

# Ohio House Government Accountability and Oversight Committee

3-7-18

## Proponent Testimony / HB 512

### Stan Jennings, Superintendent, Scioto County Career Technical Center

Chairman Blessing, Vice Chair Reineke, Ranking Member Clyde, and Members of the Ohio House Government Accountability and Oversight Committee, my name is Stan J Jennings. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I am Superintendent of the Scioto County Career Technical Center in Lucasville, Ohio. I am a 1976 graduate of the Drafting program of the Scioto County JVS. I graduated from the district that I am Superintendent of and completed programming as a student. What seemed to be true then is still true today in many ways, as I was considered a “good student” at my home district, and as such it was not impressed on me to work through a training program (i.e. attend the vocational school) for my future. I would like to express that the best thing that I have ever done in my educational experience was to become a student in a then JVS-now CT program. It prepared me for work, higher levels of education and a deepened accountability as a high school student. My statements are in support of the OACTS group that I am a member of.

When first I had read the language for the HB 512 bill I did not have a feeling of acceptance in the positions being relayed. While I feel that many times current Legislative and Educational oversight is misguided for purposes of my school’s mission (Workforce Development in Scioto County), I was not immediately supporting a realignment as it appeared to be a mere movement of the pieces of our structures.

However, we have had conversations with Rep. Reineke and some of the other HB 512 bill co-sponsors. They have worked with us to craft a potential amendment that would allow me to support this bill. With this in mind, please note the following 2 points:

1. The local Career Technical Planning District (“CTPD”) for each of Ohio’s **CTE networks would revert back to the individual CTPD, which is critical.** The current model seems to advocate for a one-size fits model that specializes in foundations. This seems completely miss the mark for my workforce need in the marketplace. The biggest success and root directive of CTE is to meet the needs of their individual citizenry, and each portion of the state and regional entity have their own needs.

Thus the amended language seems to state that **each area would determine the needs and guide the work in that region** according to the understanding of the CTPD. For my region this is the largest benefit as the current structures seem to discount the needs of the workforces (regionally) and seem to be applying structures of foundation programming that can be applied without regard to the regional need or the employer input. It seems critical to my local work that this structure does not prepare students to take immediate needed employment, as we currently are embracing simplistic single class offerings rather than entry level skills that address workforce need. This not only is troublesome, but does not create skillset minded, work-ready future employees. Its outcome seems to foretell that workforce in the future is less likely to

meet regional need. Further; as the workforce dwindles, so do opportunities for next level employment as companies feel compelled to find workforce elsewhere.

2. **Some current initiatives from our educational entities have become something that does not enhance the regional CTE network for CTE programming.** Several initiatives that our organization has been able to procure peripherally have very well-crafted documentation that does not specify the offerings as it applies to regional or specific company need and does not suggest that training come from the network that has been established at state level (i.e. CTPD's). This creates a regression of our marketplace in understanding how to get their students involved in meaningful training outcomes and further frustrates employers who are looking for answers as to where to get needed employees. Thus, at times creating new bureaucracies and offerings that the employer has not suggested to be needed. ***Understanding the difference in a foundation program and a true CTE-employer guided offering*** is paramount to understanding that the workforce when foundation classes alone are the offerings does not create workforce. And as such will not be substantial to meeting any workforce need.

Thank you for your attention. I am happy to answer any questions.

Stan J Jennings