



BOARD OF VOCATIONAL NURSING
AND PSYCHIATRIC TECHNICIANS

New Program Approval Process

STAKEHOLDER MEETING

AUGUST 12, 2021



AGENDA

- ❖ **Welcome and Introductions**, Elaine Yamaguchi, Executive Officer
- ❖ **Goals and Structure of the Meeting**, Sarah Irani, SOLID
- ❖ **Review of Proposed Program Approval Process**, Marie Cordeiro, Supervising Nursing Education Consultant
- ❖ **Review of Comments Received**, Beth DeYoung, Nursing Education Consultant
- ❖ **Questions and Comments**, Shelly Jones, SOLID
- ❖ **Closing Remarks**, Elaine Yamaguchi

How We Got Here

	2018	2019	2020	2021
Number of programs on wait list:	29	25	36	51
SNEC position:	Vacant	Filled January	Filled	Filled
Average number of NECs:	4	5	5	6
Average number of programs assigned to each NEC:	40	40	30	30
Requested additional NEC through budget process	Requested in July 2018.	Approved to fill in July 2019.	NEC hired.	
Proposed program fees to legislature	Yes. Told to host stakeholder meetings for input.	Deferred to Sunset Hearing legislation for 2020.	Pandemic derailed proposed legislation.	Yes. Waiting for legislation to impose program fees.

Initial Program Approval (IPA) Process

- ❖ Proposed **effective date of January 2022**.
- ❖ Only open to programs on **wait list prior to January 2020**.
- ❖ Requires proposed nonrefundable initial application fee of \$5,000.
- ❖ Requires submission of all required IPA documents.
- ❖ Follows strict timelines of proposed section 2881.2 of the Business and Professions Code.
- ❖ Final approval fee of \$15,000 is payable upon program approval by the full Board.

Proposed Competitive Rating Process

- ❖ Proposed **start date of January 2023**.
- ❖ Open to programs on **wait list after January 2020**.
- ❖ Requires proposed nonrefundable initial application fee of \$5,000.
- ❖ Requires submission of all required IPA documents.
- ❖ Follows strict timelines of proposed section 2881.2 of the Business and Professions Code.
- ❖ Scoring rubric is applied to review.
- ❖ Final approval fee of \$15,000 is payable upon program approval by the full Board.

New Program Approval Process

Initial Program Approval

Approval Criteria – <u>16 CCR § 2526 (a)</u>	21 Documents
<u>16 CCR § 2530 General Requirements</u>	10 documents
<u>16 CCR § 2532 Curriculum Hours</u>	2 documents
<u>16 CCR § 2533 Curriculum Content</u>	Included
<u>16 CCR § 2534 Clinical Experience</u>	Included
<u>16 CCR § 2535 Credit for Previous Education and Experience Policy</u>	1 document 3 parts
<u>California Education Code Section 94899</u> Private Post Secondary Schools only	1 document

**Initial Program
Approval**

Proposed Competitive Rating Process

Scoring Rubric

26 Points Possible

- ❖ Readiness to Start a Program (5 points)
- ❖ Clinical Site Availability (5 points)
- ❖ Program Expansion (3 points)
- ❖ Community Partners (3 points)
- ❖ Saturation (3 points)
- ❖ Geography (3 points)
- ❖ Program Affordability (3 points)
- ❖ Sustainability (1 point)

Scoring Rubric

Program Approval Process shall:

- ❖ Initiate proposed Initial Program Approval protocol with proposed nonrefundable initial application fee of \$5,000.
- ❖ Final approval shall be conducted by the Board, at which time the proposed fee of \$15,000 shall be payable to the Board.
- ❖ Follow strict timelines as expressed in proposed section 2881.2 of the California Business and Professions Code.
- ❖ Strictly enforce NEC's scope of services.
- ❖ Prohibit NECs from assisting with creating/writing curriculum, policies, and other materials.
- ❖ Approve up to 20 new programs per year.

**Moving
Forward...**

**Public Comments received
through July 15, 2021**

“We have been waiting for our turn for several years now...”

- *We have been waiting for our turn for several years now. How does this new process affect us in the waiting list? The only item I would like to add to make this process even more fair is to consider the applications of those who have been waiting for several years...*
- *I understand that once the LVN New Program Approval Process is approved, I will receive the official LVN Application. Will the deadline continue to be March 1, 2022?*
- *...the most glaring matter that I've seen was the proposed \$25,000 fee. I believe that the fee is too steep for institutions seeking to start an already costly program. May I propose that an annual fee be implemented once the programs are active & operating? Also, I feel that the board should open the criteria for the clinicals...*

“Rubrics will lend an objectivity...”

- *I especially enjoyed seeing your rubrics. The rubrics will lend an objectivity to this process which is very important and make it much easier to give feedback to applicants who perhaps did not fare so well in the process. I also liked to see the document asking about the affordability and consideration of long-term debt for the students and sustainability of the program. Long term debt is a very important consideration especially when these students might go on to continue their journey in education. The differentiation between rural and suburban very interesting.*

“We agree with the process, however, ...some things could be improved...”

- *We agree with the process, however, some things could be improved:*
 - *Accountability should be a priority*
 - *Use of the IPA submission along with an application/processing fee is essential to streamlining the process and encouraging readiness*
 - *The application fee should be monetarily all-inclusive, private or public, large or small.*

Application due dates are also a great idea, should be published well in advance, with no late applications accepted.

As for the Technical Assistance, instructions should be published and provided with the IPA packets, A webinar could be helpful, however, if I have a question, email is the preferred method for me. I think that all emails should receive a prompt reply.

Application Review should be done quarterly to speed up the approval process. Evaluation criteria should be complete and in detail using a rubric format.

(continued)

“Geography [as defined] by mileage is also unfair to schools in this area.”

(continued)

- There are some parameters on the sample rubric that are somewhat disagreeable for XXX College specifically:

Section V: Saturation should not and cannot be applied to the rubric as there currently is no legislation regarding the “Certificate of Needs” for Healthcare facilities and programs in the State of California. LVN’s are staffed at All types of Healthcare facilities and post COVID there is a great need in XXX County...

Section VI: Geography by mileage is also unfair to schools in this area. XXX is considered... largely rural. XXX College receives many students from XXX County, and they continue to be in great need of all types of healthcare workers.

“I...ask that the board solicit from all applicants if they will require perspective students to pay for access to clinical training sites or if they will plan on paying clinical training sites for clinical placements slots...”

- *I would respectfully ask that the board solicit from all applicants if they will require perspective students to pay for access to clinical training sites or if they will plan on paying clinical training sites for clinical placements slots, in the form of gifts, unrestricted donations etc.*

This information would be helpful to know as a consumer and should be publicly available as may represent a potential conflict of interest for educational programs.

Public Comments for today

- ❖ Update documents based on stakeholder comments
- ❖ Provide proposed competitive process to Education and Practice Committee for review and possible recommendation to the full Board for discussion and approval
- ❖ Post documents to the BVNPT website on the Education tab <https://www.bvnpt.ca.gov/education/index.shtml>

Now What?

QUESTIONS?