

Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Advisory Committee

March 18, 2014

9:00-12:00pm

Chemeketa Community College
4000 Lancaster Drive NE, Salem, OR 97309
Building 3, Room 254

MEETING NOTES

Members Present/Participating By Phone: Steve Erickson, Rebecca Mathern, Larry Large and Joe Holliday , Karen Stewart, Craig Kolins, Marilyn Davis and Chris Brantley

Additional Attendees: Lynn Browne, Shelly Chabon, Cyndi Andrews, Margaret Kimble and Paul Mooredock.

Staff Present: Donna Lewelling, HECC

Public Testimony

No public testimony was given.

Approval of Minutes

Larry Large moved for approval of the minutes, Karen Stewart seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.

HECC Subcommittee

Marilyn shared that she attended the meeting and brought the group up to date on the standards and the work of the Cost Analysis Workgroup. The significance is that there may be a “reporting change” as to where the Advisory Committee reports. The group discussed some concerns regarding HB4059 and the requirement for the Advisory Committee to be advisory to the HECC. Marilyn and Craig will be unable to report both the HECC and the Advisory Committee due to time constraints. Larry shared that he also feels that we need a direct report to HECC not only based on precedent but also the complexity of the issue. The extra layer has the potential to “muddy the waters”.

Donna shared that she will be speaking with Ben as to whether or not this is going to be a temporary or permanent as the HECC works to manage the large amount of work at this time.

Cost Analysis and Funding Workgroup

The Committee reviewed the timeline. Craig walked the Workgroup through the Questions for Analysis document. Karen shared concerns about the format and she suggested turning it into a questionnaire. The group suggested adding the following questions to the document:

- What are the professional development and training needs regarding CPL? What are the estimated costs associated with this?
- How does the institution track the students who earn CPL?
- What is the role of the course instructor?
- Do students have to have a declared academic goal before the assessment of CPL?
- What student support services are in place for CPL?
- Military: Do students have to be fully admitted for Joint Service Transcript/ACE Recommendation Service Evaluation?
- Military: Is credit awarded for training separate from MOS and/or experience?

In addition, the group recommended that clarification be made regarding “Labor Intensiveness” to assist in the association between cost & labor intensiveness. Something should be added such as “estimated time related to and cost associated with awarding of credit”.

Questions such as “did you purchase portfolio-development software”, etc. are important. The group discussed how to get data/information that will help us understand the cost of CPL as opposed to the cost of doing business (e.g. investment in Portfolio software programs, etc.)

The question regarding the "type of students" should really be turned into a checklist. However you can't just isolate the information in the student information systems, so it will be difficult for institutions to provide the information. The Advisory Committee is recommending that the student-specific question be removed.

Cyndi Andrews shared that the Oregon National Guard and Military Department have requested that CPL be transparent and information being easily accessed. She also shared that Trade Act has the same type of concerns. Karen Stewart shared that the transparency of national certification availability for nursing programs is important because nursing graduates cannot work at federal positions due to the requirement that the federal government requires national nursing certifications. It was suggested that this information be shared with the Student Success and Institutional Collaboration Subcommittee for consideration as they develop policy and guidance for institutions in the area of student advising. The group discussed the importance of awarding credit that is “useful” towards a degree. This is not just a CPL issue. It is also a transfer issue. It is important to note that many veterans choose to get a degree in an area that is different than their MOS. There was a recommendation to add language to the Standards regarding the advising of veterans and the credit.

Donna requested candid feedback regarding the process to get institutional feedback. The group suggested doing another survey monkey that allows for short answers to detailed questions. Ask what we are really going for. She also asked how the Advisory Committee felt about the phases. The group

suggested that the Phases be reorganized. With “Portfolios” being the only component of Phase II so that institutions aren’t doing the survey multiple times. It was recommended that the survey filtering at beginning by type of CPL which will then select the types of questions to be answered. Donna will work with the Workgroup to refine the survey and try to make sure that it isn't so long that institutions won't take it. Also letting the person filling it out know how long it will take and the number of questions.

Rebecca and Larry volunteered to institutionally "test drive" the survey.

CPL Standards:

The group discussed leaving the word "shall" in Standard One in relation to cross-functional Leadership Team and letting the pilot project provide feedback as to leave the "shall" in. The group agreed with the exception that Standard One will now read “...shall organize a cross-function team, with suggested members including...” The following additional changes were made to the standards:

- The quotations around “institutionally” will be removed from Standard 4.4 (which currently shows as 4.5 due to a numbering change that will occur once track changes are fully accepted).
- Standard 8.1 will be changed to include:
 - Risks to students and the cost of assessment where credit may be awarded.
 - Information regarding applicability of CPL towards certificate or degree programs.

The group final changes were reviewed and approved for submission to the HECC. Donna will finalize the document and add the resources back to the document. Donna will then send them for final call for edits via email. They will then be prepared to go forward for adoption. Donna will follow-up with Executive Director regarding the process for this. The underlying question is do they go through the subcommittee or directly to the full HECC?

Pilot Project:

It was suggested that we send the letter to the project leads at the community colleges who are participated in the CASE grant to ensure they have the opportunity to participate in the pilot project.

Donna walked the group through a conversation to identify a general overview and purpose of the pilot project. The Committee identified the following:

- Identify challenges associated with adoption with implementation (unforeseen barriers);
- Outline processes for above; and
- Create cross-functional teams

The deliverables associated with the pilot project include:

- Adopt standards
- Develop implementation plan
- Convene cross-functional team
- Conduct cost-analysis

- Identify the needs for staff development & training
- Quarterly reporting on reaching milestones in implementation plan

Length of pilot (considerations include the development of the catalog)

- Year 1 (Implementation & Adoption)
 - 1st meeting share adoption experiences and implementation plans and staff development needs
 - 2nd meeting: Professional Development (OrACRAO 2015)
- Year 2: Evaluation of year 1

Selection Process:

- Okay with “experienced and newbies”
- Okay with multi-institutional participation within sectors
- Okay with the four “sector contacts” providing Donna the list of participating institutions

Joe, Larry and Steve are ready and willing to act as the conduit for the selection process within their sector. Donna, Craig and Marilyn will discuss bringing Gerald up to speed on the issue.