible    Deadline

None

Time allotted | 45 | Agenda topic Historical Perspective of Designated Programs | Presenter Wagoner

Discussion	<p>When Dale was a faculty member, he and Jim Matthews did the accreditation work and proposed a budgeting process for the Nursing and Dental Hygiene Programs. The Programs were economic losers though they are community needs. VCBS, at the time, Roy Stutzman held position that it was the College's choice to run the Programs or not. Dale and Jim disagreed because the community wanted the Programs, and the Colleges had no agency over whether they could be cut. At one point, President Carlson and Chancellor Cota proposed to the Board to evaluate whether or not there should be consideration around eliminating the Dental Hygiene Program during one of the economic downturns. Board said 'No', keep the Program. Simultaneously, the Nursing Program was in the process of expansion w/ Valley Care in Livermore, through work done by Trustee Barbara Mertes. Twenty LPC students trained thru Valley Care and Valley Care paid \$100K per year to Chabot Nursing along with \$10K per year to support science courses at Las Positas College. Nursing Program revenue was up and Dental Hygiene Program revenue was down at this time, but no consideration was given to ultimately eliminating Dental. CLPFA and Dave Fouquet got involved and brokered the numbers on how to offset cost of the Programs, ultimately getting District leadership to agree that keeping the Programs is not a decision for the Colleges to make, and that the Programs had a district-wide influence and impact for both Colleges. Twenty to twenty-five percent of the students in these Programs come from LPC and there should be an offset for these Programs, which cost Chabot over \$1mil per year. Dale noted there was an approximate offset of \$575K per year for these Programs currently in BAM under step 3A, even though their cost is much higher. The question raised was, 'how can this be recognized in CEMC and not in finance?' Revenue has to be injected into the Designated Programs. BAM fixed one problem and created another. Dales historical perspective is the new BAM model benefitted the District Office, and hurt the Colleges, especially Chabot. Natasha said once they got the BAM it created new issues. Dale said at the time</p>
------------	---

of BAM, everything we received was at the behest of the District. Everyone wanted a BAM because they felt it would give the Colleges some agency...“be careful what you wish for, I suppose”. LPC had a huge classified budget and Chabot had a smaller budget at the time of the BAM inception. Chabot was not happy about this. Natasha added that a lot was happening during this time and it took 73 meetings to get somewhere with BAM. The ultimate agreement to do BAM created an outcome that was twofold: 1. Chancellor Walters drove it due to accreditation mandate, 2. The BAM resulted in an increase of built reserves at the District since its inception.

LPC ‘flipped’ their budget with good fiscal management and the \$2.0mil offset of transition monies over 3 years from the District during BAM inception, that money was allocated due to their bad budget status at the origination of the BAM. Chabot has not been able to manage in the same manner under the BAM, and has built increasingly larger deficits after starting with surpluses in their budget at the beginnings of the BAM. Not all of this is due to the BAM, but recovery from this has been difficult under BAM.

Dale said the original “ugly” sheet in DEMC used to be three-tiered...it was all about productivity levels here: 1. Main Group, 2. Nursing/Dental, 3. CTE Programs (including the Sheriff’s Academy). Nursing and Dental are really the outliers. The productivity of the Sheriff’s Academy produces better numbers: 190-220 for Nursing, 170-190 for Dental and 330 for Sheriff. Chabot, to become more fiscally sound, has had to ‘choke other Programs off’. It costs approximately \$1.2mil to offer these two Programs under the old model; under the SCFF he [Dale] is hoping the numbers are better. Rajinder said he needs to see the numbers and work with Cynthia. Jeff said students who are not majoring in nursing still need to take pre-nursing requirements but are not declaring their major in nursing. Rajinder said he is willing to work with Cynthia on [enrollment] data if requested. Dale said Chabot is preparing students for other nursing programs and Chabot is losing 10% of the students due to the enrollment process right at start of the Program, usually due to students moving to a four-year program at the “11<sup>th</sup> hour”. Rajinder asked what the district has done to attract students. Ron said the Task Force formed to see if there needs to be consideration in BAM for Designated Programs; in PBC we said we can revise BAM--so what is the focus of Designated Program TF?

The Colleges should investigate which Programs they want and then do the data analysis of said Programs and go from there. CTE = 1. Horticulture, 2. Automotive, 3. Welding. Dale said it takes us back to the “380 bin” which was a part of the original “ugly sheet” in DEMC for college funding offset in the Main Group; Ron said not to draw too many similarities with the past due to the new funding model. CTE programs make a different world. Ron posed a hypothetical question: Do we need any CTE to be in BAM? Dale agreed that with the new SCFF, CTE may not be needed to offset Program costs; perhaps the Colleges can decide to auto award certain certificates in the Programs after the 1<sup>st</sup> year and generate some revenue. Ron said the Board needs a list of Designated Programs to evaluate.

**Conclusion** Go back to PBC and have a new BAM conversation. District should not have a model that hurts colleges and students.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
1. Work on current [budgetary] numbers for Designated Programs by compiling a list of the current programs for the PBC to evaluate	Designated Programs TF	Not noted
2. Look at enrollment numbers and data as it pertains to the Nursing Program.	Designated Programs TF	Not noted