

Chairman Duffy, Ranking Member Ramos, and members of the House Finance Committee's Higher Education Subcommittee, good morning. My name is Joyce Malainy, and I am Superintendent of C-TEC, which provides career and technical education to approximately 400 middle school students, 650 High School Students and about 200 Adult Education students annually. I am testifying on behalf of Ohio Association of Career Technical Superintendents, Ohio ACTE, as an interested party and as a property tax payer.

C-TEC, Career and Technology Centers of Licking County is located in Newark Ohio, and we serve the 10 public school district and one parochial school in Licking County. Our goal is to ensure that our high school students graduate Career and College ready. Recently we have expanded our program to provide career exploration courses for our middle school students. Through adult education, we provide work force development training, customized business training and personal growth and interest classes. The Adult education Center falls under the auspices of the Ohio Department of Higher Education.

The College Credit Plus (CCP) program provides educational opportunities for students to earn college credits while enrolled in high school. On the surface, this seems to be an incredible opportunity for high school, and some middle school students; however, I think it is important to note several concerns.

There has been a standard method of availing high school students to college credits for years, under a variety of names: Dual Enrollment, Post-Secondary Education Options (PSEO), articulation agreements, etc. These options are binding and have provided high school students with opportunities to earn college credit while in high school for years

With the Dual Enrollment model, the high school teacher (employed at a public school with public funds and meeting high school teacher licensure requirements) had to be "approved" by the credit granting institution in order for students to be able to earn "dual credit" for the high school and college course at the same time. There was little cost associated with this model, although sometimes students were charged application fees or partial enrollment fees from the Post-Secondary institution.

In the PSEO model, the high school student would attend the college campus (or sometimes the high school would host the college level instructor) and earn college credit from a college employed instructor. In those cases, the college instructor did not/does not need the same licensure requirements for teaching high school students. Isn't that odd? With PSEO, the high school district paid for the student to participate in college credits.

Now with the CCP model, the difference is that public high school dollars are flowing directly to colleges. For C-TEC, College Credit Plus is essentially identical to the Dual Enrollment model. C-TEC *hires and pays* a licensed teacher to teach the course, and the post-secondary institution approves that teacher and courses for transcribed college credits. C-TEC then pays the post-secondary institution \$40.00 per semester hour **for work the C-TEC teacher is doing**. To whom does this make sense?

So let's talk actual dollars. Last school year, the year before CCP was implemented, 451 C-TEC students earned 1353 college credits at a cost to C-TEC of \$2,629.53

This school year, we have 202 students involved with CCP earning 1562 Post-Secondary Credits. Based upon the current student enrollment under CCP, C-TEC will pay **\$84,469** to partnering post-secondary institutions, **\$55,180.00 of which is work that C-TEC teachers are doing, on the C-TEC campus, with C-TEC students**.

This transfer of levied tax dollars to the Post-Secondary is a direct result of CCP and the recommended floor. I urge this committee to understand that this system is taking tax payer dollars voted to operate public school districts to pay post-secondary institutions. I also request committee continue to allow school districts and Universities the ability to negotiate below the floor, which without completely striking College Credit Plus, will allow public schools to keep some of their voted revenues.

Another area of concern with HB 474 proposal is the provision for **Co-requisite Remediation Pilot** for College Credit Plus, which provides parameters for a pilot program to allow co-requisite remediation for high school students under CCP.

While I am uncertain what the parameters of this particular pilot program might be and that it is limited to three such pilots, I would you ask you to consider the goals of high school: to prepare students for careers and college (college ready). So if a student is not ready for college while he/she is in high school, why should college course with remediation be an option? From my perspective, it appears as though the colleges want the funding that accompanies the students whether prepared or not.

I am an educator who supports education, in all its forms, but I am also a tax payer who feels strongly that when I am voting for levy for my local school district, that those tax dollars should be supporting the district for which I am voting, and not a Post-Secondary institution.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to address the subcommittee, and I will address any questions at the pleasure of the chair.