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**ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Call to Order**

Chair Francesconi called the meeting of the Academic Strategies Committee to order at 3:07 p.m.

2. **Approval of May 9th Minutes**

   **ACTION:** Directors Jill Eiland made the motion to approve the minutes and David Yaden seconded. Motion carried.

3. **Academic Program Approvals**

   - **PSU, M.S. in Global Supply Chain Management**
     Chair Francesconi called upon Sona Andrews, Provost at Portland State University (PSU), to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The M.S. in Global Supply Chain Management is directly linked to three of PSU’s strategic priorities, namely, global excellence, community engagement and sustainability. The program is designed to link business and industry, and is the only program of its kind in the state.

   - **WOU, B.A./B.S. in Early Childhood Studies; Applied Baccalaureate in Gerontology; Applied Baccalaureate in Psychology**
     Chair Francesconi called upon Steve Scheck, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Western Oregon University (WOU) to provide an overview of the proposed academic programs. The B.A./B.S. in Early Childhood development offers a non-licensure option for students interested in working with children in an inclusively early childhood setting. The program was developed in partnership with Chemeketa Community College and Lynn-Benton Community College to
coordinate smooth transitions between Applied Associate Degrees in early childhood fields, and this program.

Vice President Scheck elaborated on the remaining WOU program proposals, the Applied Baccalaureate (A.B.) in Gerontology and A.B. in Psychology. The A.B. in Gerontology is designed to provide students with a terminal associate of science level credits the opportunity to continue their education in a timely manner. There is a need for trained professional to work in gerontology fields, and WOU targets this program towards more mature students.

The A.B. in Psychology is designed to provide students that have a terminal associate degree from an Oregon Community College the opportunity to finish their degrees in a timely manner. By Providing the A.B. option, WOU would tap into an underserved market, and provide additional degree options for students.

**ACTION:** Directors Emily Plec made the motion to approve the programs, and Jim Middleton seconded. Motion carried.

**NEXT STEPS:** The Committee requested that campuses include information regarding total credit and assumptions in the A.B. program write-ups in order to better inform members during the program approval process. In addition, the Committee requested a report on the Program Review process. Helen Stampe will generate a report on all programs from the last five years.

4. **Credit for Prior Learning Policy**

Chair Francesconi called upon Karen Marrongelle, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Strategies to provide an overview on the OUS Credit for Prior Learning Policy (CPL). The CPL task force has crafted a policy recommendation that is a roadmap for major best practices and reflects input from the Provost Council as well as campus stakeholders. The policy calls for each OUS institution to establish a CPL policy that includes the twelve essential policy components: guiding principles, types of assessment accepted, standards and criteria for awarding CPL, cost/tuition structure, CPL transferability, CPL transcription, data collection and reporting, faculty and staff development, authority, transparency and accessibility, support at the institutional level, and policy review. It was agreed that the policy should move forward with the addition of compliance date by which the campuses will need to report on their implementation practices.

Discussion centered on the need for campuses to make information about CPL readily available to students. It was pointed out that the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) is also working on a document that will likely provide greater detail about the statewide vision for CPL.
ACTION: Directors Jim Middleton made the motion to approve the policy as amended, and David Yaden seconded. Motion carried.

NEXT STEPS: The policy on Credit for Prior Learning will be placed on the October 4, 2013 agenda for consideration of the full Board.

5. Achievement Compact Targets
Chair Francesconi called on Bob Kieran, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research to provide the committee with an overview of the work on Achievement Compacts. Target setting for the Achievement compacts was a collaborative process between OUS and the campuses. The Office of Institutional Research in conjunction with the director of performance measurement compiled all data including preliminary projections and targets for each campus. A draft document was reviewed at the May Provost Council meeting, and institutional targets were refined throughout the month.

Discussion centered on the intersection of campus diversity goals with the Achievement Compacts. It was noted that the Achievement Compacts attempt to predict what will happen with the students currently in the pipeline, but do not predict the long-term demographics of the state.

ACTION: Directors Jim Middleton made the motion to approve the achievement compact targets, and David Yaden seconded. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
6. Campus Diversity Goals and Strategies
Chair Francesconi called on Dr. Marrongelle to provide the committee with an update on the campus diversity report. In May, the Committee offered recommendations to staff for how to improve upon the document and create more robust aspirational goals for campuses. The feedback at that time included: the expansion of retention issues, transfer rates, more specificity about the types of problems and issues that need to be addressed in the report and tactics we are currently using to help and the development of a call to action that translates the report’s findings into action oriented strategies. In addition, emphasis should be placed on collaborations at the middle and high school level, by creating a robust college going culture, and addressing unmet need. It was noted that data indicate that Oregon universities are not keeping pace with the enrollment, retention and completion of students of color, particularly Latino, African American and Native American students.

Discussion centered on next steps to move the initiative forward, calling for greater specificity around the connection between retention and graduation. It was agreed that staff should evaluate best practices and strategies that address “stopping out” and positively affect retention among underrepresented and students of color. The Committee also discussed the need to place equal emphasis on recruitment and completion, and uncover cost-effective
measures for students in their community and supporting the college going pipeline. Attention was drawn to the need for additional financial resources in order to support diversity efforts, as well as how OUS might calculate the true cost to educate students.

After a full and frank discussion, the Committee offered specific feedback to staff, including:
- development of action steps for campuses, the state, and policy leaders; consider incorporating aspirational goals into presidential evaluations;
- implement recruitment strategies that are culturally sensitive and prioritize outreach initiatives;
- address affordability and financial aid barriers and/or financial incentives to accompany report, i.e. targeted funding to increase student retention and enrollment, expand resources for pre-college programs, mentoring, etc.

**ACTION:** Directors Jill Eiland made the motion to endorse the Campus Diversity Document with aspirational enrollment goals, and Emily Plec seconded. Motion carried.

**NEXT STEPS:** At the direction of the Committee, staff will establish aspirational goals for campuses around completion, plan a qualitative study of the experiences of students of color, and flesh out data related to faculty/staff/administrators of color.

7. **Oregon Education Investment Board Equity Lens**

Chair Francesconi called on Dr. Marrongelle to provide the Committee with a report on the OEIB Equity Lens. It was noted that the Committee ought to share feedback with Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB) about the Equity Lens, and that any synergies between the two bodies of work should be identified. After a full and frank discussion, the Committee agreed that the OEIB Equity Lens, ought to reflect similar principles of supporting not only students of color, but also PELL eligible students that are traditionally underrepresented. It was agreed that staff should look toward other groups like the OEIB and the HECC to determine where work may overlap, and to find synergies around research and initiatives. In addition, the Committee emphasized the need for a full show of commitment to diversity, cautioning that if done in part, efforts may be seen as a tokenistic approach to inclusion.

**NEXT STEPS:** Chair Francesconi will converse with staff from the OEIB to encourage the endorsement of a call to action.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

8. **Campus 40-40-20 Strategies**

Chair Francesconi opened the discussion on 40-40-20, noting that the discussion paper will be heard by the full board at the June meeting. Director Yaden and Dr. Marrongelle outlined the assumptions, campus actions and concerns, and highlights of the discussion paper noting the goal of this exercise is to make the 40-40-20 goal more tangible, underscoring that the goal is not an end in and of itself; the goal is a better educated citizenry. Reference was made to the
inclusion of regional equity in the discussion paper, noting the value added in working toward the state-wide goal.

Following the discussion, reference was made to the importance of providing quality academic experiences for students, noting that if we are not intentional about reaching 40-40-20, quality for students and institutions may suffer.

**NEXT STEPS:** Staff will continue to work on the 40-40-20 discussion paper and generate an action framework that deconstructs the complexity of the state-wide goal.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**9. Board Policy on Accreditation Virtual Site Visits**

Dr. Marrongelle advised the Committee of proposed modifications to the program approval process by the OUS Provosts Council. Currently, when graduate programs are proposed and approved at Provost Council, an external review of the program is required. The Provost Council has proposed an interpretation of the current process that allows for a virtual site visit. A virtual site visit would require campuses to draft a statement that explains the need for the request. This request either be approved or denied by the Provost Council before advancing to the Academic Strategies Committee for full program consideration. Currently, the Northwest Commission on Colleges & Universities (NWCCU) is exploring options for the implementation of similar policies, and the request for virtual site visits is in line with the growing trend.

**NEXT STEPS:** Staff will consult NWCCU to gain clarity around their movement toward virtual site visit/review. The Provost Council will work with staff to clarify the process and language for implementation of virtual site visits and advance any policy changes to the Committee for their review.

**OTHER ITEMS**

**10. No other items were put forward by the committee**

**11. Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.
Oregon Institute of Technology seeks Board approval to offer an instructional program leading to a M.S. degree in Marriage and Family Therapy.

1. **Describe the purpose and relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s mission and strategic plan.**

   The Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) degree prepares individuals to assess, diagnose, and treat individuals, couples, families, children, adolescents, and the elderly. The mission of the Master of Science (M.S.) in Marriage and Family Therapy is to enable students to become effective and ethical marriage and family therapists. Students will be prepared to apply knowledge of theories of family systems, human development, psychopathology, counseling and behavior change to psychosocial problems of individuals and families from a wide variety of backgrounds. The program emphasizes in-depth skill development in marriage and family counseling. Graduates will be able to communicate effectively, think critically, behave ethically and with cultural sensitivity, and work interpersonally with families, couples, and individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds.

   The M.S. in MFT supports Oregon Tech’s mission to offer rigorous applied degree programs by providing rigorous, high-quality coursework designed to meet accreditation standards. It supports Oregon Tech’s mission to meet the needs of Oregon’s citizens by providing the educational experience that will allow graduates to provide critical expertise in addressing serious social problems and to meet the community demand for a local Master’s degree program. It also supports Oregon Tech’s mission to provide educational opportunities to Oregonians by providing residents of southern Oregon and northern California with access to a local program in Marriage and Family Therapy.

   The M.S. in MFT supports OIT 2017, Oregon Tech’s strategic plan. Specifically, having an M.S. in MFT will move Oregon Tech towards meeting the goal of having at least two graduate programs in the College of Health, Arts and Sciences. The program has been designed to meet the accreditation standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs and the Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education; thereby, moving Oregon Tech closer to the goal of delivering high-quality academic programs and allowing Oregon Tech to meet the goal of preparing students for professional licensure. The M.S. in MFT program in Klamath Falls will allow Oregon Tech to meet the goal of providing educational access to underserved rural students in southern Oregon and northern California.
2. **What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?**

Need for Marriage and Family Therapists: There is a continuing need for individuals trained at the master’s level to provide services to adults and children in both an individual and family context. The need exists at the national level, state level, and local level. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012) indicates that, nationally, employment growth through 2018 for counseling-related positions is expected to be faster than average (i.e., between 14% and 24% growth). In particular, it is noted that the number of job openings is expected to exceed the number of counseling program graduates. Position openings in Oregon are expected to increase by 25% during this time period (U.S. Department of Labor, 2012). The Oregon Employment Department projects a 15% growth in the regional employment outlook for Klamath and Lake counties from 2008 to 2018 (Oregon Employment Department, 2012). The most recent Klamath County United Way Needs Assessment (2006) indicated that child related issues are at the top of the list of community concerns. The results of the survey indicated that there is a need for professionals trained specifically to work with children and their families.

Need Assessment Data: The Applied Psychology Program has collected feedback from students, alumni, and community members. Data from Senior Exit Surveys have been collected across several years. Surveys of current students, graduates and local agencies were conducted in 2007 and 2010. The 2007 survey explored the option of an M.S. degree in Counseling; the 2010 survey explored the option of the more specific M.S. degree in Marriage and Family Therapy. The overwhelming response to an M.S. degree has been positive.

3. **Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?**

Four degree programs in Oregon have been approved for Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist (LMFT) licensure by the Oregon Board of Licensed Professional Counselors and Therapists; none in the southern part of the state. The Oregon graduate programs approved for licensure for LMFT are George Fox University, Lewis & Clark College, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon. Applicants to these programs exceed their capacity to accept students. The M.S. in MFT at Oregon Tech would provide additional opportunities for the Oregon University System to meet the demand for counseling programs.

4. **What new resources will be needed initially and on a recurring basis to implement the program? How will the institution provide these resources? What efficiencies or revenue enhancements are achieved with this program, including consolidation or elimination of programs over time, if any?**

The M.S. in MFT program will require three additional FTE faculty members. One new position will be added immediately and the remaining positions will be in place by the second year of the program. Additional recurring costs to implement the program include additional support for library resources, equipment and professional development for faculty, and support for recruiting students. The University will provide these resources; the revenue generated by the program will support the program.
All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommends that the Board’s Academic Strategies Committee authorize Oregon Institute of Technology to establish an instructional program leading to a Master of Science (M.S.) degree in Marriage and Family Therapy, effective Fall 2014. With the Committee approval, a five-year follow-up review of this program will be conducted in 2019-20.

(Committee action required.)
Portland State University (PSU) and Oregon Heath & Science University (OHSU) seek Board approval for an exception to the on-site external review process. This exception would permit PSU and OHSU to conduct a coordinated virtual program review, as a means for fulfilling the site visit component of the program review process.

A coordinated virtual review for both programs, PSU’s PhD in Community Health and OHSU’s PhD in Epidemiology, has been designed to maximize efficiencies for both institutions. Since the programs will eventually be linked to one another in a single school of public health, the same reviewers have been assigned to assess both programs. The external review is a robust review; the programs do not necessitate the need for special instruction or laboratory space, and therefore a site visit would not add additional value to the assessment the external reviewers have been asked to make regarding each programs.

PSU and OHSU have been in contact with the external reviewers and the virtual review is underway. Although PSU and OHSU now know that the ASC feels the need for a policy change, the universities are requesting an exception to the current policy, allowing them to continue the external review currently underway. Given this juncture, to arrange for campus visits would cause significant delays for both programs, and require a great deal of time and resources to coordinate schedules at both institutions.

PSU and OHSU have worked diligently on a timeline for submitting documents to seek accreditation for our proposed OHSU/PSU School of Public Health. Accreditation requires that both programs are approved before the application, and to pause the program review process may significantly delay the establishment of a joint school of public health.

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE**

The OUS Provosts’ Council recommends that the Board’s Academic Strategies Committee grant an exception to PSU and OHSU, authorizing both universities to continue with a coordinated virtual program review, as a means of fulfilling the site visit for the PSU’s PhD in Community Health and OHSU’s PhD in Epidemiology.

(Committee action required.)
In keeping with a steady state approach to budget processes, the proposed distribution of incentive funding follows the method used for the prior biennium. The Provosts Council is in support of this continuation and the Academic Strategies Council is expected to formally concur at its September 20, 2013 meeting. For Fiscal Year 2014, $3,368,842 was set aside to reward and incentivize institutions based on a performance funding model that supports 40-40-20 goals. The allocations are based on two metrics:

- Metric 1 – Half of available funding for the number of degrees each institution awarded to Oregonians in 2012-13 (both graduate and undergraduate)
- Metric 2 – Half of available funding for the number of degrees each institution awarded to underrepresented and/or rural Oregonians in 2012-13 (both graduate and undergraduate)

### Degrees Awarded and Funding for Incentive Metrics • 2012-13 Degree Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available for allocation in FY14</th>
<th>$3,368,842</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount per metric</td>
<td>$1,684,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incentive Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric 1 - Oregon Residents Only</th>
<th>INSTITUTION Degree Recipients</th>
<th>FOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Cascades</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meter 1</td>
<td>Share of Total</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ share</td>
<td>$61,227</td>
<td>$54,626</td>
<td>$358,885</td>
<td>$23,444</td>
<td>$562,080</td>
<td>$79,549</td>
<td>$389,098</td>
<td>$115,512</td>
<td>$1,684,421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Metric 2 - Oregon Residents Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural and Underrepresented Degree Recipients</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
<th>10.0%</th>
<th>6.5%</th>
<th>22.9%</th>
<th>1.2%</th>
<th>25.6%</th>
<th>8.0%</th>
<th>17.1%</th>
<th>8.7%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ share</td>
<td>$167,758</td>
<td>$109,385</td>
<td>$386,528</td>
<td>$19,984</td>
<td>$431,229</td>
<td>$135,153</td>
<td>$287,661</td>
<td>$146,723</td>
<td>$1,684,421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Both Measures Combined

| $228,985| $164,011| $785,413| $43,428| $993,309| $214,702| $675,759| $262,235| $3,368,842 |
STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE
Staff recommends that the Academic Strategies Committee review the proposed FY14 incentive funding allocations and make a recommendation to the full Board for approval at its next meeting (currently scheduled for October 4, 2013).

(Committee action required.)
See Appendix A for full report
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PURPOSE OF PAPER

Oregon has set a high goal for educational attainment. That goal is widely cited but little understood. Nor has there been any significant consideration in any forum about intent, meaning, or consequence of the goal. There is no consensus on what the goal means. Taken literally, the goal masks important questions about:

- Understanding the intent and policy implications of different interpretations of the goal.
- The trade-offs between quantitative achievement of the goal and other important public policy goals, including equity, regional and demographic diversity, research and public service, and quality of education.

The purpose of this paper is to present these issues for discussion in order to give guidance to the Academic Strategies Committee for completion of a draft 40-40-20 strategy framework. The goal is to have a tool to set targets for campuses and to identify the main points of leverage for achieving the goal, including financial implications. Setting targets is the final step once a framework is in place.

A 40-40-20 strategy by itself is not a mission statement for higher education and any successful strategy must recognize the distinct research and public service missions of university education. Nor is 40-40-20 a plan for financial stability and sustainability—it is an essential part of such a plan, but only a part.

UNDERSTANDING THE GOAL

Defining the goal

Senate Bill 253, adopted in 2011, is explicit in setting a target for 40 percent of adult Oregonians to hold a bachelor’s degree or higher by 2025. This sparse specification begs a number of questions about what the target means and how it relates to other state and OUS policies. Taken as an aspirational goal (the Governor has referred to it as a “North Star” – a direction rather than a destination), it requires some fundamental policy decisions. This is important guidance.

All adults, working-age adults, students now in school...?

Whether the goal is taken to be 40 percent of all adults, all working age adults, or some other
age cohort makes a difference in, not only in the number of degrees to be held by Oregonians by 2025, but also in the focus of policy and investment toward the goal.

It is important to realize that over time any definition will result in “all adults” achieving the desired result, with timing being the primary, yet significant difference. Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that the intent behind the goal is to improve Oregon’s economic competitiveness and the economic and civic capabilities of its citizens. Thus, it is reasonable to take the goal to mean all working age Oregonians. There seems to be little question about this.

This still leaves a question about timing and focus of strategies. If the goal is taken literally to mean “all working age adults” by the year 2025, it will require a massive investment in adult education for the simple reason that so many individuals who will be in the workforce in 13 years are already in the workforce. As a consequence, many believe the focus of 40-40-20 should be on the cohort of those presently in school who will be entering the workforce by 2025.

Beyond the ease of achieving the goal lays a fundamental policy decision. A focus on adult education might be extremely productive from the standpoint of rapidly improving the economic performance of Oregon and Oregonians. In contrast, a “cohort” focus will orient us toward making permanent improvements in educational performance, with deeper and longer-lasting benefits.

For the purposes of this initial framework, we define the age group to be 22-35 year olds. The rationale is that, as stated above, over time any definition will result in 40% of the adult population (however defined) as holding at least a bachelor’s degree. Further, adult returning students are more likely to start at community colleges than at universities when returning to school to earn a degree. For these reasons, we recommend limiting the age group to 22-35 year olds, with the understanding that as we continue to monitor trends, we may modify this age group in the future.

Resident and nonresident degrees
The 40-40-20 goal is silent about whether it is to be met by degrees granted to Oregonians or in part by degree-holders that migrate to Oregon. Looking at the balance of in-migrants and out-migrants, Oregon currently gains about 14,800 bachelor’s degree-holders each year. However, if the goal of 40-40-20 is developing a high-performing educational system offering access, affordability, and success to Oregon students, there is an argument for ignoring the net gains and losses from migration. Among the reasons, there is little public policy available to shape migration patterns, which varies with economic circumstance.

The issue of enrollment of nonresident students is more hotly contested. For purposes of 40-40-20, one could adopt the view that the state policy is silent about nonresident enrollment as long as all qualified Oregon students have access at affordable prices, including capital for capacity. In other words, once enrollment and degree targets are agreed and met and an affordability standard is in place, there is freedom on campuses to manage enrollment. Indeed, some will argue that without this flexibility there is no way to arrive at a reasonable
affordability standard for Oregonians nor to allow universities to pursue excellence. On the other hand, the point at which nonresident enrollment begins to crowd out resident enrollment will no doubt be controversial.

The focus here is on educating Oregonians, leaving aside the debate over how nonresident enrollment affects this.

So the goal is...

For purposes of this project, the goal is to have 40 percent of each cohort of 22-35 year-old Oregonians achieve at least a bachelor’s degree by 2025.

The gap to reaching the goal

Preliminary analysis indicates OUS institutions need to collectively produce about 500 more degrees per year, compounding annually. Once a framework is in place to specify targets for degrees, further consideration can be given to analysis of financial resources required, space considerations, and additional costs and obstacles for educating students of color and low income and first generation students.

Role of private universities

What role should an OUS strategy envision for private colleges and universities?

By way of background, there are 24 private non-profit colleges and universities in Oregon. Currently they enroll about 10,000 Oregonians and graduate about 2,400 resident students each year. According to the Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities, its postsecondary institutions plan on expanding degree production to help contribute to the 40-40-20 goal by 2025.

Beyond factoring in the likely degree production of the private universities, there are two questions to resolve:

1. If private universities should be engaged directly in the strategy, who engages them and how?
2. Are there particular aspects of an overall strategy that the private universities may be particularly well-suited to address? For example, some have suggested that some of the private universities might play a strong role in adult education.

OTHER POLICY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE FRAMEWORK

The straight-forward 40-40-20 goal leaves open questions about who gets degrees, where they live, and the quality and nature of those degrees.

These questions provide the policy context within which 40-40-20 must operate. Some were introduced in the section on “defining the goal” (age cohort, residency, role of private universities). Others reflect important OUS policies and values and require some specification for how they should be incorporated into a 40-40-20 strategy.
Graduate degrees
The 40-40-20 goal gives no special consideration to graduate degrees. (If both undergraduate and graduate degrees are counted, there will be double counting.)
- How should a 40-40-20 strategy include consideration of graduate degrees?
- Should an overall target be set? How?
- Should institutional missions be more precise on this score?

Geographic and regional equity
The 40-40-20 goal for OUS assumes that the goal will be met through statewide engagement. The State Board of Higher Education is committed to a set of goals for statewide public higher education that includes positive contributions to the economy and civic and cultural life of communities across the state. By providing access to higher education throughout the state, investments are being made in local economies, workforce development, and civic engagement.
- How do geographic and regional equity goals and concerns get factored into setting targets?

Demographic diversity and underserved populations
In order to reach the 40-40-20 goal, OUS institutions must (1) reduce their achievement gaps, (2) increase retention and graduate rates for all students, and (3) increase enrollment of more:
- Students from rural parts of Oregon
- Students of color
- Students from lower socio-economic backgrounds than current students
- Students who require more financial aid to realize their college aspirations
- Adult learners

While the aspirations within OUS are clear,
- How should these be factored into setting targets?

Targeted degrees
Funding for targeted degrees is now provided directly, making it easier to incorporate these directly into a 40-40-20 strategy.

Affordability
For the state’s overall 40-40-20 goal, access and affordability are key. They link directly back to the importance of students in middle and high school having the motivation and belief that college is and should be in their future.

The Shared Responsibility Model, control of tuition, and the set-aside of part of tuition increases for financial aid are the basis of the existing affordability policy for students.
However, the missing piece is that a mechanism does not exist to link state enrollment funding, tuition, and shared responsibility together in a way that effectively puts the burden on the legislature to be transparent about the number of degrees it is actually willing to fund. Nor is there any direct link to the actual costs of degrees. Without such a link, costs can continue to rise, with tuition and aid both chasing, and access becomes a variable rather than a guarantee or real target.

It is possible to address this in 40-40-20 by way of the weight given to students for whom price and cost are barriers. It is also possible to address, perhaps, through a strategy of paying for degrees.

**Quality of degree**

The quality of OUS degrees cannot suffer as a result of meeting the 40-40-20 goal. Questions that will need to be addressed in the future include:

- What consideration should be given to quality of degree, however measured? What is the future for moving more toward proficiency assessment for degrees?
- Should the idea of “value” of different types of degrees (majors, employability, etc.) be given more consideration?
- Should there be some weight for degrees with public service and/or research components in them?

**Allocating targets and improving performance**

Once a target for degrees is set or assumed for the state, how should responsibility be divided among OUS institutions? There is simplicity but no strategic reason for simply scaling up each institution’s existing share of degree production; there are strong reasons for not doing so, primarily that it may be neither the most efficient nor the most equitable. Potential factors to be weighed might include:

- **Fit with mission.** Should missions be more specific about expectations for 40-40-20? Should there be greater differentiation about roles in achieving regional and demographic equity, or carrying responsibility for access and affordability?
- **Efficiency.** Which institutions can provide additional degrees at least cost, including capital investment? Which institutions can contribute effectively and efficiently to the qualitative aspects of 40-40-20 (equity, diversity, high-value degrees, etc.)?
- **Institutional considerations.** If targets for 40-40-20 will affect competitive and financial position of institutions, how should this be factored?

Related to this is where leadership for improving institutional performance resides. At what level do we understand and act on how much and at what cost might enrollment rates, graduation rates, time-to-degree, etc., improve from:

- Changed pedagogy at universities, including course redesign, use of technology?
- Distance learning and on-line learning?
- A seamless K-16 pipeline?
• Effective Admissions Policy, Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management Systems?
• Retaining students taking diverse pathways to and through college?
• Accelerating and improving completion?

PROCESS
• Board agrees to specification of goal and outline of policy considerations
• Academic Strategies Committee produces framework report recommending method for setting targets and incorporating policy considerations identified above
• **Board** adopts 40-40-20 framework for use internally, by Institutional Governing Boards, HECC, and OEIB

###
Introduction:

House Bill 4059, passed by the 2012 Oregon Legislature, directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) to work with the State Board of Education, State Board of Higher Education, community college districts, independent not-for-profit institutions of higher education and the for-profit private career colleges to carry out specific goals for expanding and improving access to Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). One of the goals for the bill was to “increase the number of students who receive academic credit for prior learning... while ensuring that credit is awarded only for high quality course-level competencies.” The Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Advisory Committee, under the auspices of the Commission, identified a set of implementation strategies in response to legislative goals outlined in the bill. One of strategies was to develop policies and state standards in collaboration with the higher education institutions to ensure colleges and universities develop and maintain high quality Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) opportunities for students.

The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) directs Oregon postsecondary institutions that award CPL to adopt a set of standards for awarding Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). These standards shall build on the recognition and acknowledgement that credit awarded for prior learning is granted only for evidence of learning and not solely on the basis of experience. Foundational to these standards is faculty involvement and use of their expertise to assess credit awarded to students. Credit may be awarded through these types of assessments:

Several Credit by Assessment @ Postsecondary Level:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Credit – By-Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)
- ACE Credit Recommendation Service
- Industry Certifications

Credit by Agreement from Secondary Level:
- International Baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement

The HECC has identified eight standards that must be addressed by all Oregon postsecondary institutions. These areas include:
- Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning
- Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment
- Standard 3: Cost/Tuition and Fee Structure
- Standard 4: Transcription and Transferability
- Standard 5: Data Collection and Reporting
- Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development
- Standard 7: Oversight
- Standard 8: Transparency/Access
Higher Education Coordinating Commission  
Credit for Prior Learning Standards  

Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning  

For those areas in which Credit for Prior LearningCPL is awarded, Oregon’s postsecondary institutions shall develop institutional policies and procedures for awarding credit in response to the Credit for Prior LearningCPL Standards. The procedures must ensure credit is awarded only for high quality college-level competencies. The policies and procedures must be transparent to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders.  

Resources:  

Oregon’s Statewide International Baccalaureate Alignment Policy for the 2013-14 Academic Year:  
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/IBCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf  

Oregon’s Advanced Placement Course Credit for the 2013-14 Academic Year:  
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/APCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf
Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment

2.1 For those Oregon postsecondary institutions which award Credit for Prior Learning CPL, all credit must be based on sufficient evidence provided by the student and/or the institution. All evidence must be reviewed by the institution to document the credit awarded, and reviewed by the institution to document the credit awarded. Primary to the review, should be ability of The primary purpose of the review should be to have the student articulate and document the connection between how what they have learned in another setting is connected to the theoretical foundation, knowledge, and skills of the credit to be awarded.

2.2 Evidence provided by the institution The assessments must be based on nationally recognized assessment processes and/or procedures methods for each type of credit awarded for prior learning. Multiple assessment processes/tools may be used to determine the amount of credit awarded, including, but not limited to, nationally recognized tests, institutionally developed tests or final examinations, performance-based assessments, demonstrations, presentations, portfolios, and industry certifications.

2.3 Credit awarded shall be evaluated by appropriately qualified faculty or credential experts to determine the amount of credit to be awarded.

2.4 Institutions shall provide a guided process to assist students with organizing their documents for evaluation.

Resources:

Oregon’s Statewide International Baccalaureate Alignment Policy for the 2013-14 Academic Year:
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/IBCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf

Oregon’s Advanced Placement Course Credit for the 2013-14 Academic Year:
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/APCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf

Marylhurst University Prior Learning Assessment:
http://www.marylhurst.edu/academics/prior-learning-assessment/
Standard 3: Cost/Tuition and Fee Structure

Oregon’s postsecondary institutions that award Credit for Prior Learning CPL shall develop a cost/tuition fee structure. This structure must be transparent and accessible to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. Institutions should consider the following factors to identify direct and indirect costs related to assessing and awarding credit:

- Costs for student services to guide the student and to support the assessment process;
- Costs associated with faculty workload for the evaluation of Credit for Prior Learning CPL;
- Costs associated with recognizing and supporting faculty and staff who are involved in the assessment process including any costs related to training and staff development;
- Costs related to transcribing credit;
- Costs for developing portfolio infrastructure and conducting portfolio assessments; and
- Other costs associated with developing and assessing Credit for Prior Learning CPL such as challenge exams, review of ACE Credit Recommendations, etc.

Resources:

“Fees charged for assessment should be based on the services performed in the process and not determined by the amount of credit awarded.” (CAEL Ten Standards for Assessing Learning)

The Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning state the following:

- “The fees for assessment will be based on actual costs plus reasonable. The fees will be based on the amount of credit requested, not the amount of credit awarded.
- Fees should be published and consistently applied.
- Fees should be consistent to the extent possible across the system”
Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription

4.1 Oregon’s postsecondary institutions that award Credit for Prior Learning CPL shall develop articulation agreements with partnering institutions to promote transferability of CPL to ensure academic credit is awarded for only documented evidence based assessment of learning experiences or implement existing agreements developed among institutions to promote transferability.

4.2 For institutions awarding CPL, processes must be in place. Processes must be in place for a student to request credit for prior learning CPL for a course offered by the college in which the student is enrolled or will be enrolled from a college or university. The institution must be able to determine the applicability of credit for prior learning CPL towards a degree, certificate or elective credit and to determine how credits for prior learning are transferred from other institutions.

4.3 Academic credit will be awarded and transcripted only for those courses directly applicable to curriculum requirements at the college/university of enrollment and to the student’s declared certificate or degree program as outlined in college publications. Institutions are encouraged to accept transfer of credit whenever possible.

4.4 All documentation and files regarding a student’s prior learning credit will be maintained by the registrar’s office.

4.5 All academic credit that is awarded must be transcripted to comply with state, federal regulations and accreditation policies and standards. Institutions granting Credit for Prior Learning CPL shall identify the type of credit granted on the students’ transcripts. Notations on the transcript shall clearly identify the type of Credit for Prior Learning CPL Awarded. Types of Credit for Prior Learning CPL include:

Credit by Assessment @ Postsecondary Level:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Credit-by-Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)
- ACE Credit Recommendation Service
- Industry Certifications

Credit by Agreement @ Secondary Level:
- International Baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement
Resources:

- CAEL Assessment Standards
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Standards:

2.C.7 Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution’s regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students’ transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution’s review process.

2.C.8 The final judgment in accepting transfer credit is the responsibility of the receiving institution. Transfer credit is accepted according to procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality, relevance to the students’ programs, and integrity of the receiving institution’s degrees. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that the credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic quality, and level to credit it offers. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements between the institutions.
Standard 5: Data Collection & Reporting

Institutions granting Credit for Prior Learning CPL shall collect and report data on the types of credit award. Data to be collected include the number of credits granted for and the number of students who receive credit thru Credit for Prior Learning CPL on the following types:

- Portfolio
- Challenge Exams
- Military Credit for Prior Learning CPL
- International Baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement
- Credit granted for other Prior Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to be collected</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Exams</td>
<td>Credit granted thru the assessment of course student learning offered by the institution. Credit granted for tests of learning – including DSST / DANTES, CLEP, Excelsior, NYU Foreign Language, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Credit</td>
<td>Credit granted through evaluation of ACE published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs offered by non-collegiate agencies, both civilian employers and the military. Or credit awarded through the evaluation of military experiential learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Credit granted for International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Exams</td>
<td>Credit awarded thru the evaluation of Advanced Placement Exam scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Credit for Prior Learning</td>
<td>Credit granted for other prior learning experiences Not listed in other areas. Such as credit granted for industry certifications for proof of applied knowledge and skills in an industry-identified area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development

Institutions shall develop a policy and strategic plan for Faculty and Staff Development for granting credit for prior learning. Widespread, overarching knowledge of the institutional opportunities for developing, assessing and recommending credit for prior learning should be foundational to this plan.

Resources:

All personnel involved in the assessment of learning should pursue and receive adequate training and continuing professional development for the functions they perform. (CAEL Ten Standards for Assessing Learning).

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Standards:

2.C.7 It for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution’s regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students’ transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution’s review process.
Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 7: Oversight

Institutions granting Credit for Prior Learning CPL shall organize a cross-functional (student services, instruction, registrar, etc.) Credit for Prior Learning CPL Leadership Teams. The team shall be responsible for conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional Credit for Prior Learning CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices. The Higher Education Coordinating Commission shall review the accomplishments of each team through a periodic audit process to ensure credit is being awarded for high quality assessment activities.

Resources:

Tennessee Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations for “the Periodic review of PLA policies”. These recommendations can be found on page 13 of the 2012 Recommended Standards Report:

Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 8: Transparency/Access

Institutions granting Credit for Prior Learning CPL shall develop a communication plan for students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. This plan shall be developed by including faculty, and student services with a goal to build a widespread, overarching knowledge of the institutional opportunities for Credit for Prior Learning CPL. Information should be made electronically at all institutions and be searchable using the term “Credit for Prior Learning CPL”. Information on how to access the following shall be included:

- Institutional Credit for Prior Learning CPL Contacts;
- Cost/Tuition and Fee Structure(s); and
- Available Credit for Prior Learning CPL opportunities and the learning outcomes assessed.

Resources:

Tennessee Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations for “Maintaining Transparency and Consistency” These recommendations can be found on pages 13-14 of the 2012 Recommended Standards Report:

Glossary of Terms

**Advanced Placement (AP) Exams:** A series of tests developed by the College Board initially for AP High School courses. This is also a type of early postsecondary educational opportunity.

**American Council on Education (ACE) Guidelines:** Published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs and examinations offered by non-collegiate agencies (including civilian employers, the military, professional associations, and other workplace related-training).

**Council for Adult Experiential Learning (CAEL):** National nonprofit organization that works at all levels within the higher education, public, and private sectors. Responsible for the development of 10 standards related to Credit for Prior Learning.

**College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Exams:** Tests of college material offered by the College Board.

**Credit for Prior Learning (CPL):** Granting of college-level credit for prior learning. Per HB 4059, “prior learning” is defined as the knowledge and skills gained through work and life experience, through military training and experience and through formal and informal education and training from institutions of higher education in the United States and in other nations.

**Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Tests (DSSTs):** DSSTs are examinations administered by Prometric. While originally being restricted to active and retired military personnel, these tests are now available to civilians.

**Evidence-Based Assessment:** Assessment of learning that is based upon the confirmation of student’s knowledge of identified course outcomes, student proficiency and demonstration of course outcome knowledge.

**International Baccalaureate Programs (IB):** An internationally accepted qualification for entry into institutes of higher education, much like the AP program. Designed for students ages 16 to 19, it is a two-year curriculum that leads up to a final examination. To receive a diploma, students must achieve a
minimum score and have completed satisfactory participation in the creativity, action, service requirement.

**Portfolio:** Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside of the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month (and date if known)</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Framework Draft with Policy Areas Identified</td>
<td>Draft by Workgroup Approval by Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Conversation with NWCCU</td>
<td>Advisory Committee &amp; Members of Workgroup (target date of August 16th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>心底</td>
<td>Draft of Standards</td>
<td>Drafts by Workgroup Approval by Advisory Committee Approval by full HECC: August 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>= Need approval from HECC to proceed... Who will be representative/contact for communication to field?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3:</td>
<td>Tee-up Memo to CC Presidents, Provosts, Private Career Colleges, The Alliance</td>
<td>Come from the HECC – Donna likely send on their behalf electronically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Review of Final Drafts &amp; Communication to field</td>
<td>Workgroup and Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Draft Outline for Report to Legislature</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Governing Board Overview and Updates (SBE, SBHE, The Alliance, Private Career Colleges)</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4:</td>
<td>Memo and Standard Draft to Institutions &amp; Stakeholders (CIA, JBAC, JT. Provosts, etc.)</td>
<td>HECC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10:</td>
<td>Draft of the report for HECC Review</td>
<td>HECC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Draft for Report to Legislature</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14:</td>
<td>HECC Approves final report</td>
<td>HECC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5:</td>
<td>Feedback due from Institutions &amp; Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17:</td>
<td>Review of Feedback from Institutions Completed</td>
<td>Advisory Committee by the 17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month (and date if known)</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Who &amp; Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31:</td>
<td>Report due to Legislature</td>
<td>HECC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Brief the new “HECC” on the History of the CPL Journey.</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Co-Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Advisory Committee reviews themes, comments, feedback and concerns from Institutions – In light of institutional feedback, Advisory Committee makes recommendations for edits to Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>Final Standards are reviewed and approved by the Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>Process Review with HECC re: Standards.</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Co-Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Possible First Reading of Final Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Second Reading of Final Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Final Adoption of Final Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Considerations:**

- Given the December 5\(^{th}\) deadline from institutions (2 months is the minimum requested timeframe for feedback), we need to work our December review timeline around when HECC will meet to approve/accept the report for submission to the Legislature.

- OUS Policy Framework goes to SBHE in October
Background:
House Bill 4059, passed by the 2012 Oregon Legislature, directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) to work with the State Board of Education, State Board of Higher Education, community college districts, independent not-for-profit institutions of higher education and the for-profit private career colleges to carry out specific goals for expanding and improving access to Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). The HECC’s CPL Advisory Committee, comprised of higher education experts from around the state, worked to identify a set of strategies in response to legislative goals outlined in the bill. One of strategies was to develop policies and state standards in collaboration with the higher education institutions to ensure colleges and universities develop and maintain high quality CPL opportunities for students.

Currently, the HECC’s CPL Advisory Committee is seeking feedback on the proposed implementation strategy from stakeholders around the state, including but not limited to the State Board of Higher Education, OUS Provosts’ Council, enrollment managers, and registrars. A final report on CPL standards is to be delivered to the HECC in November, with a full report to the legislature in January.

Simultaneous to the HECC CPL Advisory Committee, the Oregon University System (OUS) convened a task force comprised of faculty and staff to study the impact and implementation of CPL on students and the universities they attend. In June 2013, OUS staff advanced the policy recommendation of the Task Force to the Board’s Academic Strategies Committee. This policy provides an “essential components” framework that guides campuses through the development of local policies that reflect institutional need.

Crosswalk:
In comparing the OUS policy to the HECC’s draft standards, it is clear that the framework provided by OUS informed the draft standards currently under review, expanding the essential components framework, and providing greater detail and clarity on the implementation of CPL. For a breakdown of the major components, and the differences between the two documents, please see the chart on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>OUS Policy</th>
<th>HECC Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **I. Guiding Principles for CPL. Number of standards/components** | 12 Essential Components  
  1. Guiding Principles  
  2. Types of Assessment Accepted  
  3. Standards/Criteria for Awarding CPL  
  4. Cost/Tuition Structure  
  5. CPL Transferability  
  6. CPL Transcription  
  7. Data Collection and Reporting  
  8. Faculty and Staff Development  
  9. Determine Authority  
  10. Transparency and Accessibility  
  11. Incentivizing CPL at institutions  
  12. Undertake Policy Review | 8 Standards  
  1. Credit for Prior Learning  
  2. Evidence-Based Assessment  
  3. Cost/Tuition and Fee Structure  
  4. Transferability and Transcription  
  5. Data Collection and Reporting  
  6. Faculty and Staff Development  
  7. Oversight  
  8. Transparency and Access |
| **II. Types of Assessment Accepted** | Types of Assessment largely consistent with HECC Standards.  
  - Portfolio-based  
  - Standardized exams (AP/IB, CLEP, DANTES, DSST)  
  - Challenge exams  
  - Published guides (ACE, military and corporate training; ACE, non-collegiate)  
  - Other, emerging learning | Types of Assessment largely consistent with OUS Policy. Uses “Industry Certification” as mode of assessment. Does not use broader category of “emerging learning.” Expands section to include the responsibility of the student, the responsibility of the institution, and how credit will be awarded. |
<p>| <strong>III. Standards &amp; Criteria for Awarding CPL</strong> | Details essential components: Enrollment in CPL, types of credit awarded for CPL, number of credits, residency requirements, etc. | Did not explicitly include categories provided by OUS. Not consistently measured across types of institutions statewide. |
| <strong>IV. Cost/Tuition Structure</strong> | Calls for a tuition and fees structure for CPL. | Requires development of a tuition cost/tuition structure that considers: costs associated with: student services for assessment, faculty workload, recognizing and supporting faculty and staff involved in assessment and training, transcribing credit, developing portfolio infrastructure and assessment, other costs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>OUS Policy</th>
<th>HECC Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. CPL Transferability</td>
<td>Calls for the development of strategy.</td>
<td>OUS component V and VI were combined to create Standard #4, Transferability and Transcription. Provides guidelines for awarding academic credit, and how credit is identified on transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. CPL Transcription</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Data Collection and Reporting</td>
<td>Identifies importance of data in reporting on CPL.</td>
<td>Requires institutions to collect and report data on types of credits awarded, number of credits granted, and number of students receiving CPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Faculty and Staff Development</td>
<td>Identifies need to build capacity among faculty/staff, and provide physical space and support for developing shared assessment tools.</td>
<td>Required to develop policy and strategic plan for Staff Development for granting CPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Determine Authority</td>
<td>Calls for identification of decision-making authority and ongoing advisory group.</td>
<td>Institutions must organize a cross-functional CPL Leadership Team responsible for conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices. HECC to review accomplishments through periodic audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Transparency and Accessibility</td>
<td>Details essential components: access, transparency/expectations, dissemination of information, and other marketing or promotional decisions.</td>
<td>Requires development of communication plan for students, faculty, staff and stakeholders, with the goal of widespread knowledge of the institutional opportunities for CPL. Includes institutional contacts, cost/tuition structure, available CPL opportunities and learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Incentivizing CPL at Institutional Level</td>
<td>Calls for plan.</td>
<td>Not included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>