



Ohio House of Representatives
Finance Subcommittee on Primary and Secondary Education
House Bill 49, State Budget

Testimony of Joyce Malainy
Superintendent, Career and Technology Centers of Licking County

March 16, 2017

Chairman Cupp, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for allowing me to address the committee today. My name is Joyce Malainy and I am the superintendent of the Career and Technology Education Centers of Licking County. I am testifying on behalf of my students, staff, the Ohio Association of Career and Technical Education (Ohio ACTE) and the Ohio Association of Career Technical Superintendents (OACTS).

Career Technical Education is currently at a crossroads in Ohio, and your committee has an opportunity to implement changes that will advance CTE for the State of Ohio.

You have heard (or will hear) testimony from my colleague, Judy Wells, who has shared the potential negative impact the funding formula has on Career Centers throughout the State. Obviously, changes to the budget in that regard are important. However, I would like to ask you to consider additional budget issues that will help CTE prepare students to meet the employment needs of our growing economy, and help address the skills gap.

Adult education at Ohio Technical Centers (OTCs) continues to add significant value to the state, but often seems overshadowed by Higher Education. During the last state budget process, the state allocated roughly \$16.8 million to OTCs, compared to the over \$420 million spent on Ohio community colleges. This funding disparity exists in spite of the fact that OTCs have been highly successful in educating students: the average performance rate for technical skill attainment at OTCs is 96.5%. The state has not increased funding for OTCs in over a decade. Our Associations continue to advocate for increased state funding for OTCs. In addition, we would like to see the successful implementation and promotion of the One Year Option, which allows certain OTC graduates to receive college credit toward a technical degree upon enrollment in an institution of higher education.

In addition, Adult Education at Ohio Technical Centers (OTCs) should qualify to offer CCP. OTCs provide labor-market driven, post-secondary workforce education and training throughout the state. While similar workforce programs at community colleges qualify for CCP, Adult Education courses at OTCs do not. Note that students who successfully complete specified technical programs are already eligible to have technical credit transfer to public colleges and

universities. This transfer of credit is described in Career-Technical Assurance Guides (CTAGs). CTAGs are advising tools that assist students moving from Ohio Secondary and Adult Career-Technical institutions to Ohio public institutions of higher education. The CTE program must undergo an approval process for students to receive CTAG credit. Students from approved programs can apply for credit in their discipline at any Ohio public college or university.

Another ongoing issue is the funding for College Credit Plus. We appreciate some of the changes to CCP reflected in HB 49, including a reduction of cost for the textbooks. However, we are adamantly opposed to removing the ability to negotiate below the “floor”. I believe it is an inappropriate use of tax dollars levied for local schools to pay the post-secondary institution for college credits taught by high school staff on the high school campus. For example, for FY 16, C-TEC paid colleges \$54,222 for work done by CTEC staff at C-TEC. The ability to negotiate the floor will permit the option of students earning credits on district property taught by district staff without paying the post-secondary institution for district services.

Along the lines of Ohio Technical Centers offering college credits, I would also like to address our desire for the state to allow OTCs to provide Associate Degrees to students under certain circumstances. Certain regions of Ohio are in high demand for a trained workforce in specialized fields but lack the necessary Associate Degree programs to help serve community needs and raise regional employment rates. OTCs are uniquely positioned to offer comprehensive Associate Degree programs but are not currently authorized to do so under Ohio law. To address this issue, our Associations have proposed to allow OTCs already located in underserved areas to provide Associate Degree programs in high-demand fields as determined by the Chancellor of Higher Education. Note that our proposal would mirror language in the current budget bill that allows community colleges to offer bachelor degrees under certain circumstances.

In addition, there are several recommendations in HB 49 that seem to indicate a tremendous lack of knowledge about the value career technical education currently brings to the State. The first is requiring teachers to do externships. Many CTE teachers are hired directly from the field they teach. Welding instructors have been welders, electrical teachers have been electricians. To “require” that these teachers do externships seems very redundant; they already have significantly more knowledge of the field than could be learned through an externship. And even with an exemption for CTE experts, targeting academic instructors is still problematic because no data exists to support the superfluous requirement. Another concern is the potential cost of externships. If done during the school year, we are removing a teacher from the classroom and paying for a substitute. If done on a time other than a school day, districts are either giving up valuable professional development time, or paying a teacher for a non-contract day. This requirement consequently turns into yet another unfunded mandate.

Our final concern with the budget is language mandating the appointment of three business community members to each of Ohio’s local boards of education. Currently Career Centers rely heavily on business advisory committees, which as the name suggests, are made of local business and industry representatives from each program area. These committees meet at least twice each year with the goal of providing a business perspective on school operations, curriculum needs, employment needs and others. C-TEC has approximately 540 such business representatives

serving on our collective advisory committees. Further, our boards are already made up of business and community leaders. The Ohio School Boards association has determined that 55% of elected board members in Ohio are currently executives or represent business professionals. An additional 14% are self-employed and run their own business. At C-TEC, 6 of the 7 board members fall into those categories. As such, we feel this proposed requirement is also redundant and unnecessary, especially for Career Centers.

On a positive note, we are encouraged by the work currently in progress to address the high school graduation requirements. The State Board of education has charged the State Superintendent to form a committee of stakeholders to develop options for graduation. OACTS is pleased to have two CTE superintendents participating on this committee. There are options on the table that will promote the value of Career Technical Education by allowing for some of the current testing requirements to be used to help students graduate. For example, our organization has been working for years to have the WebXams, which are required for students, but currently provide no value to students, to be used to help students graduate. Students who graduate from High School and have been successful in a two-year CTE program will provide the skilled workforce for which our employers are clamoring. I mention this because our policy recommendations are not always implemented by ODE or the State Board, which results in the need for legislative reforms. We are hopeful this will not be the case.

I truly appreciate the work done by this committee and the opportunity to share my thoughts about Career Technical Education in Ohio, and will be happy to answer any questions.