Ohio Senate Finance, Higher Educations Sub-Committee HB 49, State Biennial Budget Testimony of Amy Schakat, President Ohio Association of Comprehensive and Compact Career Technical Schools May 23, 2017

Chair Gardner, and members of the committee, I am Amy Schakat, President of the Ohio Association of City-Career Technical Schools (Ohio CCS). Ohio CCS represents <u>two</u> of the three types of career technical education offered in Ohio. Our members offer career technical education through comprehensive single districts and compact districts. Comprehensive <u>single</u> districts have 1,500 or more students and offer career-technical education in career centers and/or at existing high schools in the district. Compact districts are comprised of <u>several</u> school districts that have developed an arrangement among themselves to deliver career technical education. For example, our members include, the comprehensive career technical program like South-Western City Schools, Lorain City Schools and Dayton City Schools, as well as, compact programs like Centerville-Kettering-Oakwood CTC, Mayfield Excel, and Tri-Heights Career Prep Consortium.

I am the Director of South-Western City Schools, a comprehensive district in southwestern Franklin County. We are a district of 22,000 students with over 6,500 high school students. We have 694 students enrolled in CTE workforce development programs in the district at 5 high schools. We are unique in that one of our high schools is the South-Western Career Academy (SWCA). There are 13 workforce development programs at the SWCA and 4 programs located at the other 4 high schools. Of the 17 career-technical programs we offer, 14 have an industry credential. In addition to the career-technical programs, we have 15 career-technical electives at the high school level and 3 at the middle school level.

Ohio CCS appreciates the opportunity to provide testimony on HB49, and we'd like to share our support of the *House Passed* version of HB 49, as it pertains to the ability for agreements between high schools and colleges that are below the floor for CCP. In the *As Introduced* version of the bill, our major point of concern was the elimination of the ability for agreements between high schools and colleges that are below the floor for CCP. Currently, many of our members have agreements below the floor with their post-secondary CCP partner; often these agreements are reached when the teacher and facility are the responsibility of the secondary partner. These agreements provide students and parents with great opportunities for free college credit while attending high school at low or no cost to the secondary partner.

If the elimination of the alternative agreement language were to return to HB49, we are very concerned that we would not be able to afford the additional cost. We know from previous testimony, it has been shared that the number of post-secondary partners offering agreements below the floor is limited, however, we know for those secondary partners it is <u>absolutely</u>

<u>necessary</u> to maintain those agreements in order for them to continue to offer the variety of CCP courses to their students.

For example, our legislative chair Krista Hussar, Director of South Stark Career Academy shared that more than 20 school districts in Stark and surrounding counties have a negotiated agreement with Stark State College that requires districts to pay \$28/credit hour for courses taught at their own schools by their own staff, and also for online course offerings. That is \$13.50 below the floor for every credit hour taught on their campuses, and \$138 below the ceiling, which is typically the cost for every credit hour taught online. In 2016-17, one of her districts had students taking 632 credit hours taught by her faculty and 54 additional hours online. The cost without their negotiated agreement would increase by \$15,984. Even with the negotiated agreement below the floor, the district has seen a significant increase in overall college credit plus costs because they see the value of offering a variety of courses to their students. As of now, Krista has been asked to hold off on adding more CCP courses outside the core academic subject areas. There are many more college credit opportunities she could pursue for her career tech programs, but just like every other area district dollars are spent, there is a limit on what dollars can be spent on CCP. If the ability to negotiate agreements below the floor is taken away, thus increasing the cost for CCP courses significantly, there will certainly not be any additions to career technical CCP options, and there may even be cuts to non-academic-pathway CCP offerings on campuses. It is important to note that some of these career tech CCP courses are the direct link to industry-recognized credentials, such as EMT Basic and the Microsoft Office bundle.

This is a very important issue affecting career-technical education in our 42 compact and comprehensive career-technical planning districts across Ohio. Again, I urge you to support the *House Passed* language that retains the ability to negotiate CCP below the floor. I appreciate the ability to convey our concerns and will answer any questions you may have. Thank you.