

Program Cost Analysis

Dear School Board Member;

I am writing you this memo to voice my opinion about the plan to reduce the Construction Trades Program from two instructors to one. I am retiring on June 7th and this reduction will have no bearing on my future. I take pride in the program that I helped create and I would like it to continue. I appreciate the time you are taking to look at another point of view. I will be breaking this down into two parts: the first will be concerned with the Program Cost Analysis figures that were given to you and lastly a few remarks about what was said at the last board meeting.

Looking at figures you can get different interpretations from the same numbers. I will show you that by operating the Construction Trades program with 2 instructors there is an actual gain of \$37,043 over operating a one instructor lab.

I will be using the 2012-2013 Budget figures supplied in the March agenda.

As you look on page one: Teacher Salaries, Teacher Benefits, Substitutes, and Inst. Supplies, these are the only figures that are a direct cost of operating a program. All of the other figures are fixed cost. By eliminating an instructor or even a program the figures will not decrease. Instead they will increase because they will then be passed on to the remaining programs. An example is Principal Svcs, a one teacher lab will then be charged \$9203 instead of the \$18,405 of a 2 teacher lab. Joe will not be taking a salary cut of \$9203; the difference will be just passed along making each teacher's share increased to \$9663. All other remaining fixed costs are similarly passed along.

What I have done was to add Teacher salaries, Teacher Benefits, Substitutes, and Inst. Supplies to get a basic cost of the program operating with one instructor and operating with two instructors. For 2 instructors I put in Dave's salary and benefits. I then used the lowest present staff's salary and benefits as the new instructor's salary and benefits. For the Inst. Supplies I dropped it to \$9000. for a one instructor lab.

	Salary	Benefits	Substitutes	Supplies	Total Cost
1 teacher	\$65,330.	\$30,466.	\$1,406.	\$9,000.	\$106,202.
2 teacher	\$107,638.	\$56,141.	\$2,812.	\$14,000.	\$167,991.

A figure of \$6177. is used as the amount credited per student enrolled.

2 teacher 64 students X \$6177. = \$395,328. Minus program cost \$167,991 = \$227,337.

1 teacher 48 students X \$6177. = \$296,496. Minus program cost \$106,202 = - \$190,294.
\$37,043.

A two teacher lab will bring in \$37,043. more than a one teacher lab. I also used the maximum number of 48 students for a one teacher lab even though there isn't one program today operating with 48 students. Presently Construction Trades is close to its lowest enrollment ever. A one teacher lab will never generate any more revenue but a 2 teacher lab has the potential for much more. Five years ago there was serious talk of closing down Automotive Technology and look at it today. We have just come through the biggest slowdown in the housing industry and our numbers are low but they still generate positive income. Last month it was reported that 48,000 construction jobs were created. We have had enrollments in the 80's in the past and it will increase again.

If you look at the budget analysis, 11 programs are losing money while only 7 are in the black. Something is wrong.

Presently, adding 2 teacher's Salaries, Benefits, Substitutes, and Supplies comes to \$208,405. The total Expenses found on page 4 is \$451,044. \$451,044.
-\$208,405.
\$242,639.

The overhead is \$242,639. This exceeds the direct cost of operating the program. Eliminating or reducing programs is not the answer. We have to increase the programs to pay for the fixed cost or reduce the fixed cost.

At last meeting it was asked what academic impact would there be going to a one teacher lab? Dr. Jackson's response was that there would be no difference in the subject matter taught. In all likelihood he was correct. The same basic subject matter would be covered but the instructor's time would have to be divided each session between the different levels. Presently I teach only one level and Dave teaches the other level. If there is a reduction in staff Dave would have both 1st level and 2nd level in the AM and the rest of the 2nd level and all 3rd level in the PM. In our lab you can't allow one level to

work in the lab while you have a theory lesson with the other. One of the groups would be unsupervised. You would have to run theory for both groups at the same time. Kind of like what they did when they had one room school houses. When working out in the lab, the instructor will be pulled in two different directions trying to teach two different groups. The argument has been made that: "This is done in different labs now". Yes it can be done. I did it before but the quality of the instruction is nowhere the same, I would never want to go back. It should never be done in any lab when the number of students could merit having two instructors. One of my student's biggest complaints today is the length of time they have to wait for individual help.

For the past few years we have had meetings and we have spent in-service days on how to improve our teaching techniques. No amount of teaching techniques can replace another teacher in a lab.

Safety is another concern. Metal Fabrication is often used as a comparison because it has only one instructor. Granted Metal Fabrication is a dangerous lab but it is smaller and a more visible lab. The machines are stationary unlike our circular saws and air nailers. We also work off of ladders, scaffolds and roofs. If Metal Fabrication had 55+ students they should also have two instructors.

Going to a one instructor lab we would then be turning away 12 students. The argument given last month was that we currently turn away more than that in Health Assistant and Cosmetology now. The comparison is wrong. There is no room for more students in either lab, unlike our situation in Construction Trades. You should be looking at expanding labs instead of cutting them back.

I know this is a lot of information, but I tried to be as concise as possible. I could explain this further if you have any question please call me at 725-3880. I appreciate your time and consideration you have given to the program. It was said that if Construction goes to a one teacher lab, in all likelihood it will never go back.

Thank-you

Charlie Lytle