



**WICHITA**  
**PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**House Education Committee**  
**Rep Aurand, Chair**

**H.B. 2620– Career Technical Education**

*Submitted by Diane Gjerstad*  
February 8, 2012

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee:

The Career and Technical Educational components of HB 2620 will advance career readiness for high school students by promoting secondary CTE programs and increase access to postsecondary technical programs for high school students.

**Tuition:** The plan would provide funding to pay the costs of secondary students enrolled in postsecondary technical programs. Financial barriers are far too often insurmountable obstacles for families. Removing the financial obstacle will be a tremendous asset allowing students to gain post-secondary credits while in high school.

**Transportation:** Funding to cover transportation costs of secondary students to postsecondary education institutions could be advantage in some districts. However, it is not clear if the funding source is new money or if these expenses would come from funding currently available through the vocational weighted funding.

**Incentives:** New funding to establish a career technical education incentive program may provide a much needed financial boost to schools stretching to meet the needs of students in high demand occupations.

**Geographic limits:** The bill has components which need additional detail or consideration so existing secondary CTE programs and access by students to those programs isn't negatively impacted. The '30-mile rule' has two very important qualifiers that need careful consideration - determining what constitutes program duplication, and confirming postsecondary capacity to meet the needs of secondary students.

In most CTE programs there are differences in curriculum and instructional approach used to prepare students to take advantage of postsecondary programs in the same CTE content area. In short, a secondary health science program may have many similarities to a

postsecondary health science program but there may also be numerous differences. Duplication needs to be determined through a review of the entire curriculum and experiences offered by the program, not just course titles and high level outlines. The educational needs, skills levels and long-term goals of secondary students are likely to be different from postsecondary students and may require a different approach.

It is equally critical that the process to determine capacity be well defined and consistently implemented. Is it capacity in the postsecondary program at the postsecondary site? It is capacity in the postsecondary program offered at the secondary school? This aspect needs much more development to consider all the possible configurations and their respective implications. Because of the numerous questions and time involved, we would suggest grandfathering all current CTE high school based programs and begin the duplication review with new programs in the future.

**Industry recognized certificate:** The bill also prompts some questions. The bill contains language that ties CTE state aid funding to the number of CTE programs that offered that provide industry certification upon completion (New Sec. 16 (a) line 27). It will be important that appropriate and acceptable options for industry certification for all state approved pathways, and that no school district will be denied such funding based upon the an absence of a sanctioned industry certification.

The cost of exams will be a financial difficulty for many students. Identifying a funding source will be critical if our goal is to increase the number of students with an industry recognized credential upon completion of high school.

Mr. Chairman, we support the overall concept of this proposal with a few modifications, including removal of the 30 mile limitation; grandfathering current programs to expedite implementation for school year 12/13; and funding industry recognized certifications.