

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 23, 1999 LB 495

been not to make secondary education more expensive by adding courses that are career specific and which may be tremendously expensive. In the old German system, they didn't do that. What they did, because they wanted career specific, narrowly educated people, they took them right out of the schools and they put them in businesses and they make them apprentices and they taught them on the very machines they would work, and we departed from that a long, long time ago because that's too narrow a person for us, for a democratic government. And that's what we could do here though. If you want career specific, on the machines taught, take them out of high school and put them on the machines. That would be the most cost-effective way of doing this. But that's not what we do or what we want to do I think. Under the system that we've set up, we do teach through vocational education, because there are different ways that students learn, but I haven't heard it said that they couldn't learn through vocational education courses that are roughly the equivalent in cost of other types of courses. I mean, there are other types of courses that are more expensive, too. Physics courses, courses that require a laboratory, are we going to start putting more money into those courses than through another program, or do we rely upon the school system to make those judgments? But the point I want to get back to is this; that that kind of career specific education we provide for in our system, we support in our system, but we support it at the community college level. One of the best things community colleges do, I think, and one of the reasons I'm most supportive of them, is because they take these technologies that are equipment heavy and expensive, but they take the technologies that are Nebraska related, more so, and they specifically relate students to types of careers, and we pay for that education, to a large extent, and then the students, at a later age in their maturation, can direct the skills that they've learned in high school, all of the life skills they've learned in high school, to something that's career specific, and I think that's a good system. I think that's the way it should work. I don't think we should have expensive equipment both at the community college level, which we fund, and at the secondary school level, because trying to put that expensive equipment in all secondary schools is going to be preposterously expensive. And once you set up a program that gives it to some schools but not to others and then they all want it, how can we react? How will we react? How