



Docket Item:

Credit for Prior Learning

Summary:

As part of the ongoing oversight by and partnership with the Student Success and Institutional Collaboration Subcommittee, the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Advisory Committee provides periodic updates to the SSIC on the progress being made in achieving the goals outlined in HB 4059.

Since the last report to the SSIC in March, progress has been made in several areas related to CPL. The following will provide a highlighted summary and recap of the activities:

Advisory Committee:

The Advisory Committee has spent several months learning about various proficiency-based assessment models. In May the Committee received presentations from both the Eastern and Willamette Promises regarding their models with a particular focus on assessment and transcription of credit. In June, Western Governors University provided an overview of their assessment processes and policies. As a result of these presentations, the Advisory Committee Learning continues to believe that learning which takes place concurrently with high school learning is not viewed as CPL. To further these conversations and to assist with the clarification of what is and what is not CPL, the CPL Advisory Committee has invited members of the Chief Academic Officers/Provosts Accelerated Learning Workgroup to join them during the October CPL Advisory Committee meeting to further this discussion in the hopes of providing additional clarification as it relates to CPL and new and emerging models of accelerated learning.

In addition, the Advisory Committee has been focused on organizing the upcoming American Council on Education (ACE) event. This event which is scheduled for November 13, 2015 will focus on the Ace academic review process and transcript services. This event is the second of two events approved by the full Commission in June 2014. At this time, the Advisory Committee is estimating 250 attendees from both private and public postsecondary institutions.

As required by HB 4059, the Advisory Committee has also begun its work on the 2015 CPL Legislative Report. The report will be organized around the goals outlined in HB4059 and include additional sections which will provide background information, funding and cost analysis information and recommendations for next steps in 2016.

Pilot Project:

Year One of the CPL Pilot Project has come to a close with promising results. Of the original eleven participating institutions, nine completed year one and of those nine all have completed an end of year survey.

STUDENT SUCCESS & INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION SUBCOMMITTEE

September 9, 2015

The results of this survey will be reviewed at an upcoming CPL Advisory Committee meeting and will be included as part of the 2015 CPL Legislative Report.

As result of the positive feedback received regarding the Pilot Project, the Advisory Committee has recommended a second year of the Pilot Project, to allow additional institutions to participate. At this time, staff have been approached by at least one institutions from all four postsecondary sectors indicating an interest in participating in “Cohort B” of the Pilot Project. In addition, all nine Year One Pilot Project institutions (“Cohort A”) have indicated an interest in continuing on for a second year both to mentor the incoming institutions but also to work together with a focus on communications and transparency plans as they relate to CPL offerings at the institutions. The Co-Chairs of the Advisory Committee will be working with staff to contact institutions via “sector contacts” to solicit institutions who wish to participate in Cohort B. A copy of the timelines associated with both Cohorts is attached.

Funding & Cost Analysis

The Funding & Cost Analysis (F & CA) Workgroup has finished its analysis of the F&CA Worksheets that were completed by members of the CPL Pilot Project. The Workgroup compiled the analysis into a summary document. The summary underlines the significant amount of institutional investment in the area of CPL especially for costs associated with faculty salaries and for those institutions which are just beginning to offer CPL or are expanding their CPL offerings, the current institutional investment is much greater. A copy of the full summary document is attached.

Presentations

Staff and representatives from four of the CPL Pilot Project institutions presented at the OrACRAO (Registrars) conference in May. The presentation highlighted lessons learned and also the advantages of participating in the Pilot Project. In addition, staff will be presenting at the upcoming National Council for Continuing Education and Training highlighting the CPL Standards and how the recent creation of the Noncredit Training Certificate can be structured in a way to create pathways to credits for students via the use of CPL.

Staff Recommendation:

No action is needed at this time.

CPL Pilot Project Overview

Year Two

Cohort A

General Overview and Purpose:

The purpose of the pilot project is to identify challenges or barriers associated with implementing the CPL Standards including any organizational issues, costs associated with awarding CPL credit, staff development needs, student issues encountered to assess and award credit, strategies used to plan for adopting the standards or any other problems or concerns related to fully implementing the standards. The CPL Advisory Committee is also interested in learning about how the cross-functional teams contributed to implementing the standards and to what extent the various sectors of the institution were involved in making decisions about awarding CPL, i.e. advising, registration, faculty, etc.

Year Two for Cohort A brings the original “pilot institutions” into a second year where they will focus on communication tools which will assist in transparency and communication with faculty, students, staff and stakeholders.

The Deliverables:

A set of communication tools that will be developed by the pilot institutions that can be used as templates statewide to provide information related institutional CPL offerings.

Fall 2015	Conference call in late September to finalize details for Year Two <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify communication needs• Messaging ideas• Timeline(s)• ACE Transcription Event
Winter 2015	Conference Call in late January/early February Begin development of communication tools for CPL Pilot Project Messaging ideas for CPL statewide & at institutional levels
Spring 2016	Conference Call in late March or early April Revise communication tools and obtain HECC “endorsement” of them.
Summer 2016	Final Conference Call in late May or Early June Year Two Wrap-Up

CPL Pilot Project Overview

Cohort B

General Overview and Purpose:

The purpose of the pilot project is to identify challenges or barriers associated with implementing the CPL Standards including any organizational issues, costs associated with awarding CPL credit, staff development needs, student issues encountered to assess and award credit, strategies used to plan for adopting the standards or any other problems or concerns related to fully implementing the standards. The CPL Advisory Committee is also interested in learning about how the cross-functional teams contributed to implementing the standards and to what extent the various sectors of the institution were involved in making decisions about awarding CPL, i.e. advising, registration, faculty, etc.

The Deliverables:

- Develop a plan to adopt the standards
- Develop implementation plan (Purpose: to help monitor progress towards implementation of Standards)
- Convene cross-functional team
- Identify the needs for staff development & training. Develop a plan to meet these needs and/or provide the training or identify what the state can do to help meet these needs.
- Submit quarterly reports on reaching milestones in implementation plan (POC responsible for completing quarterly reports)
- Participate in ACE CPL events on November 13, 2015.
- Complete exit survey

Length of Cohort B (considerations include the development of the catalog):

- Fall 2015- Summer 2016
 - Quarterly Conference Calls
 - ACE Event
 - Adoption of the CPL Standards.

CPL Pilot Project Timeline Cohort B

(Dates to be filled in as available)

Date/Event	Outcomes/Agenda Topics
Orientation Conference Call September - October	Overview Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss Timeline, etc. Implementation Plan Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify what format will be helpful Quarterly Reports/CPL Tracking Sheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POC responsible for completion and submission Scheduling of next call
End of October	Donna to send implementation plan & CPL templates
November 13, 2015	ACE Transcription Event in Portland
November 16, 2015	Initial Implementation Plan Updates are due
Fall 2015-16 Conference Call (TBA: 1 st week in December)	Implementation Plan Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on development • Discussion regarding identified barriers and successes in plan development
December 15, 2015	Changes/edits to Implementation Plan Updates due (if applicable)
February 1, 2016	Implementation Plan Updates are due (Winter Update) Data Tracking Sheets are due for Fall Term
Winter 2015-16 Conference Call (TBA: Mid-February)	Quarterly check-ins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Quarterly Progress Reports (reports due 2 weeks prior to call) • Hiccups & Successes to date – • Progress towards Standards Adoption
May 2, 2016	Implementation Plan Updates are due (Spring Update) Data Tracking Sheets are due for Winter Term
Spring 2016 Conference Call (TBA: Mid-May)	Quarterly check-ins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Quarterly Progress Reports (reports due 2 weeks prior to call) • Hiccups & Successes to date – • Progress towards Standards Adoption
Winter 2015-16 Conference Call (TBA: Mid-May)	Implementation Plan Updates are due Data Tracking Sheets are due for Spring Term
June 15, 2015	Exit Surveys are due.

As of August 11, 2015

Credit for Prior Learning Pilot Project
Summary of Funding and Cost Analysis Findings
June 2015

Background:

The Funding and Cost Analysis (F&CA) Worksheet was developed as a mechanism to gather information from Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Pilot Project institutions regarding the costs, activities and fees associated with credit for prior learning. The Worksheet was drafted using guidance from the CPL F&CA Workgroup¹ and feedback from the community college business officers. The Worksheets were sent to the pilot institutions in late 2014 and returned in February – March 2015. Eight of the eleven original participating institutions provided information within the Worksheet.

The Worksheet is broken down by the tasks associated with CPL such as marketing, advising, assessment, transcription, etc. for the various types of CPL. The Worksheet was designed to gather information related to faculty and staff time, position classifications, costs associated with staff development, processes used to complete tasks, estimated institutional costs associated with tasks and fees charged to students. The information gathered is not meant to provide a concrete methodology for estimating CPL costs at institutions, but as a mechanism for the CPL F&CA Workgroup and CPL Advisory Committee to gain a further understanding of how institutions approach CPL activities and how these activities are at their institutions.

Findings

Credit by Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)

Institutions which offer CPL via Credit by Exam reported that the majority of the institutional investment for this activity is within the assessment of learning. The assessment is usually conducted by faculty; however a few of the institutions reported also using a Program Director or Department Chair. The majority of the institutions reporting this type of CPL indicated that while there is significant investment of faculty/staff time (ranging anywhere from approximately .5 to 6 hours, depending on exam development needs) they do not charge a fee to students for Credit by Exam. One institution did indicate they charge a fee that ranges anywhere from \$120 to \$495 per exam.

Industry Certifications

CPL that is granted for industry certifications requires significant institutional investment in the area of assessment. Institutions which offer CPL for industry certification report that the total time invested per student in this area ranges anywhere from one to a little over three hours. While the initial review and assessment of industry certifications is time-intensive, institutions report that once the initial evaluation

¹ The CPL F&CA Workgroup is a workgroup of the CPL Advisory Committee whose purpose is to assist the CPL Advisory Committee in identifying the factors related to funding and costs associated with CPL. Membership includes: Linda Samek (Chair); Shelly Chabon; Diane Crabtree; Kendra Cawley; Lynn Browne; Marilyn Davis; Karen Stewart; Rebecca Mathern; Jackie Fowler; Cyndi Andrews and Donna Lewelling.

of industry certifications is completed the information can be used for additional students as long as the industry certification requirements and course learning outcomes do not change. This allows for the institutional investment to decrease over time should these variables remain constant. While one institution reported that they do not charge for the evaluation of industry certifications, others reported fees ranging from \$10 to \$40 for transcription of courses with two institutions reporting learning assessment fees from \$25 to \$50 per credit.

Institutional Challenge Exams

Institutions which reported in this area indicated that the majority of investment of faculty time lies within the development of the challenge exam. Once developed, institutions reported the learning assessment takes approximately 60-90 minutes per student. Both full-time and part-time faculty members are used to develop the exams and conduct the assessments. While not included on the worksheet, follow-up discussions with institutions indicate that faculty may or may not be paid for the development and evaluation of challenge exams based on their employment status (part-time vs. full-time). Fees charged to students vary widely within this type of CPL. Two institutions reported charging full tuition and fees, while others reported charging assessment fees of \$25 to \$91 per credit. Another institution reported charging a flat fee of \$100 for the activities associated with this type of CPL.

Military Credit (American Council on Education (ACE) Credit Recommendation Service)

All of the institutions reported offering CPL for Military Credit. The amount of institutional investment varied significantly among institutions. This may be due to a variety of factors including but not limited to the methodology used for the calculations associated with staff time as well as staff experience within this area. During follow-up conversations, institutions shared that once crosswalks are developed for Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) codes, the information is saved to assist with the evaluation of recommendations for future veterans. This institutional front-end investment is very similar to those of industry certifications and challenge exams. The majority of the institutions do not charge a fee for ACE transcript evaluation or related institutional transcription. ACE does not charge a fee for services related to military credit, but does charge students with "civilian" training a \$40 registration fee (which includes the first transcript requested) and a \$15 fee for each transcript requested after that for courses which have been evaluated by ACE.²

Portfolios

The majority of institutions currently do not offer CPL for portfolio evaluation. However, for those which do offer this type of CPL, the institutions reported that a significant amount of time goes into the evaluation of the portfolios. One institution reported close to six hours per student for each portfolio evaluation that is conducted. Students are charged a fee ranging from \$25 to \$120 per credit evaluated. One institution indicated that an additional charge of 30% of tuition for each course is assessed for transcription services. While some institutions approach the development of portfolios through a portfolio development course, each portfolio that is evaluated is done so on a very individual basis, which makes it difficult for the institution to decrease costs associated with this CPL type over time

² Source: American Council on Education Registry and Transcript System

Students may also be charged a fee to enroll in the portfolio development course and an additional per credit fee for the assessment of the portfolio.

Professional Licensure

Institutions which reported that they grant CPL for professional licensure indicated that they follow very similar processes and procedures as CPL for industry certifications. Like CPL for industry certification, the initial review and assessment of licenses is time-intensive with institutions reporting that once the initial evaluation is completed, the information can be used for additional students as long as licensure requirements and course learning outcomes do not change. Unlike institutional challenge exams however, the fees charged for this type of CPL vary greatly from one institution reporting \$10 per credit and another reporting a fee of \$226 per credit.

Position Classification & Employment Status:

The positions and employment status of those involved in CPL tasks at institutions appear to be dependent on the size of the institution. Smaller institutions appeared to rely heavily on their Admissions and Registrar's Office to carry out the tasks associated with CPL. A few of the institutions indicated that classified and faculty staff were involved in all aspects of CPL. There did not appear to be a trend in relation to whether these positions were full or part-time. While Portland State University currently has a grant program supporting its current CPL activities and Marylhurst University has a Prior Learning Assessment Department, the majority of the institutions do not have staff dedicated solely to the area of Credit for Prior Learning.

Costs Associated with Faculty & Staff Development

Only one institution reported estimates associated with Faculty & Staff Development. The amounts reported indicated that a larger institutional investment is necessary for the areas of industry certifications and institutional challenge exams. Many other institutions report that they are working to imbed CPL training into their regular fall in-service schedules so disaggregating costs become difficult; however, it is important to note a significant institutional investment is required to bring together faculty and staff for any purpose. This appears to be an emerging promising practice and may be the best use of institutional resources for those institutions in which CPL is a small part of institutional offerings.

Summary

Although the information received from institutions varied greatly and data was difficult to obtain even though a standardized form was used, it is very apparent from the information collected that there is a significant amount of institutional investment in the area of CPL especially for costs associated with faculty salaries. Faculty involvement is at the heart of CPL Assessment. According to the human resource data in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Data center for US institutions who have full-time first-time undergrads, the Average Weighted Monthly Salary for All Full-Time Instructional

Staff in 2013-2014 was \$5,945.³ It is important to note that this is a national average and does not include all institutions, only those which reported for this measure.

Those institutions with a longer history of CPL have a great deal of expertise and have created streamlined processes which have, over time, reduced their current overall investment in the tasks associated with CPL advising, assessment and transcription. Also important to note is that while faculty play a central role in the assessment process, advisors are key to helping students understand CPL as an acceleration tool.

For those institutions which are just beginning to offer CPL or are expanding their CPL offerings, the current institutional investment is much greater. While CPL has been shown to decrease the time to completion⁴, currently Oregon postsecondary funding formulas do not support CPL activities. In addition, federal financial aid or veteran's benefits cannot be used towards the evaluation of credit, leaving the institution to support these activities or to pass on the associated costs to students. This makes implementing HB 4059 as it relates to increasing the types of CPL to be offered and access by students cost-prohibitive for institutions⁵.

³ Source: <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/trend.aspx>

⁴ Source: http://www.cael.org/pdfs/pla_fueling-the-race

⁵ Source: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2012R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB4059>