



Making public schools great for every child

KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Mark Desetti Testimony
House Committee on Education
February 8, 2012

Good afternoon Mister Chair, members of the Committee. I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you today about House Bill 2620.

We applaud the emphasis on providing Kansas students with quality career and technical education opportunities. Nothing is more important than the ability to secure a good paying job as you move from school to work. To that end, we support efforts to get high quality career and technical education programs to students who don't plan to go on to a four-year university.

As we discussed the changes to career and technical education contained in HB 2620, we found ourselves coming up with more questions than answers.

- How will it be determined if two programs are duplicative?
- Will post-secondary institutions be empowered to offer programs now available only at the high school and effectively shut the high school programs down?
- What processes does HB 2620 put in place to cause articulation agreements to be made between high schools and post-secondary institutions?
- On the issue of capacity – if the post-secondary institution can accommodate most but not all of the students in the high school program, what provisions will be made for the students left out?
- With high school funding pulled back to the KSDE and distributed based on enrollment, will they take into consideration the varying costs of programs?
- How will schools be able to accommodate the schedules of students now at the post-secondary institution who participate in extra-curricular activities?
- Will special needs students who now receive technical training at the high school where they are entitled to accommodations be able to receive such accommodations at the post-secondary institution?

We could go on. Some of these issues have already been raised in discussions both here and in the Senate Education Committee.

While we generally support the idea of improving career and technical education opportunities and believe that efficiency is a laudable goal, we think there are just too many questions to go ahead with this plan immediately.

We would suggest that this plan would be a good candidate for an in-depth study by the Legislative Post Audit Division. The questions we have listed above and others could be analyzed by the LPA with a report to come back to this body next year. We would urge this committee to tread carefully and get all the answers before proceeding.