February 4, 2019
Senate Education Committee

Chair Baumgardner, Vice Chair Alley and committee members,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony today regarding concurrent courses.

Community colleges believe in concurrent education and work with their 207 local school districts to provide these courses. These are long term relationships between the school districts and the colleges.

A student’s first college course should be quality education for the students. We believe we have that now.

The factors driving the cost to deliver a concurrent course is controlled by whether or not there are:

1. available high school teachers that meet HLC accreditation qualifications at the location of the high school or whether the college has to hire adjunct faculty or pay current college faculty;
2. a sufficient number of students at a location to take the class (dollar rate times number of students);
3. free locations where the class is taught. (The high school does not require the college to pay them to deliver the courses); and
4. choice and cost of teaching materials/textbooks. Currently, at some colleges, faculty have the negotiated right to select a course textbook. Requiring Open Educational Resource material would be a unilateral action on a negotiated item as it is defined in many college master teacher agreements. Textbooks cost money and that needs to be figured into the reimbursement rate if the college is prohibited from charging for them.

If you look at the chart on page 6 of Dr. Flanders’ testimony, there appear to be questions about the data which has a range from $6.52 to $671.76 for credit hour expenditures for all concurrent courses. And, on page 8, per credit hour expenditures for Composition 1 range from $1.00 to $971.38.

However, we know the variables cited above can change from semester to semester and year to year and impact a college’s cost to deliver the courses.
KBOR testimony appears to be that a college can teach the concurrent course in their service area for a median cost, even if the college loses money doing so, or KBOR decides what college can come in and take over the classes at the high school in the first college’s service area regardless of any long-standing relationships between the high schools and the college.

If the goal is to provide quality courses tuition free to high school students, by providing state funding for college credit, there are multiple ways to do this.

We would suggest when working out a cost that allows the student to get the course for no tuition, the state reimbursement rate given should not cause monetary harm to the colleges.

Perhaps that means there is a rate the state reimburses for concurrent credit hours when they are taught by an HLC qualified high school teacher at the high school with a certain class size, no fee is charged by the high school and if textbooks are required.

Perhaps there is another rate if the class is taught by an HLC qualified adjunct or faculty, and/or if the class size is less than a certain minimum, if no fee is charged by the high school and if textbooks are required.

As one of my colleges has pointed out, some of the districts they serve may have only three to four students in a course, making the KBOR proposed reimbursement rate an even greater loss to the provider college.

This same college currently has four full-time faculty members teaching concurrent classes at area high schools. They are doing this because the high school does not have HLC credentialed faculty in place. The proposed rate will not come close to covering their salaries.

If variable funding as discussed above is not acceptable, then at a minimum we would suggest taking the average cost reported for Composition 1 which is $126.25 per credit hour and colleges can try to make that work, assuming that figure included textbook costs. However, we can see by looking at the chart on page 8 of KBOR testimony that six colleges reported their costs were higher than this average amount. Even more troubling, if you take the KBOR suggested median of $71, fourteen colleges reported their costs were higher than this.

My colleagues from other states, having variations of free tuition programs, have all expressed concern about the sustainability of those programs. However, if this is the direction you choose to go, we would like to work with you to ensure this type of program can be sustainable. We stand ready to ensure the complexities are considered and solutions proposed.
I would be glad to provide a thoughtful president for further detailed discussion at another time if that would be helpful.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of KACCT,

Linda Fund, Executive Director
Kansas Association of Community College Trustees