

**System Council of Chief Academic Officers
Minutes**

**Wednesday, March 12, 2014
8:45 a.m.**

**Kathy Rupp Conference Room
Kansas Board of Regents**

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room, Kansas Board of Regents, Topeka, Kansas, at 8:45 a.m. on Wednesday, March 12, 2014.

Members Present:

Karla Fisher, Butler Community College
David Cordle, Emporia State University
Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University
Chris Crawford, Fort Hays State University
Tony Vizzini, Wichita State University

April Mason, Kansas State University
Jeffrey Vitter, University of Kansas
Randy Pembroke, Washburn University
Jon Marshall, Allen County Community College
Marilyn Mahan, Manhattan Area Technical College

Board Staff

Gary Alexander, Karla Wiscombe, Susan Fish, Jacqueline Johnson, Zoe Thompson, Kathy Hund, and Cynthia Farrier

Others Present:

Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Justin Honey, Pittsburg State University; Bill Backlin, Cloud County Community College; Jim Williams, Emporia State University; Andy Anderson, Johnson County Community College; Alysia Johnston, Coffeyville Community College; Mike Ahern, Dodge City Community College; Duane Dunn, Seward County Community College; Shala Mills, Fort Hays State University; Susan Bradley, Butler County Community College; Mike Calvert, Pratt Community College; and Penny Quinn, Barton County Community College

Approve Minutes of February 12, 2014 Meeting Minutes

April Mason moved, and David Cordle seconded the motion, to approve the February 12, 2014 minutes as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Updates

Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) Update

Karla Wiscombe updated SCOCAO regarding the status of the Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC). TAAC will meet Thursday, March 13th, and will focus on future transfer courses to be reviewed at its fall September 12th meeting. Subcommittees are working on improving communication between TAAC and the institutions' faculty and advisors and reviewing issues arising from difficulties with transfer this year for improving quality assurance. Breeze Richardson will meet with TAAC regarding marketing methods.

The new transfer courses with equivalencies and outcomes have been posted to the Kansas Board of Regents website effective summer 2014.

Developmental Education Working Group Update

Susan Fish gave SCOCAO an update of the Developmental Education Working Group. At the February 28th Working Group meeting they discussed the criteria for choosing strategies in instruction and advising, and how to implement and support the pilots of these strategies. The Reading/Writing Subgroup presented its report. The Working Group also discussed possible recommendations for state developmental education policies. The next meeting will be the end of March.

Prior Learning Assessment – Zoe Thompson

Zoe Thompson, Kathy Hund and Cynthia Farrier presented an overview of the Prior Learning Assessment Kansas Survey.

Zoe Thompson reiterated the Kansas Prior Learning Assessment Project objective is to write a Kansas guidebook for policy recommendations and implementation steps to have consistency across institutions. At its February meeting, SCOCAO asked for the “Prior Learning Assessment Kansas Survey” and its results. Handouts were provided and are attached to these minutes.

Kathy Hund indicated the purpose of the survey was to obtain basic information about the current use of PLA in Kansas. Board staff adapted a survey from the *College Productivity Resource Guide* and information provided by Jobs for the Future.

Cynthia Farrier provided some clarification regarding the survey results:

- Most institutions accept some type of PLA
- The majority of the institutions do not accept PLA as transfer credits
- Only one school reported it accepts College Level Examination Program (CLEP) according to Board policy
- Institutions are not consistent in recording PLA – some record PLA on transcripts and some do not, which creates difficulty in distinguishing PLA credits for transfer students
- Conclusion – anomalies exist in how the institutions accept and record PLA

A second survey of measures that can be reasonably supported by data was conducted in Kansas in February 2014 entitled “Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Data Survey. It was sent to institutional research officers and registrars. The above mentioned handouts include the summary of the survey results which are attached to these minutes.

The PLA Task Force is considering recommendations:

- Establishing another task force to look at:
 - Best practices
 - What we are doing across the state
 - Consistency of definitions of PLA across the state and how it is recorded on transcripts
 - Encourage broader transferability
- Quality Validation Standards
- Transferability
- Ensure Kansas is aligning with national standards for best practices

Kathy Hund pointed out to SCOCAO the next two meetings on the Timeline:

- April 1 – full steering committee will meet to review all of the recommendations
- April 16 – completed draft to share at SCOCAO

Other Business

There was no other business.

Meeting adjourned at 9:13 a.m.

Prior Learning Assessment Kansas Survey Results

Goals for the Kansas Prior Learning Assessment Project supported by Jobs for the Future include:

- Increase use of Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) as a proven tool to increase numbers of degrees and credentials earned by Kansans (Board of Regents Foresight 2020 goal)
- Encourage appropriate PLA use to award credit for college-level learning with supportive standards, principles and procedures
- Improve access to PLA and transparency of information for students and families
- Promote consistent use of PLA among institutions

To obtain basic information about current use of PLA, the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) staff adapted a survey from the *College Productivity Resource Guide* and information provided by Jobs for the Future. In August, 2013 all public universities, community and technical colleges were invited to participate in the survey, with 21 surveys completed. The questions and a summary of the responses are presented below. Copies of the complete comments are available from KBOR staff. Details from a similar survey conducted by KBOR Academic Affairs in February 2013 are also incorporated here.

Note: These survey responses provide a snap shot picture of current practices of PLA use in public institutions as reported by those responding to the survey. To develop a more complete understanding of current use, further clarification and follow-up is indicated.

Q1 Are Prior Learning Assessments (PLA) utilized by your institution?

Yes	90%	19 responses
No	10%	2

One college uses the term "Credit for Work Experience" rather than the comprehensive PLA term.

Q2 What PLA methods does your institution use to evaluate prior learning and award credit?

Individualized student portfolios or portfolio assessments	38%	8 responses
Evaluation of corporate and military training	90%	19
Program evaluations	19%	4
Challenge exams (course final exams or department level tests)	48%	10
Standardized exams (e.g., AP, CLEP, DANTES, DSST exams)	76%	16
We don't offer prior learning	10%	2

Colleges highlighted the use of American Council on Education (ACE) recommendations for military credit, Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Exam Placement (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and credit for technical training/competencies. One college reported that AP

and CLEP exams for lab science courses must be accompanied by the student enrolling in the lab portion to get full credit.

Q3 What are the costs for PLA at your institution? (Costs may include fees for the assessment itself, evaluation of prior learning skills, transcription or posting fees, and other administrative costs.) Please describe:

Fees assessed range from no fees charged to evaluate PLA credits to the full cost of tuition for the course, plus evaluation fees. Some colleges charge only for the exam, e.g., \$25, some do not charge to evaluate a military transcript or corporate training, some charge fees only after the evaluated portfolio is approved and then a fee per credit hour is charged. Tuition charged for transcribing PLA coursework ranges from no charge to full tuition. Others report a tuition charge of one half the course cost or a \$25 fee for transcribing. One college reported charging 50% of tuition at PLA application and 50% due to transcript the course. Fees to evaluate a Prior Learning Portfolio range from \$0 to \$75 for the portfolio to \$50 per credit hour. Survey results are summarized in the chart below but caution should be exercised in drawing conclusions on the small sample.

Type of fees	Number of institutions reporting use of this fee	Examples of fee
No fee	10 institutions	
Exam fee only	4 institutions	\$25 for challenge exams
Portfolio evaluation fees	4 institutions	½ of course cost, \$75 for review, \$50 per credit hour
Full or partial tuition	5 institutions	Partial fees, full fees
Transcribing fee	1 institution	\$25 fee
Administration fees	1 institution	\$15 plus standardized exam fee

Q4 How are credits earned through PLA reflected on the student transcript? Is the PLA data stored electronically? Please describe:

Most colleges report PLA credit on the transcript similar to a transfer credit and indicate a P, CR, or similar notation for credit; a few colleges offer grades for sufficient scores on standardized exams (AP or CLEP). Tests such as AP or CLEP may be noted and military training may be credited to the branch of service. Some PLA department challenge exams are recorded by department and not on the transcript. Several colleges reported using a PLA or Advanced Standing Credit denotation on the transcript. Most institutions record PLA data electronically or are in transition to an electronic system.

Q5 How does your institution apply your PLA policies and practices...

across all divisions and departments	76%	16 responses
policies vary among departments at your institution	19%	4
N/A	10%	2

Most colleges report they have consistency in policies but variation by department due to subject exams, evaluations, CTE accreditations, etc. Some colleges report varying practices across the institution because of “dynamics and differences of each venue.” Others report that standardized exam results (e.g., CLEP) must be reviewed by the academic department faculty and chairperson.

Q6 Do you have a Prior Learning Center or single point of contact for providing PLA services at your institution?

Yes	65%	13 responses
No	25%	5
NA	10%	1

Most institutions are providing PLA services with a single point of contact in the Registrar’s office while others direct students to various offices within Academic Affairs including the Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Testing, or Student Services/Advising center. Some reported there is no centralized contact and students’ access information through the program while one college is in the process of designating a single contact as they expand their PLA services. While the survey results are inconclusive, it appears that no institution has a PLA Center per se.

Q7 Is information for PLA posted on your website? If so, please provide URL.

Yes	65%	13 responses
No	25%	5
N/A	10%	2

Many colleges include PLA information on their website, usually in their college catalog or on the admissions page.

Q8 Do applicable PLA credits fulfill degree/major requirements? (PLA credits may not be applied because of institutional and system policies limiting their application to general education and elective requirements only.)

Yes	90%	19 responses
No	0%	0
NA	10%	2

Generally, colleges report that PLA credits apply to equivalent coursework with some limitations (reported in next question). Courses requiring a “C” or better must be evaluated by the department. One university awards advanced standing (37 credit hours) for nursing students who have passed the NCLEX-RN exam.

Q9 Does your institution cap the number of PLA credits that can be earned by the student?

Yes	70%	16 responses
No	14%	3
NA	10%	2

Colleges reported the following descriptions:

No cap on credits earned but do cap the number of credits applied toward degree;

Maximum PLA hours cap: 15 hrs, 24 hrs, 30 hrs of 125 total, 37 hrs maximum;
up to 50% of program of study requirement,

CLEP limit – 12 hrs, 16 hrs, 17 courses

AP limits – 12 hrs

Military credit – 10 hrs, 15 hrs maximum, 4 hrs of P.E., rest is elective

Degree limits – 6 CR hrs for Technical Certificate; 12 CR hrs for AAS

Q10 If your institution has residency requirements; do you allow PLA credits to fulfill these requirements? (Some colleges have a requirement that a student must take a certain number of credits at the degree granting institution.)

Yes	5%	1 response
No	62%	13
No residency requirements	24%	5
NA	10%	2

Residency requirements vary from none to “student must have earned credit and have a transcript at our institution” to “15 of the last 24 credit hours from our institution.”

Q11 Do you accept transfer PLA credits granted by other institutions? (Because of accreditation requirements and internal policies, institutions may have a cap on the number of PLA credits accepted for transfer from other institutions, or they may not accept any PLA credits in transfer.)

Yes	42%	8 responses
No	56%	11

While 42% of institutions reported accepting appropriate PLA credit from an accredited institution, many require evidence and original documentation be sent to the college for re-evaluation (official military transcripts or national examination documents). Institutions have differences on PLA policy limits (e.g., up to 17 courses for CLEP). Some may require an evaluation of the competency requirements at the institution.



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Data Survey Results Summary

Background information: The Kansas Board of Regents has clearly established goals for increasing the higher education attainment among Kansas citizens and outlined in Foresight 2020. The January 2014 Progress Report names Prior Learning Assessment as an important strategy for continuing to increase the number of students who earn credentials or degrees.

Working with Jobs for the Future (JFF), the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) has charged a steering committee with developing a guidebook that recommends best practices regarding PLA. It is expected that many of the recommendations will align with PLA policy recommendations of the Council for Adult & Experiential Learning (CAEL). The goals of the steering committee include promoting quality assessments and standardized practices as well as defining uniform measures for evaluating the effectiveness of PLA, using common data points.

In order to inform the committee regarding measures that can be reasonably supported by data, the committee surveyed institutional research officers and registrars from public postsecondary institutions in Kansas in February 2014. Chief academic officers and presidents were copied on the survey request. The committee will make recommendations based upon the responses. If adopted, the guidebook will include the recommendation that KBOR engage a committee of institutional research officers and registrars to develop data standards and common metrics for PLA.

Summary of Responses: Thirty three institutions responded to the survey, a 97% response rate. Nearly half of the respondents (48.5%) award PLA upon enrollment. Another 30% indicated some type of delay. Several cited specific residency requirements such as 6-15 hours of credit in residency.

When asked whether the data was stored in the student information system, nearly all (94%) answered affirmatively. When asked whether the type of PLA (e.g., credit by exam, military transcript, portfolio, etc.) was denoted in the SIS or on the transcript, 85% denote in the SIS, but 94% denote the type on the transcript. The manner in which the credit is denoted varies widely and with PLA type. Some record it as a single category, such as 'advanced standing' while at least one indicates only the exam scores on the transcript. Some who don't record the specific type did not see it as a barrier, given enough time to update their systems.

Most institutions articulate the credit and store the articulations in the SIS and on the transcript (76% and 70%, respectively).

★ LEADING HIGHER EDUCATION ★

All respondents accept some form of PLA with the most common being credit by exam; however, only 24% of institutions accept PLA from another institution as transfer credit. For those institutions who do accept PLA as transfer credit, they are selective on the type of PLA credits accepted.

Two options were posed for data and metrics tracking. A majority (64%) prefer that that KBOR include PLA courses in its data collection and that KBOR calculate the metrics. The minority (33%) prefer that institutions calculate its own metrics. For either option a majority rate the complexity as somewhat difficult with 1-2 years lead time required in order to allow for system changes necessary for data recordation, determination of consistent definitions, and programming necessary to extract data and calculate metrics.

When asked whether respondents are interested in serving on a committee to determine state-wide data standards, definitions, and common metrics for tracking of PLA, one-third answered in the affirmative.

Kansas Board of Regents
PLA Data Survey Summary Results

		Respondents=33	Non-Response=1
		Affirmative Responses	
			% of Respondents
1. When do you award PLA?	Upon Enrollment	16	48.5%
	Delay	10	30.3%
	Other	9	27.3%
2. Are PLA credits stored electronically and noted in SIS and on transcript?	2a. Electronic?	32	97.0%
	2b. In SIS?	31	93.9%
	2c. Denote Type In SIS?	28	84.8%
	2c. Denote Type On Transcript?	31	93.9%
2d. Record as an articulated course?	In SIS?	25	75.8%
	On Transcript?	23	69.7%
2e. Accept PLA transfer credit w/out independent documentation?	Accept?	8	24.2%
	For Some (i.e. Partnership)	3	9.1%
	Regionally Accredited	5	15.2%
	All Accredited	3	9.1%
	Varies w/ type	4	12.1%
	Other - noted	4	12.1%
3a. Include course record in KHEDS?	Rank 1 (Most Preferred)	21	63.6%
	Rank 2 (Less Preferred)	10	30.3%
3a. Level of complexity	Easy	2	6.1%
	Somewhat Easy	2	6.1%
	Moderate	10	30.3%
	Somewhat Difficult	12	36.4%
	Difficult	5	15.2%
3a. Lead Time to Accomplish	6 months	3	9.1%
	9 months	3	9.1%
	1 year	13	39.4%
	18 months	5	15.2%
	2 years	8	24.2%
3b. Institutions calculate own metrics.	Rank 1 (Most Preferred)	11	33.3%
	Rank 2 (Less Preferred)	20	60.6%
3b. Level of complexity	Easy	3	9.1%
	Somewhat Easy	1	3.0%
	Moderate	11	33.3%
	Somewhat Difficult	4	12.1%
	Difficult	11	33.3%
3b. Lead Time to implement	6 months	4	12.1%
	9 months	5	15.2%
	1 year	5	15.2%
	18 months	5	15.2%
	2 years	11	33.3%
4. Interested in serving?	Yes	11	33.3%
	No	19	57.6%

As of March 5, 2014

Draft Timeline - Prior Learning Assessment Steering Committee

Date	Action	Who
Nov, 2013	Prepare 1-page definition and charge for each subgroup, summary of deliverables	Kathy and KBOR workgroup
Before Dec 4	Subgroup chairs review and edit	Kathy will call each chair for feedback
Dec 4	Subgroup chairs review assignments for each group, prepare list of experts needed, possible dates, process and communications	Kathy and subgroup chairs, KBOR workgroup team leaders
Dec 5-13	Update survey, conduct research	Kathy with workgroup
Dec 18	Present to Faculty Senate presidents	Zoe
Dec 19	Present to Transfer and Articulation Taskforce	Zoe
January	All Subgroups conduct 1st (and 2 nd ?) meetings	Kathy, Chairs, KBOR team leader
January	Expert webinars – CAEL Jan 14; ACE Jan 16, CLEP Feb 3, First subgroup committee meetings Jan 28 (all 3 subgroups)	Kathy arrange, all participate
February	All Subgroups conduct 2 nd & 3rd meetings - weekly calls?	Kathy, Chairs, team leader
Feb 12	Present update to SCOCAO	Zoe
Mar 12	Present update to SCOCAO- requested items	Zoe, Karla, Kathy?
March 14	All subgroup recommendations due to Kathy	Kathy and workgroup
March 26	Complete compilation of subgroup recommendations and send to full PLA committee	Kathy and workgroup review
April 1	Full Steering Committee review of all recommendations – Washburn Tech, Topeka	Kathy, Chairs, workgroup, all members
April 16	Present draft guidebook to SCOCAO and BAASC; 8:30 and 10:30 am respectively	Zoe and chairs, all members
April 28	Complete edits	Kathy and workgroup
May 14	Present revisions to BAASC if indicated	Zoe, Chairs, workgroup
June 18	Present to Board	Blake
Summer seminars	Technical assistance based on committees recommendations	
May 28*	CAEL 1 day seminar in conjunction with the National Aviation Consortium – WATC, Wichita	Kathy, Sheree Utash
June 24*	ACE 1 day seminar	Kathy
	Plan implementation guides, faculty professional development	

*Tentative- to be confirmed