FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
April 21, 2014

The Pittsburg State University Faculty Senate met at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, April 21, 2014 in room S102 of the Kansas Technology Center with Justin Honey, President, presiding.

Past Minutes
The minutes for March 24, 2014 were approved.

Announcements

Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs – Dr. Lynette Olson
Dr. Lynette Olson spoke of Digital Measures being on campus this week for 3 demonstrations. This software allows faculty to catalog activities, scholarship and creative activity. She advised that the Kelce College of Business has been using this for several years and recommends the rest of the campus explore.

Dr. Jan Smith provided an up-date on the progress of the Strategic Plan Task Force. She shared her thanks for all who participated thus far in the over 30 conversation groups and advised us to expect a MrBulke regarding a survey that everyone should complete. This questionnaire will provide quantitative and qualitative information for both the external consultant and the task force to review and provide an opportunity for everyone to be heard.

Dr. Peggy Snyder shared information about Prior Learning Assessment. (See attached KBOR drafted guidebook). Dr. Snyder indicated the discussion started last summer primarily on the community college level and more recently has included 4-year institutions. The expectation is that credit hours accepted at the community college level will also be accepted at the 4-year level. Proposal thus far includes no specific notation on the transcript to denote how the credit was earned, to avoid prejudice. Committee members representing 4-year institutions expressed concerns. There is another meeting scheduled for the end of May that will be attended by many from PSU.

Dr. Olson indicated that she addressed her concern on the timeline to COCAO members. They first saw the document on Tuesday before a Wednesday meeting with no time to speak to respective campus constituents. Initially believed it was to be a guidebook, but appears to be moving more toward a policy. She expressed her intent to having dialogue and learning more. Mr. Bob Kehle asked about having a student take an entrance exam to show they have the bases for credit in a particular class. Dr. Snyder indicated that the policy does not allow for re-testing and that whatever comes to us from a community college is expected to be accepted.

There was further discussion regarding the intent and our ability to weigh-in. Dr. Olson indicated her preference would be that each 4-year institution creates its own policy, but senses that the community colleges feel differently. She added that this is a discussion being held nationally and was part of the conversation at a recent HLC meeting she attended. Based on other conversation in the room regarding competency, Dr. Snyder remarked that we need to track to see how successful based on subsequent class grades. Dr. Lee Young added this creates a swinging door and could be opening a Pandora’s box. He could envision students starting at a 4-year college, transferring to a community college and then back again.

PSU/KNEA – Dr. Browyn Conrad, President
Dr. Conrad reported that elections still on-going and will have the results in May. Bargaining is also still on-going. Dr. Conrad also provided a brief update on the Social Media policy discussion. The group is working on a revision to provide recommendations to the full board. Mr. Honey added that it appears that the BOR wish to keep the original language intact, but considering possible additions and word changes.

Student Senate Remarks – Bailey Peak
Not present.

Unclassified Senate Remarks – Dr. Andrew Myers
Not present.
Classified Senate Remarks – Dacia Clark
Not present.

Faculty Senate President – Justin Honey
Mr. Justin Honey stated that Prior Learning and Social Media policies are the two hot topics and his group is waiting to see what happens. Concern continues that faculty could have less input on decision of what credit to accept from a community college.

Committee Reports

Undergraduate Curriculum – Mike Carper, Chair
Dr. Carper shared a list of 7 curriculum items, all approved by the committee. The senate voted unanimously to approve.

Departmental Academic Honors – Akram Taghavi-Burris, Chair
Ms. Akram Taghavi-Burris referred the group to memo included in the April agenda and asked that the recommended blanket statement be considered for a first reading. There was discussion on the wording to include more than just the approval of the instructor. The motion passed to accept as a first read with a change to the statement to read: Any 300-799 undergraduate level courses may be taken for honors with approval of the instructor, and chair or director.

Student-Faculty Committee – Josh Letner, Chair
Mr. Letner presented Posthumous Degree Award Policy as a first read (see agenda) and advised that the policy had been thoroughly discussed within the committee as it pertained to number of hours completed and added there is no current policy. There was discussion pertaining to when the posthumous degree could be awarded. The reply was it would be the semester of the student’s passing. The policy passed unanimously as written for acceptance as a first read.

A handout was circulated (see attached) as a first read for procedures for action on a dead week violation. It was noted that the italics noted a revised area. Discussion included frequency of offenses, lack of clear cut procedure, but that committee followed something very similar to what was being proposed recently to suggest there had been a successful beta test. Approved unanimously.

Faculty Affairs Committee – Mark Johnson, Chair
Dr. Johnson advised that funds are spent. Discussion included need for a larger budget to the amount previously promised by Dr. Brad Hodson before the recession. Dr. Olson assured the group that she had spoken with Dr. Hodson, but suggested a formal letter be submitted by Faculty Senate to request an increase. The recommendation was seconded and Mr. Honey asked that the Faculty Affairs committee submit such a letter. Motion to write an appeal for additional funding letter approved unanimously.

Constitution Committee – Mark Johnson, Chair
Dr. Johnson reviewed the 3 recommended revisions to the by-laws (see March minutes). He advised that the changes better align with process to be 3 year appointments on the General Education Committee allowing continuity. Motion to accept revisions passed unanimously.

General Education Committee – Mark Johnson, Chair
Dr. Johnson alerted members to watch for a MrBulke from Dr. Olson about general education workshops. They will be on May 1st and 2nd. Moving forward with a pilot test and will do all next year. Presently looking for volunteers to conduct the pilot with expectation of mandatory adoption of changes following year.

Unfinished Business
None.

New Business
None.
Open Forum

Dr. Johnson announced the next Pechakucha to be held on Friday, April 25th at 7:20 and would include students from Girard Middle School.

Dr. Peter Chung advised that the Biology Department has moved to the department’s temporary location of Hartman Hall and that the Biology office can now be found in 210 Hartman.

Meeting Adjourned

Motion to adjourn was approved at 4:10 p.m.

Debbie Greve, Recording Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 21, 2014
Senators for 2014-2015

The Pittsburg State University Faculty Senate met at 4:11 p.m. on Monday, April 21, 2014 in room S102 of the Kansas Technology Center with Julie Dainty President-elect, presiding.

Ms. Dainty called the meeting to order at 4:11 and distributed paper ballots for election of officers for 2014-2015. Ballot allowed for write-in candidates for each office, but none were added. With 25 senators voting, the vote was unanimous to elect Julie Samuels as President-Elect, Carol Werhan as Secretary and Greg Belcher as Parliamentarian.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arruda, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachner, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belcher, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book, (Women's Studies)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botello-Samson, (Hist, Philosophy &amp; Soc Sci)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannock, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, (Physics)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung, (Past President)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert, (Health, Human Performance &amp; Rec)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig, (Military Science) (replaced by Shay)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dainty, (Technology &amp; Workforce Learning)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay, (Accounting &amp; Computer Inf Systems)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harries, (Biology)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey, (President)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooey, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Karen, (Nursing)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Mark, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehle, (Music)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lal, (Economics, Finance, and Banking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, (Management and Marketing)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lether, (Communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClaskey, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meats, (English)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, David, (Engineering Technology)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicklaus, (School of Construction)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rojas, (Modern Languages and Literatures)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuels, (Teaching and Leadership)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schreiner, (Axe Library)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shay, (Military Science) (replacing Craig)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam, (Chemistry)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spera, (Psychology and Counseling)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taghavi-Burris, (Graphics &amp; Imaging Tech)</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, (Automotive Technology)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tseng, (Art)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade, (Mathematics)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werhan, (Family and Consumer Sciences)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zepemick, (At-Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Senate Representative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Senate Representative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Christel Benson substituted for Akram Taghavi-Burris at the September meeting. Greg Murray attended the September and October meeting. Patricia Lindley attended the October meeting. Carol Deats substituted for Bob Kehle, Clark Shaver substituted for Grant Moss and Randy Jones substituted for John Thompson at the November meeting. Barbara Pope substituted for Susan Schreiner at the December meeting. Scott Craig substituted for Josh Shay at the January meeting.
Credit for Prior Learning:
Suggested Standards for Policy and Practice for Kansas Public Colleges and Universities

A Guide to Prior Learning Assessment in Kansas

June 2014

Prepared by the Kansas Credit for Prior Learning College Steering Committee
In partnership with Jobs for the Future
Introduction

The Kansas Board of Regents is committed to a 10-year strategic agenda for the state’s public postsecondary education system. Entitled Foresight 2020, the plan sets long-range achievement goals that are measurable, reportable, and ensure the State’s postsecondary education system meets Kansans’ expectations. The three strategic goals for Foresight 2020 are:

1. Increase higher education attainment among Kansans
2. Improve alignment of the State's higher education system with the needs of the economy
3. Ensure state university excellence

One means by which to increase the attainment of postsecondary credentials, especially among adult students, is to award postsecondary course credit for demonstrated knowledge and skill equivalent to the learning outcomes established for postsecondary-level courses. Such credits are awarded based on an assessment of students’ prior learning. A formal Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) policy provides consistent quality, accessibility and standard methods for earning credits for prior learning and a structure for awarding those credits.

In recognition of the need to evaluate learning which has taken place outside the higher education classroom, the Kansas Board of Regents offers this guidebook to Kansas public universities and community/technical colleges. The purpose of the recommended standards and policies in the guidebook is to ensure that students in Kansas seeking postsecondary CPL have a consistent and transparent means by which to advance towards a credential or degree regardless where they obtain their education. Each public university and college in Kansas is encouraged to review the guidebook and establish policies for evaluating prior learning and awarding appropriate postsecondary credit aligned with its institutional mission. Institutional CPL policies should adhere to principles of good educational practice and be documented and available to students, faculty and other stakeholders through publications that accurately describe the CPL policies and services. Institutions should also ensure they regularly evaluate their CPL processes to protect the integrity and credibility of CPL and meet their regional accreditation standards.

Goals of CPL include:

- Supporting Foresight 2020 to increase the credential attainment rate among Kansans
- Aligning CPL in Kansas with Higher Learning Commission standards
- Enhancing the student experience with CPL in terms of accessibility, consistency and transparency
- Elevating the importance of and encouraging appropriate use of CPL
- Increasing student enrollment through the use of CPL
- Defining measures with which to evaluate the effectiveness of CPL

The Board was awarded a grant from Jobs for the Future (JFF) in March 2013 for the purpose of assisting more adults to complete college. The grant was part of the Adult Completion Policy Project funded by the Lumina Foundation. This guidebook is the outgrowth of work supported by that grant and completed by the Kansas Credit for Prior Learning College Steering Committee (See Appendix A) with technical assistance and guidance from JFF.
Credit for Prior Learning Purpose Statement

The Kansas Board of Regents is committed to fostering an educated and skilled workforce, an essential component for economic prosperity for the state, its communities and individuals. Increased enrollment in — and successful completion of — postsecondary education is critical to achieving that goal. Credit for Prior Learning (CPL), also referred to as Prior Learning Assessment (PLA), can expedite adults' completion of postsecondary education programs by evaluating an individual's existing knowledge and competencies and awarding college credit as appropriate.

For the purpose of this guidebook, "prior learning" includes the postsecondary-level knowledge and skills gained through work and life experiences, such as employer and military training programs, industry certifications, non-credit postsecondary-level courses, and civic or volunteer experiences. CPL encompasses both credit for prior learning and advanced standing for prior learning. Obtaining credit for prior learning is the optimal outcome of a prior learning assessment.

The Board of Regents advocates appropriate use of CPL for its benefits to students, institutions, and the state. As employers continue to increase requirements for higher-order technical, problem-solving and critical thinking skills, it is important for the workforce to be educated at the postsecondary level. A CPL program recognizes the credit-worthy education and training that takes place outside of traditional educational pathways and offers students the opportunity to apply that training and education toward obtaining a postsecondary credential. Having that credential, in turn, positions the student for career promotion, may contribute to job security and may enable the student to compete more effectively in the global economy. Postsecondary education institutions also benefit from CPL as students complete degrees in less time thus increasing efficient use of resources. In addition, colleges and universities can utilize CPL as a recruitment tool and as a means of meeting the needs of adult students. Communities benefit by having residents with postsecondary credentials who form a highly-skilled, qualified workforce.
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I. Definitions and Forms of Credit for Prior Learning

The list below is provided for convenience and to avoid conflicting definitions for CPL terminology. It is not intended to be exhaustive. Kansas institutions may consider adopting these common definitions for their own communications, policies, and internal purposes to simplify and improve the student-user experience.

A. Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) – A comprehensive term used to describe learning gained outside a traditional academic environment. “Prior Learning Assessment” (PLA) is also used to describe CPL. CPL is learning and knowledge students acquire while working, participating in employer training programs, serving in the military, studying independently, volunteering or doing community service, or studying open source courseware. CPL is the evaluation and assessment of an individual’s learning obtained outside a formal academic setting. CPL may take the form of college credit, certification, or advanced standing toward further education or training. Obtaining college-level credit is the optimal outcome. CPL is not confined to portfolio assessment, which is simply one type of CPL (as are CLEP tests, ACE evaluations, challenge exams, etc., defined below).

B. Advanced Placement (AP) Exams – A series of standardized exams developed by the College Board. College credit is awarded based on exam score. The exams usually follow standardized high school courses generally recognized as being equivalent to undergraduate college courses.

C. American Council on Education (ACE) and ACE Guides –Major coordinating body for higher education institutions in the U.S., providing leadership on 3rd party, unbiased/credit equivalency recommendations among other services. ACE Guides are 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).

D. College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Exams – Tests of college material offered by the College Board and designed to measure college-level competence achieved outside the college classroom. Course credit is given to students earning a satisfactory score on the CLEP exam indicating successful mastery of course material.


F. Crosswalk – A diagram illustrating various learning pathways to degree programs.

G. Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Tests (DSSTs) – Examinations developed by the Chauncy Group International and administered by Prometric that allow a student to demonstrate proficiency of college level knowledge and skills. Now available for civilian and military personnel.

H. Evaluation of Local Training — Individual colleges’ program evaluations of non-collegiate instructional programs.
I. **Excelsior College Examination Program (ECE)** – Examinations for college credit offered by Excelsior College, NY. These were formerly known as “Regents College Exams” or “ACT/PEP Exams.”

J. **Institutional Exam or Course Challenge Exams** – An examination for a particular course that an academic program or department may utilize to give students credit for a course. A student will work directly with the individual program or department to learn about the availability and cost of institutional course examinations.

K. **International Baccalaureate Programs (IB)** – An internationally accepted qualification for entry into institutions of higher education, much like the AP program. It is a demanding two-year curriculum culminating with final examinations. Credits are awarded to students who achieve a minimum score on the exams. Graduates of the IB program must demonstrate competency in languages, social studies, the experimental sciences, and mathematics. In addition, the program includes three core requirements that are included to broaden the educational experience and challenge students to apply their knowledge and understanding. To receive a diploma, students must achieve a minimum score of 24 out of a possible 45 points, as well as satisfactorily complete the creativity, action, service requirement.

L. **Learning Counts** – A resource developed by the Council on Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) to guide students in preparing a portfolio to demonstrate their lifelong learning and receive a transcript with college credit recommendations.

M. **Locally Evaluated Industry and Workplace Credit** – Individually evaluated non-collegiate instructional programs, such as those for industry certification, professional licensure, apprenticeship, and other local workplace training that demonstrate competency required for completion of degree or certificate programs. CPL credit may be awarded based on evaluation by trained faculty in the student’s program, awarded based on recommendations in the ACE Guide, and/or awarded as part of a student’s portfolio.

1. **Apprenticeship**: Apprenticeship is a combination of on-the-job training and related technical instruction in which workers learn the practical and theoretical aspects of a highly skilled occupation. Apprenticeship programs may be sponsored by individual employers, joint employer and labor groups, and/or employer associations.

2. **Certification**: Certification (usually by a 3rd party industry group) is a designation that is obtained once the student is qualified to perform a particular task or job. Certification differs from licensure in that certification is an employment qualification and not a legal requirement for practicing a profession.

3. **Professional Licensure**: “Permission to practice” granted by a governmental entity. Licensure is a legal status. Professional licensure restricts practice of the profession to individuals who have met specific qualifications in education, professional experience, and/or have successfully passed an examination.

N. **National College Credit Recommendation Service (NCCRS)** – Coordinates teams of college faculty evaluators and subject matter experts to conduct extensive reviews of education and training programs offered outside of the traditional college classroom and translates them into college credit equivalencies. Education and
training by corporations, unions, religious organizations and proprietary schools has been evaluated and cooperating postsecondary institutions grant college credit based on credit recommendations and in accordance with their own transfer policies.

O. **Portfolio Review Credit (or portfolio assessment credit)** – Credit awarded as a result of review of a portfolio prepared by the student to demonstrate learning acquired outside of the classroom and that is relevant to the student’s educational program. A portfolio may include documentation such as certificates of training, work samples, awards and honors, job descriptions, performance evaluations, samples of work product, evidence of self-directed learning, and resumes to validate that equivalent learning outcomes are met. A portfolio course may be offered by the institution to assist the student in preparing a quality portfolio.

P. **Prior Learning Assessment (PLA)** – See definition of CPL above.

Q. **Prior Military Training Credit** – College credit for military training awarded through the American Council on Education (ACE) College Credit Recommendation Service or through direct evaluation of the student’s
IV. Validation Standards for Credit for Prior Learning

A. Validation Methods

Kansas public higher education institutions should award CPL in accordance with the Higher Learning Commission standards (www.ncahl.org), the recommendations of this Guidebook, CAEL standards (Appendix B), and the CPL Quality Check List (Appendix C). CPL should be awarded on a course-by-course basis when the prior learning is equivalent to the learning outcomes in the postsecondary course. Institutions should include in their policy and practice a quality assurance process, documented standard intake processes, CPL advising and guidance from trained advisors, and standard transparent policies. Institutions should consider the Recommendations for Implementation (Appendix D).

B. National Exams for Postsecondary Credit

1. Institutions should evaluate the competencies measured in national standard exams and award appropriate credit when the competencies are equivalent to the learning outcomes of college courses and the student has met or exceeded the standards.

2. Institutions should consider the following national exams. The list is not meant to be exhaustive. If additional exams are deemed valid and appropriate by the institution, they should also be considered.
   - College Board College Level Examination Program (CLEP)
   - Advanced Placement (AP)
   - International Baccalaureate Diploma Program advanced courses (IB)
   - DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSSTs)
   - UEExcel Exams
   - Excelsior College Examinations

C. Credit Recommendation Services

1. Institutions should follow the recommendations for credit equivalency provided by nationally recognized, reputable credit recommendation services and award credit when the learning outcomes are equivalent to those of the institution’s postsecondary courses, and where applicable, approved system-wide transfer courses.

2. Recommendations from the following services should be considered. If additional credit recommendation services are deemed valid and appropriate by the institution, they may also be considered.
   - American Council on Education (ACE) National Guide to College Credit for Workforce Training
   - American Council on Education (ACE) Military Guide
• National College Credit Recommendation Service (NCCRS)
• Right Skills to Work by the Manufacturing Institute, National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)

D. Industry-recognized Credentials

Institutions should award appropriate CPL for industry certifications that are equivalent to learning outcomes in postsecondary courses.

E. Individual Portfolio Assessments

1. Institutions should provide portfolio assessment options to award credit for prior postsecondary-level learning.
2. Portfolio assessments should be evaluated by trained faculty using national standards established by CAEL or other nationally-recognized sources. Postsecondary institutions should use quality portfolio checklists and/or a professional portfolio service.
3. Students should be counseled on the suitability of portfolio CPL and provided guidance or instruction on preparing quality portfolios.

F. Institutionally Prepared Exams

Institutionally prepared exams may be used to award credit when equivalent, consistent learning outcomes are met. Institutions should ensure exams developed by an individual faculty member or faculty teams are valid, reliable and objective. Institutional exams should be monitored and controlled; content protected for security and use; and proctored responsibly. The assessment criteria (passing grade, competencies measured etc.) need to be determined prior to examination. Grading, required record-keeping and transcription methods for institutionally prepared exams should also be pre-determined and implemented consistently.

V. Quality Credits that Apply to Degree

Credit awarded for prior learning is documented, evaluated, and appropriate for the level of degree awarded and in full compliance with the criteria and standards of the HLC.—Academic credit will be awarded only for degree seeking students who have enrolled in an institution and:

A. For courses directly applicable to curriculum requirements. Changing majors should not result in reassessment of previously awarded CPL.
B. CPL shall be applied and used as the course equivalencies or block credit.
C. CPL should apply toward majors, minors, concentrations, general education requirements, and electives that count toward the degree or program certificate being sought in the same manner as traditional courses.
D. CPL should satisfy prerequisite requirements in the same manner as course equivalencies at the institution.

VI. Transferability of Credits for Prior Learning

CPL awarded and documented in a student transcript at any regionally accredited institution whose policy follows the Kansas CPL Guidelines and complies with the Higher Learning Commission criteria should be accepted as transfer credit toward a degree or program certificate at all Kansas public postsecondary institutions.

VII. Fees Assessed to Students

A. Costs to students for establishment of credit should be comparable throughout the state system and should reflect the actual costs for institutional administration of the CPL evaluation (e.g., actual test fee for a standardized national test plus an administrative fee that covers the actual costs for test proctoring; actual costs for faculty time in portfolio evaluation, etc.).

B. Fees should be based on the assessment service performed and not determined by the number of credits awarded. Tuition fees should not be assessed for CPL.

C. Fees for recording CPL in student transcripts should be consistent with fees for other transfer credits.

VIII. Data Tracking and Evaluation

A. Institutions should ensure that credits awarded for prior learning are recorded in the student information system and on the transcript as transfer credit. The type of credit for prior learning should be denoted in the institutional student data base. The data associated with the credit should include the course identifiers and description of the articulated course, semester (term) for which the credit is applied, credit hours awarded, and the actual date awarded by the institution.

B. Data definitions and metrics used to evaluate CPL should be consistent statewide and aligned with the metrics for approved system-wide transfer course articulations among all institutions. Evaluation metrics shall include measures for quality and effectiveness of CPL.

IX. Information Dissemination

A. Institutions should publish on their websites full information regarding their CPL policies and fees to students. Institutions may use additional methods to make consistent information accessible to students regarding CPL credits, policies and the number of students receiving CPL credits. Information should be updated at least annually.
B. The KBOR website should include links to all institutions’ CPL web pages.

C. A CPL Fact Sheet on the web from each institution should include:
   1. General Institutional Policies and link to CPL
   2. Policy differences in departments
   3. Use of CPL (general, major, elective)
   4. Programs accepting CPL
   5. Types of CPL offered
   6. Credit limits for CPL
   7. Fees and other costs
   8. Portfolio assessment policies
   9. Student facts – number of CPL earners, number of CPL hours earned
   10. Transfer of CPL credits within institution
   11. Appearance of CPL credits on transcript
   12. Acceptance of CPL credits from other institutions
   13. Institution contact information for CPL

X. Credit for Prior Learning Guidebook Review

The Kansas CPL Guidebook should be reviewed by the System Council of Chief Academic Officers on an annual basis and updated or revised as needed. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee should review and approve the CPL Guidebook in preparation for the Board of Regents. KBOR will annually audit adherence of CPL Guidebook to Board policies.
### Appendix A–Kansas Credit for Prior Learning Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Anderson</td>
<td>Executive VP Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Johnson County Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Burnett</td>
<td>Assoc. Professor Health &amp; Human Performance</td>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Chatfield</td>
<td>VP for Academic &amp; Student Affairs</td>
<td>Northwest Kansas Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Cregg</td>
<td>Assoc. Director Continuing Education</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Gabelmann</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Instruction</td>
<td>Washburn Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Genandt</td>
<td>VP for Student Learning</td>
<td>Neosho County Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilu Goodyear</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Harris</td>
<td>VP for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Independence Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Hoss</td>
<td>VP of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Hutchinson Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Isbell</td>
<td>Dean Instructional Services</td>
<td>North Central Kansas Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis King</td>
<td>Director of Virtual College</td>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Loewen</td>
<td>VP of Instructional Services</td>
<td>Flint Hills Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Maes</td>
<td>Dean, Div. Continuing Education</td>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Mahan</td>
<td>VP of Instructional Services</td>
<td>Manhattan Area Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Norton</td>
<td>Director of Satellite Campuses &amp; Workforce</td>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Quinn</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Barton Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Rapp</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Seward County Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Snyder</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Speary</td>
<td>Dean Academic Support</td>
<td>Butler Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Stiles</td>
<td>Assist. VP for Academic Services</td>
<td>Northwest Kansas Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheree Utash</td>
<td>VP of Instructional Services</td>
<td>Wichita Area Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Wheatley</td>
<td>Assist. Dean, Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Beene</td>
<td>Director of Federal Initiatives</td>
<td>Kansas Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Farrier</td>
<td>Director, Data, Research &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Kansas Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Hund</td>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>Kansas Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Thompson</td>
<td>Director, Workforce Training &amp; Education</td>
<td>Kansas Board of Regents, Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Wiscombe</td>
<td>Assist. Director Academic Affairs, Transfer &amp; Artic.</td>
<td>Kansas Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

The 10 CAEL Standards for Assessing Learning

As the nationally recognized body on prior learning assessment and the only body recognized by all regional accreditors for PLA, the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning’s (CAEL) Standards for Assessing Learning have become the foundation for most PLA programs. Kansas colleges and universities may use these standards as a guide.

1. Credit or its equivalent should be awarded only for learning, and not for experience.
2. Assessment should be based on standards and criteria for the level of acceptable learning that are both agreed upon and made public.
3. Assessment should be treated as an integral part of learning, not separate from it, and should be based on an understanding of learning processes.
4. The determination of credit awards and competence levels must be made by appropriate subject matter and academic or credentialing experts.
5. Credit or other credentialing should be appropriate to the context in which it is awarded and accepted.
6. If awards are for credit, transcript entries should clearly describe what learning is being recognized and should be monitored to avoid giving credit twice for the same learning.
7. Policies, procedures, and criteria applied to assessment, including provision for appeal, should be fully disclosed and prominently available to all parties involved in the assessment process.
8. Fees charged for assessment should be based on the services performed in the process and not determined by the amount of credit awarded.
9. All personnel involved in the assessment of learning should pursue and receive adequate training and continuing professional development for the functions they perform.
10. Assessment programs should be regularly monitored, reviewed, evaluated, and revised as needed to reflect changes in the needs being served, the purposes being met, and the state of the assessment arts.

Appendix C

Credit for Prior Learning Quality Checklist

1. CPL is awarded in compliance with the criteria for accreditation of the Higher Learning Commission, Kansas Board of Regents policy manual, state statutes, and the Kansas CPL Guidebook.
2. CPL is awarded for college level learning that is equivalent to learning objectives or outcomes in college courses and is not based on time or experience.
3. Enrollment procedures are structured to benefit students, encourage appropriate application of CPL and avoid artificial barriers.
4. The number of CPL credits accepted for degree or program completion is a reasonable portion of credits and the maximum allowable is established with thoughtful evaluation of program requirements.
5. CPL awards in a college or department are consistent with policy across the institution.
6. Where possible and appropriate, national exams are used for CPL.
7. CPL awards advance the student towards degree or program completion.
8. The institution accepts CPL awarded at other accredited Kansas institutions.
9. CPL fees are reasonable and aligned with actual costs incurred by an institution to deliver the service.
10. CPL fees are based on assessment services performed and not on number of credits awarded.
11. Fees assessed to transcript CPL are consistent with fees to transcript other transfer courses.
12. CPL is transcripted in accordance with state guidelines and allows for institutional analysis of success and statewide data collections.
13. Professional development and training are provided to all personnel associated with CPL including intake counselors, advisors, and other student services personnel.
14. Faculty and deans are provided professional development for quality practices in evaluating equivalent learning outcomes for national standard exams, institutional exams, portfolios and all assessment methods.
15. CPL policies, types, programs, fees etc. are published and widely available to students. All policies and procedures for CPL are transparent and consistent. Continuous improvement processes are in place to improve the students’ experience.
Appendix D

Recommendations for Implementation

1. Provide technical assistance to colleges from CAEL, ACE or other national experts on implementation of national standards, best practices, and aligning CPL with KBOR Foresight 2020 goals, designing fee structures and other quality standards.

2. Each institution develop clearly stated CPL policies for students, faculty, administration and external sources and specify any limits on which institutional and program requirements may be met by prior learning.

3. Utilize recognized, standardized evaluation methods and multiple assessments to award credit for demonstrated learning and clearly specify the standard for acceptable performance in each academic area.

4. Define and articulate roles and responsibilities of all persons connected with the CPL assessment processes in the institution.

5. Provide professional development for all institutional staff based on roles and responsibilities to assure quality practices are consistently implemented. Include technical assistance for appropriate Office of Admissions staff and advisors on credit for prior learning methods, tools and applications in order to help students advance toward degree completion.

6. Implement an intake process for students with a trained advisor who discusses the possibility and suitability of CPL to advance the students’ degree completion.

7. Include provisions for periodic evaluation of policies, procedures and practices for assessment of learning and awarding credit and continuous improvement steps. Include evaluation of:
   a. fair and consistent treatment of students
   b. success rate in subsequent courses of students awarded CPL
   c. progress toward degree completion for students awarded CPL

8. Provide regular review and updates of CPL information and policy updates for all appropriate staff so information shared with students is consistent and accurate and student user experience is positive.

9. Establish a statewide taskforce to determine standard cut scores for AP, CLEP and other national exams. Begin with the courses approved for system wide transfer and add additional exams and courses as deemed most useful or valuable for students. Publish the cut scores for these and other courses that institutions accept.

10. Evaluate industry certifications and agree on course equivalencies and number of credits awarded. Use the Program Alignment process to standardize across the state.

11. Provide technical assistance from ACE on how to use the military transcript and corporate/workforce training to award credit appropriately.

12. Convene a statewide taskforce of chief academic officers, registrars, faculty and other stakeholders to ensure CPL credits are accepted as transfer courses.

13. Convene a task force of registrars and IR leaders to clarify data definitions, metrics and type codes for data collection including (at a minimum) the following items:
   a. Data definitions
   b. Data recordation, programming, and data extraction
   c. Data collection and programming for reporting of metrics
14. Institutional representatives on the taskforce should identify at least four metrics that examine quality and effectiveness of CPL. These metrics may include:
   a. Number of prior learning credits awarded, disaggregated by CPL type and dates awarded;
   b. Headcount of students awarded prior learning credits, disaggregated by CPL type and dates awarded;
   c. At least one metric to measure quality of learning: progress in subsequent courses, for example.
   d. At least one metric to indicate effectiveness of prior learning policies: shorter time to degree, for example.
15. Suggested standardized type codes for the taskforce’ consideration include:

   AP       Advanced Placement Exams
   CLEP     College Level Examination Program
   DSST     DANTES Subject Standardized Test
   IB       International Baccalaureate Programs
   CHAL     Institutional Challenge Exams
   PORT     Portfolio Review Credit
   WORK     Occupational or Workplace Training Programs
             (Apprenticeship, Certification, Licensure)
   Other

16. System Council of Chief Academic Officers review definitions, metrics and codes.
17. The state should collect additional data regarding courses; hours earned; dates awarded; and type of CPL awarded in its KHEDS academic year collection. State level data would support enhanced research, additional disaggregation of metrics, and comparisons across institutional sectors.
18. Establish a timeline for data collection implementation and provide lead time of 24 months for the collection of prior learning data.
19. Convene a taskforce of chief academic officers and communication/marketing experts to define the information points recommended above to be included on the combined KBOR web page and encourage each institution to include same information on institution web page. Use the Transfer and Articulation and KanVet webpages as a model.
20. Implement a statewide campaign to make students aware of the possibility and benefits of CPL at public institutions.
21. Consider a state-wide membership in Learning Counts® to assist all institutions with a quality practice in portfolio assessments.
22. Explore the concept of a CPL Learning Center to serve the state and an Office for Assessment of Professional and Workplace Learning to complete evaluations of company training for key Kansas employers (similar to the Thomas Edison State College model).
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Wednesday, April 9, 2014
8:00am

Attendees:
Mike Carper (Chairman), Chris Anderson, David O’Bryan, John Thompson, Julie Dainty.

Committee Actions:
The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee met and reviewed the following legislation:

1. The Department of Art submitted two REQUEST FOR REVISION TO COURSE for
   - ART 288 Western Art History I to ART 288 Introduction to Art History I
   - ART 289 Western Art History II to ART 289 Introduction to Art History II
     Approved.

2. The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences submitted a REQUEST FOR REVISION TO COURSE for FCS 392 Infant and Toddler Development to include, “Practicum hours required” in the course description. No other changes requested.
   Approved.

3. The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences submitted a REQUEST FOR REVISION TO CURRICULUM to move a currently required course, FCS 571/771 Directed Readings in Family and Consumer Sciences to an elective as it was not appropriate to all majors and should be an elective.
   Approved.

4. The Department of History, Philosophy, and Social Sciences submitted a REQUEST FOR NEW COURSE for PHIL 207 Critical Thinking. Coupled with this change, the department also submitted a REQUEST FOR REVISION TO COURSE for PHIL 208 Logic and Critical Thinking to PHIL 208 Logic. Included in the request was a revision to the course description as well.
   Approved.

5. The Department of TCHLS submitted a REQUEST FOR REVISION TO CURRICULUM for the Bachelor of Science in Education, Early Childhood Unified to drop BIOL 114 Environmental Science Lab for Teachers as it is no longer offered. No course will need to replace it because the KDSE requirements for total number of required hours in science dropped from 10 to 8 and students were already taking more hours than needed for degree requirements.
   Approved.
6. The Department of Family and Consumer Sciences submitted a REQUEST FOR REVISION TO CURRICULUM to remove *TTED 694 Principles of Vocational Education* (which is no longer applicable to the major) and replacing it with *FCS 370 Introduction to Career-Technical Education in Family and Consumer Sciences*. (Please note: *FCS 370* is in the process of being legislated.)

Approved.

7. The Department of Technology and Workforce Learning submitted a REQUEST FOR REVISING TO A COURSE for *TTED 694 Principles of Vocational Education* to include a name change to *TTED 694 Foundations of Vocational/Technical Education* and course description change.

Approved.

Next meeting is set for Monday, April 28th at 8:00am.
Meeting adjourned at 8:30.
Enforcement component for Dead Week policy complaints: Reviewed by committee Spring 2014

Complaints from students about a perceived violation would be processed via this procedure:

1. A complaint is reported to an officer of the Student Government Association (SGA). That or other SGA officer or representative would be assigned to the case and would collect the following information from the student(s) making the complaint:
   - Name of the instructor allegedly violating the policy
   - The class and section number in which the alleged violation took place
   - The date and description of the alleged violation
   - A copy of the syllabus

2. The Academic Affairs Director of SGA would compile the information and email it or deliver it to the chair or other member of the Student / Faculty committee.

3. Action to investigate the allegation would include:
   - The Student / Faculty committee chair would immediately contact the instructor and the instructor's department chair that a complaint had been made.
   - The department chair would gather documentation from the accused instructor describing activities in the class during dead week including copies of the assignment, test, exercise, or other class activity in question as stated in the original complaint.
   - The affected students in the class would be notified by the chair of the committee via campus email to contact the assigned SGA representative to make statements addressing the complaint and pertaining to activities for that class during the days of dead week.

4. The gathered documentation would be delivered to the chair of the Student / Faculty committee within 3 days of the original complaint.
   - The Student / Faculty committee would convene upon receipt of the violation notification to discuss the documentation and the complaint. The findings of the committee as to whether or not a violation was committed would then be forwarded to the instructor and the department chair involved.
   - If it is determined that no violation occurred, the issue would be dropped.
   - Any determined violation will be ameliorated by either 1) voiding the grade resulting from the violation; 2) allowing affected students to retain grade or; 3) providing a fair alternative method of grade adjustment as determined by faculty, chair and dean. These options should extend to the entire class affected. All final grades for that class should be adjusted accordingly with the following exception.
   - All students in the class will be notified of the actions and will have the right to choose the option they desire. To exercise their option students would need to contact the Registrar’s office, provide identification and make a request in writing within 7 days of the department notification. The Registrar’s Office will then contact the affected faculty member, department chair and dean with the results. The faculty member responsible for the grades of the affected individual(s) will make the needed adjustment to that individual’s final grade.

5. Instructors should have the option to appeal the determination of the Student / Faculty committee. Appeals should be directed to Faculty Senate by way of the Faculty Senate President. The appeal would be heard by the President, the Student / Faculty committee and the affected instructor and department chair on or before Friday, noon of Finals Week with the intent of make a ruling on the appeal in advance of the deadline for final grades.

6. First violations by any individual instructor will result in a warning from the dean of the respective college. Additional violations will result in a letter to the chair and dean of the respective department/college indicating that the history of repeated violations of the Dead Week policy be included in the said instructor’s performance evaluation.

Reviewed by the 2013-2014 Committee, 4/15/14