



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Jason Phillips

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

Bill: [S.B. 220 of the 130th G.A.](#)

Date: November 18, 2013

Status: As Introduced

Sponsor: Sen. Gardner

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: No

Contents: Dual enrollment program participation fees

State Fiscal Highlights

- No direct fiscal effect on the state.

Local Fiscal Highlights

- The bill may allow districts, schools, and colleges to recoup some or all of the costs of certain dual enrollment programs through student charges. This may result in more dual enrollment programs being offered than would otherwise be the case.

Detailed Fiscal Analysis

Dual enrollment program participation fees

Generally, dual enrollment programs allow a student to take a course for which the student may earn both high school and college credit. Public and chartered nonpublic high schools must provide students the opportunity to participate in at least one dual enrollment program. One example of a dual enrollment program is the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) Program. School districts are required to participate in PSEO. PSEO permits students to take courses for both college and high school credit while in high school. Students may take the course free of charge and have the college reimbursed for the costs associated with the course. These reimbursements may be through state payments that are deducted from the foundation aid of each student's district or school, or through alternative funding agreements between schools and colleges. Under continuing law, a college that receives reimbursement through PSEO may not charge the student for tuition, textbooks, materials, or other fees directly related to the course.

In addition to PSEO, other dual enrollment programs include advanced placement courses, early college high schools, and any similar program established through an agreement between a school district or chartered nonpublic school and a

college. H.B. 59 of the 130th General Assembly prohibits school districts from charging students an additional fee or tuition for *any* dual enrollment program offered by the district, except that districts are permitted to have students pay the costs of advanced placement or international baccalaureate examinations. H.B. 59 also requires that alternative funding agreements under PSEO prohibit charging a student any tuition or fees. These H.B. 59 prohibitions are in addition to the prohibition on colleges charging students under PSEO.

The bill removes the two H.B. 59 provisions described above. As a result, the law regarding whether or not students may be charged for dual enrollment programs returns to what it was in FY 2013, before H.B. 59 became effective. The bill, therefore, may allow districts, schools, and colleges to recoup some or all of the costs of certain dual enrollment programs through student charges. This may result in more dual enrollment programs being offered than would otherwise be the case. Due to the bill's emergency clause, these changes will go into effect immediately.

Board of Regents recommendations

Under H.B. 59, the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents is required to make recommendations by December 31, 2013 to establish the College Credit Plus Program, a new dual enrollment program that may make structural or funding modifications to PSEO. The bill requires the Chancellor to make recommendations regarding whether colleges, school districts, and schools may charge students for costs associated with the College Credit Plus Program by that same date. This provision has no fiscal effect, as the work associated with developing recommendations for student charges is being completed as part of the College Credit Plus report required by H.B. 59.