



## **Senate Education Committee: Public Testimony Senate Bill 216**

**December 13, 2017**

Chair Lehner, Vice Chair Huffman and members of the Senate Education Committee, my name is Robert Callahan and I have the honor of serving as the Government Relations Chair for the Ohio Alliance of Dual Enrollment Partnerships (OADEP).

We would first like to thank the committee members for including OADEP in this very important conversation and to provide a brief description of our organization. OADEP began in 2009 as a grass root cadre of dual enrollment practitioners and advocates from across Ohio who began meeting to discuss best practices, opportunities and challenges. OADEP is proud to be the first state chapter of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP).

Our membership currently includes over 100 professionals who represent a diverse set of organizations including both public and private school districts, college and universities and community organizations. The purpose of OADEP is to link Ohio college-school dual enrollment partnerships and to support and promote such partnerships through advocacy of quality initiatives, program development, professional development, communication and promotion of national standards.

OADEP actively engages in the following activities:

- Disseminates best standards for high quality dual enrollment programs
- Provides professional development to all interested parties concerning quality dual enrollment programs, including discussions for best practices and challenges
- Advocates for programs that enable interested teachers to obtain dual enrollment credentialing
- Serves as a state advocate for dual enrollment partnerships
- Fosters strong partnerships between post-secondary and secondary institutions

On behalf of our organizations membership, we would like to take this opportunity to address the potential impacts, both positive and negative of the policy proposals related to the College Credit Plus program in Senate Bill 216.

### **Senate Bill 216 – Public School Deregulation Act**

#### **Course Location & Institution Choice**

The OADEP membership is all too familiar with the financial impact that the College Credit Plus program is having on the budgets of colleges, universities and school districts that are participating in the program. We recognize that this policy could, in some scenarios, reduce the tuition costs for school districts, ease schedule planning and better predict teacher loads for future academic terms.

However, limiting a student's ability to decide the location and institution from which they receive their instruction will lead to reduced access and student choice. This policy would directly counter the student-centered philosophy of the College Credit Plus legislation. OADEP feels strongly that students should continue to have the discretion to choose to which institution they enroll and the location from where they receive instruction.

Students participating in the CCP program often build an affinity with a particular institution, are planning to enroll at a specific institution after high school and/or are working on a defined pathway at an institution. Creating barriers to an institution's courses would in many cases disrupt a student's progress towards achieving specific educational outcomes or working towards future academic plans.

In addition, many students choose to enroll full-time in college coursework or would be taking college courses on-campus at the same time the course would be offered in the high school. This would create additional and unnecessary travel burdens

and would create scheduling conflicts for students ultimately leading to disruptions to course sequences or pathway requirements.

Furthermore, some colleges and universities have course transfer policies in place that do not allow for the acceptance of courses that are delivered at secondary school locations. Some of these policies specifically state that if the class roster is comprised only of secondary students, then the course would not be accepted at the receiving institution. Many students have aspirations to attend out-of-state or private colleges that do not have dual enrollment friendly transfer credit policies, so limiting course location options for CCP students would create an unnecessary equity issue.

For the reasons the stated above, OADEP is opposed to this proposal and would ask that it be removed from S.B. 216 in its entirety. We would also like to note that the same policy was proposed in H.B. 445 during the 131<sup>st</sup> General Assembly and it failed to garner the support needed to pass.

### **Textbook Cost-Sharing Model**

Textbook costs continue to create a financial hardship on secondary schools, some of which are spending well over \$100,000 dollars per year on required textbooks and course materials for their participating students. Additionally, secondary schools have very little control over the cost of textbooks. That control lies mostly with the textbook publishers and college faculty, who in most cases, operate under academic freedom and have discretion over textbook decisions.

The proposed policy to create a cost-sharing model for textbooks between the participating families and school districts is supported by the OADEP membership. We believe that participating families who are financially able should shoulder some responsibility in the cost of the program.

It is important to note that this cost-sharing model could pose some logistical challenges to school districts and may create financial barriers to participation for some families who do not meet the definition of being economically disadvantaged. In order to counter these concerns, OADEP recommends that ODE and ODHE create a statewide taskforce to study and make recommendations on the ways in which savings on required course materials could be obtained. This taskforce should also explore potential shared service models that could reduce logistical overhead. Many IHE's are already engaged in this work and could provide valuable resources in helping to shape those recommendations.

### **Ohio Department of Education Reporting Requirements**

The infancy of the College Credit Plus Program warrants the need for sound research-based data to inform best practices and future policy proposals. The OADEP membership strongly supports the proposal that would require the Ohio Department of Education to analyze and issue a report regarding the results and cost-effectiveness for students as well as districts participating in the College Credit Plus Program. We would also suggest that the State College Credit Plus Advisory Board, that has been commissioned by ODE and ODHE, have input on developing the metrics and questions that the assessment will measure.

Chair Lehner, Vice Chair Huffman and members of the Senate Education Committee, the Ohio Alliance of Dual Enrollment Partnerships (OADEP) is grateful for the opportunity to engage in this conversation and to offer perspectives on behalf of our membership that we hope are valuable to you as these conversations continue. I would welcome any questions you may have at this time.

Sincerely,



Robert Callahan  
Ohio Alliance of Dual Enrollment Partnerships (OADEP)  
Government Relations Chair