



## CC/CPL Implementation Team Report Cover Sheet

### Implementation Team: Competency Certification & Credit for Prior Learning (CC/CPL)

All campuses will develop and implement CC/CPL & Competence-Based Education (CBE) processes, opportunities and resources. MnSCU and individual institutions will commit capacity building resources.

#### Guiding Principles:

- Ensure student-centered faculty driven practices.
- Competence is the central focus for assessment.
- CC/CPL precedes/leads CBE.
- CBE options can be developed parallel to existing models.
- Provide consistency and transparency.
- Improve student portability of credits earned.
- Ensure alignment of necessary student support services.
- Maintain academic integrity across all institutions.
- Recognize autonomy for campuses and faculty
- Identify appropriate system support and policies.
- Recognize all learning domains.
- System supports are essential.

### Which Charting the Future Report Recommendation(s) did your team address?

#### Primary Focus:

- Certify student competencies and capabilities, expand pathways to accelerate degree completion through credit for prior learning, and foster the award of competency-based credit and degrees.

#### This work aligns with all other CTF Initiatives to:

- Dramatically increase the success of all learners, especially those in diverse populations traditionally underserved by higher education.
- Develop a collaborative and coordinated academic planning process that advances affordability, transferability, and access to our programs and services across the state.
- Expand the innovative use of technology to deliver high quality student service, and provide more individualized learning and advising
- Work together under new models to be the preferred provider of comprehensive workplace solutions through programs and services that employ skills and solve real-world problems for communities and businesses across the state.

#### Core Concepts:

1. Increase opportunities and system wide access for learners to earn credit or certification through demonstrated college/university-level competence.
2. Launch a system wide, institution specific and faculty driven inquiry and curriculum process to develop CBE, and Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) options that recognize competence as the core educational concept and organizing principle.
3. Develop and implement a system wide policy and procedure to code, document, transcribe and transfer competence-based credit across institutions.

#### Recommended Initiatives

1. **CC/CPL Workgroup Formation:** Identify work groups of colleges and universities within MnSCU to advance strategies and capacity for CC/CPL. (Rounds 1, 2 & 3)
2. **Toolkit for Scale Up:** The work groups will apply and refine the toolkit to scale up CC/CPL at individual campuses across the system to build statewide capacity.
3. **Professional Development:** Each participating university and college, as well as the system office, will invest sufficient resources for faculty and staff professional development to advance these initiatives, beginning with a faculty development inquiry process that is faculty-driven and includes Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) drawn from local and system institutions.
4. **Capacity Building Resources:** Commit statewide (system and institutional) capacity building resources, leveraging both internal and external SMEs, to support campuses as they progress in this work.



- a. **Institutional Support:** Each round of work groups will teach, collaborate, and mentor subsequent institutions, faculty, staff and students on how to build CC/CPL capacity.
  - b. **System Support:** Provide system resource support (human and fiscal) for toolkit scale up and implementation, training for all stakeholders, data analysis, marketing and communication.
5. **Policy and Procedure Development:** Develop system-wide policy recommendations regarding coding, transfer, price, and compensation structure.

### CC/CPL Implementation Team Roster

Name	Association/ Union	College	Department
Kerrie Maleski – Co/Convener	MSCSA – Vice President	Anoka Technical College	Student – Supervisory Management
Rebecca Larson	MSCSA	Hennepin Technical College Transferring to Anoka Ramsey Community College – Coon Rapids	Student – Graphic Design Subject Matter Expert
Phil Olsen	AFSCME	Central Lake College	Admin Asst., Business & Industry Center
Robert Lowe	MAPE	Normandale Community College	Director of Perkins and Dual Enrollment
Janet Tauer	MMA	Minneapolis Community and Technical College	Faculty, Child Development
Darci Stanford	MSCF	South Central College	Faculty, Child Development
Marcia Anderson	MSUAASF	Metropolitan State University	Academic Advisor
Annette Parker – Convener	President	South Central College	College President
Carol Lacey	AFSCME	Metropolitan State University	Faculty, Individualized Studies
Devinder Malhotra	Leadership Council	Metropolitan State University	Interim President
Marsha Danielson	Organizational Capability	South Central College	Senior Associate to the President
Marilyn Hart	Organizational Capability	Minnesota State University, Mankato	Associate Dean Science, Engineering and Technology
Anne Johnson	Subject Matter Experts	Inver Hills Community College & Dakota County Technical College	Associate VP, Strategic Initiatives
Ginny Boyum	Subject Matter Experts	Rochester Community and Technical College	Dean, Academic Affairs
Bob DeFries	Subject Matter Experts	Alexandria Technical and Community College	Dean, CT, Manufacturing & Transp
Gina Sobania	Subject Matter Experts	Academic & Student Affairs, System Office	Military Education Director
Ginny Karbowski	Subject Matter Experts	Academic & Student Affairs, System Office	Program, CTE Career Pathways



<p><b>Initiative #1: CC/CPL Workgroup Formation</b> Identify work groups of colleges and universities within MnSCU to advance strategies and capacity for CC/CPL. (Rounds One, Two &amp; Three)</p>		
<p><b>What is the Current State?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are islands of excellence not yet brought to scale, which results in disparities of student access and service, unresponsive to changing student demographics.</li> <li>CTF identified the leadership and initiatives of colleges and universities within MnSCU, (i.e. Graduate Minnesota and military veteran's efforts), deemed valuable resources to engage and guide other colleges and universities within the system.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>What is the Desired Future State?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drawing from existing islands of excellence and CC/CPL research, statewide implementation will provide consistent access and service to all students.</li> <li>All institutions will participate in CC/CPL, drawing from and building on existing expertise, but adding their contributions to better serve students throughout the system.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Risk Analysis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By disregarding changing demographics and student needs, we underserve our students and employers and also continue to lose market share.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Type of Initiative:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institution</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-institutional</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System wide</p>	<p><b>Suggested Timeframe for Completion:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Round 1: Early Win (&lt; 6 months)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Round 2: Medium Term (6-18 months)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Round 3+: Long Term (&gt; 18 months)</p>	<p><b>Ease of Implementation</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Easy</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Round1-2) Moderate</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Round3) Difficult</p>
<p><b>Action Steps:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Charter FY16 Workgroup:</b> Leadership Council will establish a Round One workgroup in FY16 that includes representation of faculty, staff, students and administration from MnSCU campuses (Approx. 1/3) committed to advancing strategies and capacities for CC/CPL. One university, one free-standing technical college and some colleges new to CC/CPL, in addition to MnSCU colleges and universities identified as early adopters, shall be part of this workgroup.</li> <li><b>Round One Charge:</b> Round One workgroup is to implement and scale up the CC/CPL toolkit.</li> <li><b>Charter FY17 and FY18 Workgroups:</b> Establish subsequently Round Two And Three workgroups in FY17 and FY18 that will continue to work with Round One participants to prepare for and participate in CC/CPL. All MnSCU institutions will be participating by FY18 (i.e. Round Three).</li> <li><b>Communication:</b> The workgroup is also charged to collaborate with other related CTF initiatives and the Leadership Council to assure communication, encourage engagement, and provide necessary resources. One identified campus president or member of the Coordinating Committee from this workgroup will provide monthly updates at Leadership Council.</li> <li><b>Engage Leaders:</b> A team with cross-section of current workgroup members with CC/CPL expertise will provide all presidents, administrators, provosts and deans training on CC/CPL and the toolkit elements in order to provide support for the faculty driven implementation.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</b></p>		<p><b>1)</b> System wide collaboration model is needed to address interdependencies.</p>
<p><b>Resources:</b></p>	<p><b>1)</b> Human and fiscal resources for collaboration and professional development.</p>	<p><b>2)</b> Project management support at system and institutional levels.</p>
		<p><b>3)</b> Technological support for online resources, coding changes, transfer improvements: DARS alignment, VETS alignment, HR alignment.</p>
		<p><b>4)</b> Internal (institutional) and system resources for professional development (faculty/staff).</p>

**Supporting Documentation**

**Research, References, Best Practices, Gallery Walk Feedback & Other:**

See attached appendix and gallery walk feedback



**Initiative #2: Toolkit for Scale Up**

The work groups will apply and refine the toolkit to scale up CC/CPL at individual campuses across the system to build statewide capacity.

**What is the Current State?**

- MnSCU’s current structure and processes do not facilitate consistent uses and practices of CC/CPL, acceptance and transfer of prior learning across institutions.
- These inconsistencies and lack of state wide institution-to-institution coordination directly and negatively impact students.

**What is the Desired Future State?**

- Create a student centered, system-wide, seamless transferable CC/CPL model with varied assessment alternatives
- Expand student success pathway(s) that increase the number of learners prepared for careers of tomorrow.
- Increase enrollment, persistence, and graduation.

**Risk Analysis:**

- Accessible, transferable student pathways and processes are critical to serve identified student needs and goals **AND** strengthen market share in a higher education climate that is accelerating focus on recognizing and crediting competence-based learning.
- Failure to do so will result in ongoing inconsistencies for student opportunities.
- Without this resource, institutions are limited in capacity and ability.

**Type of Initiative:**

- Institution
- Inter-institutional
- System wide

**Suggested Timeframe for Completion:**

- Early Win (< 6 months)
- Medium Term (6-18 months)
- Long Term (> 18 months)

**Ease of Implementation**

- Easy
- Moderate
- Difficult

**Action Steps:**

- Toolkit Refinement:** Round One Workgroup will refine and further develop a CC/CPL Toolkit that will be a starting place or reference for faculty to use as part of the faculty inquiry process as key campus stakeholders work to enable and build capacity. There must be collaboration and coordination with the Leadership Council and the Coordinating Committee regarding inter-related core policies and processes.
- SME Resources:** The toolkit will identify useful and needed SMEs; both internal and external needed to implement the toolkit and build capacity within the system. These include faculty (who will evaluate), but also advisors, financial and student services staff, registrar, etc.
- Resource Site:** Develop system wide, searchable, publicly accessible resource sites for CC/CPL (like Distance Minnesota or Minnesota Learning Commons; [Minnesota Department of Higher Education – Credit for Prior Learning](#); Minnesota Career Pathways, etc). Attention needed in application of terminology and in maximizing potential online search engines. (Hatling Flynt expertise on marketing used by Graduate Minnesota.)
- Faculty Evaluator Pool/Inventory:** Create an inventory of faculty evaluators and courses/course competences and individualized CC/CPL evaluation to be housed in a Minnesota Counts (comparable to CAEL’s Learning Counts). This site will be available and marketed to current and prospective students. Campuses will be responsible to contribute and update their inventories of faculty evaluators and courses or individualized CC/CPL evaluation. (The site will be promoted widely by campus and system personnel.)
- Development:** Develop project planning schedule and guidelines.
- Toolkit Components:** Components of the toolkit will include topics essential for consistency and implementation of CC/CPL within the system, readiness checklist, best curricular practices, administrative procedures, etc. Continue to populate the toolkit with implementation details and best practices.
- Governance Processes:** Present recommendations through existing governance processes.



# CHARTING THE FUTURE

FOR A PROSPEROUS MINNESOTA

<b>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</b>	<b>1)</b> Lack of consistent student centered policy and processes at the institution level.		
<b>Resources:</b>	<b>1)</b> Leverage and enable current institutional SMEs from across the system to implement the toolkit and to serve as resources for professional development (faculty/staff) including facilitators; workload assignments for faculty evaluation, curricular development.	<b>2)</b> Project management support at system and institutional levels.	<b>3)</b> Technical support for online resources, coding and transfer implementation, DARS, VETS, HR.

### Supporting Documentation

### Research, References, Best Practices, Gallery Walk Feedback & Other:

See attached appendix and gallery walk feedback



<p><b>Initiative #3: Professional Development</b> Each participating university and college, as well as the system office, will invest sufficient resources for faculty and staff professional development to advance these initiatives, beginning with a faculty development inquiry process that is faculty-driven and includes SMEs drawn from local and system institutions.</p>		
<p><b>What is the Current State?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing CC/CPL initiatives have been largely externally funded (i.e. Lumina and Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) grants, etc.) or supported at varying levels (minimal to modest to entrepreneurial) by campuses and/or campus consortiums (such as the SE MN consortium.)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>What is the Desired Future State?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritization of CC/CPL within college/university strategic plans and budgeting amplified by system-wide commitment to needed resources (perhaps buoyed by incentives) <b>AND</b> investment and support to develop external grant-funding and corporate sources of support will help realize these opportunities.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Risk Analysis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeking allocation or reallocation of resources, particularly at the campus levels, is challenging at a time when many campuses (particularly 4-year) are cutting programs, reduce staff and faculty, etc. because of declining enrollment and budgets deficits.</li> <li>Professional development of faculty <b>AND</b> staff (including advising, registration, financial aid) is critical for progress in these initiatives.</li> <li>The demonstrated potential of CC/CPL to meet student needs and demands (and strengthen market share).</li> <li>Lack of institutional commitment decreases importance and value.</li> <li>Consistence and sustained implementation won't happen.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Type of Initiative:</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-institutional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System wide (see Point F)	<p><b>Suggested Timeframe for Completion:</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Early Win (< 6 months) (for jump start initiatives) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium Term (6-18 months) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term (> 18 months) (for sustainability)	<p><b>Ease of Implementation</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Easy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult
<p><b>Action Steps:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Professional Development Resources:</b> Make CC/CPL education integral to the institutions academic enterprise. To identify resources for potential professional development through internal reallocation and/or external grants.</li> <li><b>Resources:</b> Provide access to approaches that enable institutions to strategically identify professional development activities for CBE &amp; CC/CPL.</li> <li><b>Identify SMEs:</b> Identify system, institutional and external SMEs.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</b></p>	<p><b>1) Compensation for professional development.</b></p>	<p><b>2) Incentives are needed (promotion and tenure, compensation, honors/recognition, etc.) to develop CC/CPL curricular innovations, serve as CC/CPL evaluators, serve and lead in capacity building and student access.</b></p>
<p><b>Resources:</b></p>	<p><b>1) Digital resources.</b></p>	<p><b>2) Human and fiscal resources.</b></p>

**Supporting Documentation**

**Research, References, Best Practices, Gallery Walk Feedback & Other:**

See attached appendix and gallery walk feedback



**Initiative #4: Capacity Building Resources**

Commit statewide and institutional capacity building resources, leveraging both internal and external subject matter experts, to support campuses as they progress in this work.

**What is the Current State?**

- Internal resources and subject matter experts reside within the system, primarily as “early adopter” campuses at both college and university levels.
- Inter-institutional collaborations and networks have begun to develop. However, grant resources (Graduate Minnesota, Credit When it’s Due) obtained to respond to CC/CPL needs of students, military veterans and service members are not sustainable in our present state without ongoing system support.
- At the System and institutional level, CBE/CPL is not prioritized sufficiently high among the activities that compete for limited resources.
- Additionally, there is no easily accessible central repository of resources to initiate this work.

**What is the Desired Future State?**

- Institutions will have necessary resources in place to build capacity for this initiative
- Students, faculty and staff at all campuses have readily accessible, transparent processes and resources that build effective capacity.

**Risk Analysis:**

- Pockets of CC/CPL innovation and expertise will exist, but the impact will be marginal.
- We will fail to meet student needs and lose market share.
- Fail to align and recognize business and industry training and workforce needs and restrict access to post-secondary education.

**Type of Initiative:**

- Institution
- Inter-institutional
- System wide

**Suggested Timeframe for Completion:**

- Early Win (< 6 months)
- Medium Term (6-18 months)
- Long Term (> 18 months)

**Ease of Implementation**

- Easy
- Moderate
- Difficult (truly functioning system-wide)

**Action Steps:**

- Institutional Support:** Each round of work groups will teach, collaborate, and mentor subsequent institutions, faculty, staff and students on how to build CC/CPL capacity.
- System Support:** Provide system resource support (human and fiscal) for toolkit scale up and implementation, training for all stakeholders, data analysis, marketing and communication.
- Collaborative Partnerships:** Enable and reward collaboration among campuses that provide unique offerings or pathways to student success and degree completion.

**Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>1)</b> Current business model does not reward or encourage capacity building or collaboration. | <b>2)</b> Financial Aid and HLC policy and interpretation. | <b>3)</b> Compensation for work.               |
| <b>4)</b> Policy and Legislation.   | <b>5)</b> Campuses compete.                                | <b>6)</b> Faculty concern over “lost credits”. |
| <b>7)</b> Allocation model.   |  |  |

**Resources:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>1)</b> Faculty remuneration and related contract language to fully address this work. | <b>2)</b> Time and expense for campus participation. |
|--|--|

**Supporting Documentation**

**Research, References, Best Practices, Gallery Walk Feedback & Other:**

See attached appendix and gallery walk feedback



<p><b>Initiative #5: Policy and Procedure Development</b> Develop system-wide policy recommendations regarding coding, transfer, price, and compensation structure, to provide consistency and cost-effectiveness for students, improve quality and documentation, and ensure smooth transfer.</p>			
<p><b>What is the Current State?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MnSCU Policy 3.35 addresses Credit for Prior Learning, but not certification of competence or competence-based instruction and assessment.</li> <li>Implementation is variable and inconsistent, so student access is inconsistent also.</li> <li>Coding, transcription, residency requirement, credit cap and transfer acceptance vary among institutions. Cost structure and amount also vary among institutions at the same level, due to varying interpretation of Higher Learning Commission requirements and campus business models.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>What is the Desired Future State?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures and mechanisms for coding and transcription in range of CC/CPL options are developed and implemented in ISRS and DARS, providing consistency for students, record-keeping capabilities across the system, and ease of transfer.</li> <li>Transfer acceptance policies and practices have been aligned among system institutions and inform the development of consistent, cost effective CC/CPL programs.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Risk analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Varying policy interpretation negatively impacts our students and their ability to transfer.</li> <li>CC/CPL policies will remain inconsistent across institution, inhibiting persistence and completion.</li> <li>Our competitors will prevail, costing students financially. Therefore, not serving or attracting the students we could.</li> <li>Barriers will remain with little or no incentive to change.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Type of Initiative:</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-institutional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System wide	<p><b>Suggested Timeframe for Completion:</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Early Win (< 6 months) <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Term (6-18 months) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term (> 18 months)		<p><b>Ease of Implementation</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Easy <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Difficult
<p><b>Action Steps:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Policies and Procedures-</b> Develop policies and procedures to address consistent coding for a range of CC/CPL/CBE options, transcribing, transfer, residency and appeals.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise existing MnSCU Policy 3.35 and Procedure 3.35.1 and develop other policies and procedures to include: coding and transcribing, transfer of CC/CPL/CBE among institutions; residency and a System appeal policy.</li> <li>Include several representatives from CC/CPL CTF team to be on the policy and procedure development committee(s) specifically for CC/CPL/CBE, to ensure continuity and provide subject matter expertise.</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>Business Model</b> – Develop a sustainable model for that addresses programmatic capacity building and related financial implications.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop tiered levels of pricing for tuition and fees for an array of CC/CPL/CBE options, including various forms of learning assessment and financial aid applicability.</li> <li>Address system allocation framework, budgetary allocation and funding sources.</li> <li>Examine workload assignments and recommend incentives and compensation levels for CC/CPL/CBE that reflect a range of workload and an array of assessment options.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>			
<p><b>Policy barriers, interdependencies, or other concerns:</b></p>	<p><b>1)</b> Inconsistent interpretation and application of MnSCU Policy 3.35 and 3.35.1 on CC/CPL.</p>	<p><b>2)</b> Various fees and tuition amounts charged for CC/CPL.</p>	<p><b>3)</b> Mechanisms to integrate CC/CPL/CBE into workload assignments.</p>
	<p><b>4)</b> Policy and procedure components missing such as coding, transfer and appeals.</p>		
<p><b>Resources:</b></p>	<p><b>1)</b> System resources needed for project management, technological support, marketing, etc.</p>	<p><b>2)</b> Policy and procedure work-groups to develop coding, transfer, pricing, etc., with CC/CPL SMEs included.</p>	





## **CHARTING THE FUTURE**

FOR A PROSPEROUS MINNESOTA

### **Other Suggestions:**

Because of early adoption-continuing innovations among institutions within our system, some practices recommended by systems or institutions which have recently moved into CC/CPL may not meet the needs of MnSCU institutions, or keep the system on the cutting edge. Policies need to allow for continuing innovation and appropriate variation among institutions, while improving transparency, seamless transfer and consistency of access for students.

### **Supporting Documentation**

#### **Research, References, Best Practices, Gallery Walk Feedback & Other:**

See attached appendix and gallery walk feedback



# CC/CPL Gallery Walk

---

Summary & Analysis of CC/CPL Gallery Walk responses from April 13, 2015

## Summary

In general, responses were positive. There were many opportunities and benefits discussed. There are positive and negative impacts to implementing a CBE/CPL (Competency Based Education/Credit for Prior Learning) system.

The primary responses to the question of CBE/CPL development and implementation were that it would decrease cost for students and it would increase the number of degree completions. In addition, these types of programs may serve to make our institutions more competitive with others, especially for-profit institutions. CBE/CPL programs would increase recruitment and retention because students would not have to start over or pay for what they already know. These programs would be very helpful in assisting those students reentering school from either the workforce or the military in the transition to or back to higher education. Students would move more efficiently through the education system. There are extensive opportunities for industry partnerships, before entering the system, during coursework, and following degree completion. Essentially, there is an opportunity here to increase the number of students entering the system and completing their degrees in an efficient and effective way and to make education more affordable and accessible to non-traditional students.

However, there were also some concerns:

- How will competencies be determined?
- Where will the funding come from for these programs?
- Will these programs decrease the number of faculty?
- What if this becomes the new normal instead of the exception?

One primary concern is that while students may have the necessary skills, they may not have the comprehensive understanding of core concepts that they need to succeed. If students are taking fewer courses and are completing their degrees more quickly, there is concern that there will be less tuition income. The ability to determine what competencies should be included and how those competencies could be evaluated is not consistent across disciplines.

While they were a minority, there are faculty, staff, and students who disagree with implementing this kind of educational system. This reasoning is that if a position requires a four year degree for hire or advancement, that individual should have to earn a four year degree, not an equivalency. Even if they are exempted from some classes, students should be required to take other classes in place of the exemptions. While completing a degree with a number of CBE/CPL credits would result in degree completion or certification, it would only be job training, rather than a full education.

Another cause for disagreement is the additional burdens that will be placed on faculty and staff for developing and implementing this program, as well as accommodating the additional influx of new students.



The final common denominator of dissenting individuals is the current lack of funding—this project has the potential to strain other budgets, especially with the potential for decreased revenue (loss of tuition funds).

## Questions

Even if they were responding positively, individuals still had questions regarding the ability of the system to develop and implement this program:

- Would this program incur additional costs to the student, and would financial aid be able to be applied to those costs?
- How will CPL/CBE be noted on transcripts?
- How would this assessment be completed? What processes and policies would need to be put in place?
- What is a sustainable incentive model for this program?
- What are the national trends with these programs?
- Are there professional organizations or testing sources that have already made progress?
- What direction can we take from for-profit institutions that are successful with these types of programs?
- How will the standards for CPL/CBE be created?
- How will out of class time administering CPL assessment be managed?
- How will we include and accommodate multicultural perspectives?
- How can we include both a system-wide policy and an institution specific process?
- How many students can this really benefit—is the return on investment worth this very extensive work?
- How will root causes of resistance be identified and addressed?
- Who will oversee competency assessment?
- Which students will be eligible for these programs?
- How will the system maintain a standard for CPL—how do we prevent institution/personal decision making causing programs to differ from one another?

## Trends

There are trends in the responses from faculty, staff, and students. Faculty and staff are primarily concerned about cost and consistency, whereas students are more concerned about personal cost and the accessibility of this program to all students, rather than a smaller subset of the student population.

### Faculty

- Faculty are generally supportive of implementing this program. However, they are very concerned with how the program will be made available to students and cross-campus consistency.
- Faculty from 2 year and technical schools are concerned that implementing these programs will make 4 year colleges and universities less likely to accept their transfer credits.
- Another trend across faculty is the concern that this will undermine the value of the traditional liberal arts style of higher education.



- There are concerns over the reliability and validity of this type of program for faculty.
- Lastly, faculty are generally concerned that this type of program would reduce workforce needs for faculty.

### Staff

- Staff are concerned about funding and consistency. Where will the money to fund these programs come from? Implementing new programs could very well critically damage other budgets. Money should come from the system as a whole rather than individual institutions.
- One statement that embodies a common sentiment is:  
*"[We] must ensure [that] the analysis and credentialing is solid and fair. [CBE/CPL] must be systematized."* – Staff at Riverland Community College, Austin
- How competency is determined and what criteria must be met for credit to be awarded will be difficult to determine, and it is important to ensure level consistency across disciplines and across campuses.

### Students

- Students feel that this type of program would be beneficial to them because it would decrease both cost and time for degree completion.
- Students are concerned that these programs would not be accessible to all students. Is this program only for "adults"?
- Students are also very interested in how this will affect veteran students—will they have access to similar opportunities?

## Suggestions

Some of the common suggestions for the program included:

- Bring in industry mentors for students
- Allow a testing period at the beginning of a course/semester
- Dedicate advisors to CBE/CPL specifically
- System-wide leadership (MnSCU) in recognizing equivalencies
- Regulate the transfer of CBE/CPL credits to four year institutions

## Conclusion

Overall, the faculty, students, and staff who provided feedback on CBE/CPL programs during the CC/CPL Gallery Walk were in support of developing and implementing a MnSCU wide CBE/CBL as long as certain conditions were met. A system-wide CBE/CPL program would be beneficial because it would lead to more cost-effective degree completion options for students, propelling them through the system more efficiently.



## CC/CPL Implementation Team Appendix

### Appendix A: Work Group Components and Structure

- I. **CC/CPL Workgroup Formation:** Identify work groups of colleges and universities within MnSCU to advance strategies and capacity for CC/CPL. (Rounds One, Two & Three)
  - a. **Charter FY16 Workgroup:** Leadership Council will establish a Round One workgroup in FY16 that includes representation of faculty, staff, students and administration from MnSCU campuses (Approx. 1/3) committed to advancing strategies and capacities for CC/CPL. One university, one free-standing technical college and some colleges new to CC/CPL, in addition to MnSCU colleges and universities identified as early adopters, shall be part of this workgroup.
    - i. **Workgroup Responsibilities:** Round One workgroup is to implement and scale up the CC/CPL/CBE toolkit and create a pathway for Round Two and Round Three. Each workgroup shall collect and analyze data, determine distribution pathways and develop charge for subsequent Round Workgroup. Participants need to attend workgroup meetings as determined and work with campus coordinators to direct the work.
    - ii. **Charter FY17 and FY18 Workgroups:** Establish subsequently Round Two And Three Recommendation workgroups in FY17 and FY18 that will continue to work with Round One participants to prepare for and participate in CC/CPL. All MnSCU institutions will participate by FY18 (i.e. Round Three).
  - b. **Training and Orientation: (Rounds One through Three)**
    - i. Orientation for campus participation
      1. Participants will receive information on workgroup expectations, process and an introduction to the toolkit
      2. Orientation processes for internal stakeholders will be available at each round.
    - ii. Training is available by SME's and other related resources
  - c. **Communication:**
    - i. Communication with Leadership Council and CTF Teams
      1. One identified president or member of the Coordinating Committee from this workgroup will provide monthly updates at Leadership Council and Coordinating Committee
    - ii. Communication within participating campuses
      1. Leverage your campus participants trained on change and project management to establish outcomes and deliverables
    - iii. Communication with Students and External Stakeholders
      1. Ensure regular communication with student life and related student organizations
    - iv. Communication with Subsequent Rounds
      1. Provide summary to ensure a smooth handoff
      2. Implementation rounds will hold retrospectives to improve and refine the processes and the toolkit.
  - d. **Engage Leaders:**
    - i. A team with a cross-section of current workgroup members with CC/CPL/CBE expertise will engage all presidents, administrators, provosts and deans on CC/CPL/CBE toolkit process and elements in order to provide support for the faculty driven implementation



## Appendix B: Tool Kit

### I. Team Definitions:

- a. **Competence:** What you know and what you can do. Demonstrates knowledge, skills and abilities, which may include theoretical and practical components of what you know and can apply
- b. **Competency-based Education:** Focuses on learning and the application of that learning, rather than on the time spent in class or on materials. Progress is measured by learners demonstrating what they know and can do, through a system of rigorous assessments
- c. **Certification:** A credential earned by an individual through “high-stakes” assessment that is governed by a board and determined to meet specific competencies
- d. **Credit for Prior Learning:** Credit earned by a learner who demonstrates knowledge, skills and abilities acquired through work, professional training, military training, and other learning experiences and assessed by academically sound and rigorous processes
- e. **Certificate:** Academic credential earned by acquiring competence(s) through a set of learning outcomes and formal assessment, that business and industry, workforce and training organizations and accredited higher education institutions recognize
- f. **Certificate of Participation:** An award for participation in a learning experience with or without assessed learning outcomes. Such learning outcomes achieved may be applied to a formal competency based assessment

### II. Checklist for Readiness for CC/CPL

- a. **Review MnSCU Policy 3.35 and Procedure 3.35.1 and 5.11.1 and related policies and procedures**
- b. **Identify and review institutional plans, policies and procedures**
  - i. Institution wide strategic plan
  - ii. Other related plans including the master academic plan
  - iii. Any existing institutional policies/procedures specifically related to CC/CPL (credits allowed, registration and evaluation options, transcribing, etc.)
- c. **Review adult student friendly campus elements**
  - i. Might include faculty/staff who have participated in adult learning inquiries or training (Noel Levitz Adult Learner Inventory, CAEL Institutional Self-Assessment Survey, or other assessments)
- d. **Identify team members**
  - i. From each participating campus members recruit members who are Subject Matter Experts, Early Adopters, and Champions. Suggested members for campus team may include:
    1. College or university lead/contact person
    2. Academic programs and faculty to be included in CC/CPL/CBE
    3. Admissions, Financial Aid, and Registrar's office staff
    4. Students
    5. Academic Advisors/Counselor
    6. Administrator(s)

### III. Communications and Marketing Plan

- a. Review marketing plan from Graduate Minnesota from system office (i.e. Hatling & Flint, 2015)
- b. Review system level work on marketing and branding on related initiatives
- c. Establish individual campus marketing needs as work continues

### IV. References and Resources

- a. **Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)**
  - i. Internal CC/CPL/CBE subject matter experts:
    1. Reference the CC/CPL Implementation Team Roster



- ii. External CC/CPL/CBE subject matter experts:
    - 1. Keith Bird, Corporation for a Skilled Workforce
    - 2. Michele Skinner, Texas A & M System Offices
    - 3. Brett Visger, University Ohio Board of Regents
    - 4. PLA with a Purpose Report- Ohio Board of Regents
    - 5. Diane Treis Rush, University of Wisconsin System Administration
    - 6. Nan Travers, Director of College wide Academic Review, SUNY Empire State College
    - 7. Council on Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL)
    - 8. Rebecca Karoff, University of Wisconsin Flexible Option Expert
    - 9. American Council on Education (ACE)
  - iii. Identify and engage internal and external subject matter experts on transcribing and transfer
- b. Best Practices Repository**
- i. MnSCU Best Practices
    - 1. Becoming a Distinctive Voice for Adult Learners brochure – Winona State University
    - 2. Admitted Adult Learners Who Never Enrolled in Courses: A Qualitative Analysis April 2014 – Winona State
    - 3. Adult Learner Individual Interviews: A Qualitative Analysis of Adult Learners At Winona State University – Rochester Campus Spring 2014
    - 4. Adult Learning Focused Institution (ALFI) 2012 Assessment Report – Winona State
    - 5. Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) 2012 Assessment Results – Winona State
    - 6. Admitted But Never Enrolled Report – Winona State University
    - 7. Individual Interviews Report – Winona State University
    - 8. Final Rochester Report – Winona State University
    - 9. Final Winona Report – Winona State University
    - 10. Master Academic Plan Focus Group Report June 2014 – Inver Hills Community College
    - 11. Student Satisfaction Surveys Fall 2013 – (ASPS, ALI, PSOL) – Metro State
    - 12. Key Findings Report - Metro State Website – The Nerderly 2015
- c. Stakeholders (internal/external)**
- i. Internal Stakeholders
    - 1. Students and student associations (MSCSA & MSUSA)
    - 2. Faculty & Staff
    - 3. Campus Presidents
    - 4. Administration: Deans, CAOs, CFOs, CIOs
    - 5. Student Affairs/Services, Academic Advisors, Registrars, Business Office
    - 6. Governance units
    - 7. Board of Trustees
  - ii. External Stakeholders
    - 1. U.S. and Minnesota Departments of Education
    - 2. Higher Learning Commission and other Accrediting Bodies
    - 3. Legislators
    - 4. Community Leaders
    - 5. Business/Employers
    - 6. Donors/Alumni
    - 7. Education Partners (including Office of Higher Education)
    - 8. Organizations/Associations
    - 9. Prospective Learners
    - 10. Advocacy for Learners Groups
    - 11. Government Agencies



## **Appendix C: A Framework for Professional Development**

### **I. Rationale:**

- a. Affirm the value of student learning everywhere it occurs, particularly to facilitate adult learners' degree completion (whether having completed noncredit certificates, community and work experience, military and service training, associate or technical degrees, credits from multiple sources, etc.)

### **II. Sample Framework:**

- a. Board of Directors policy and campus alignment
- b. Consider using an assessment tool as a resource to determine gaps (Adult Learning Inventory (ALI))
- c. Identify campus gaps and determine goals and align with Student needs
- d. Determine Faculty and Staff training needs
- e. Consider System-wide SME's and other resources to provide broad CC/CPL/CBE inquiry based training for faculty and staff
- f. Collaborate with other institutions to advance work in related areas

### **III. Competence is the core of all learning**

- a. Faculty develop and teach most existing learning (classes, etc.) throughout the system and identify expected learning outcomes and how these outcomes contribute to competence
- b. Identify components of competence expected/attained (especially important for assessment)
- c. Resources will be accessible, open and shared
- d. Focus on how to identify, assess and validate learning and competence
- e. Professional development on assessment of learning and/or competence
- f. Train faculty how to do options for assessments (credit by exam, portfolio review)
- g. Identify and allocate resources that enable staff/faculty to participate and obtain funding to advance this work





## **Appendix D: Policy/Procedures and Business Model to Implement CC/CPL/CBE**

**Policy and Procedure Development:** Develop system-wide policy recommendations regarding coding, transfer, tuition and fees, residency credit and compensation structure.

### **Guiding Principles for Policy and Procedure Development:**

Consistent with current MnSCU policy and procedure (3.35 and 3.35.1) and with standards and principles of CAEL, policies and procedures developed for CC/CPL/CBE should:

- Recognize competence as defined in this report
  - Provide educational planning and advising to encourage best use of CC/CPL/CBE at lower and upper-division levels, and for the student's intended goals
  - Recognize credit earned through assessment of competence and assessment of prior learning as equal to competence achieved through course instruction and assessment, in coding, grading, transcribing and transfer, with no discernable difference in the transcribing, other than coding
  - Ensure quality and rigorous assessment processes that are applied consistently and with appropriate documentation
  - Recognize both course-equivalency and individualized competence assessment options among the array of assessment options
  - Distinguish external assessments accepted as transfer credit from internal assessments by internal faculty, and review and establish guidelines and criteria for each
  - Provide assessment at reasonable costs to students, with tiers of discounted tuition to recognize the range of student and faculty involvement
  - Provide for student appeals, and monitoring of programs for continuous improvement
- I. **Policies and Procedures: Develop policies and procedures to address consistent coding for a range of CC/CPL/CBE options, transcribing, transfer, residency and appeals.**
- a. Revise existing policy 3.35 and procedure 3.35.1 and develop other policies and procedures to include: coding and transcribing, transfer of CC/CPL/CBE among institutions; residency and a System appeal policy
  - b. Include several people from CC/CPL CTF team to be on the policy and procedure development committee(s) specifically for CC/CPL/CBE, to ensure continuity and provide subject matter expertise
  - c. Develop/revise institutional-level Policies and Procedures as CC/CPL is implemented, consistent with System policies and procedures

### **Specific Policy Considerations and Recommendations:**

#### **II. Coding/Transcribing**

- a. **Registration Codes:** Establish system-wide Registration Codes for all forms of assessment for credit of prior learning, course exams, competence assessment, and other competence-based student-directed learning assessed by MnSCU faculty assessors/evaluators.
  - i. Address coding for external-assess learning recorded for credit (e.g. military training, certifications granted credit, ACE recommendations).
  - ii. Registration coding should include subject area and title designations, and level (lower- or upper-division and graduate levels).
  - iii. Coding allows for tracking, documenting, metrics analysis and reporting, and decision-making on the use of CPL, provides uniform practices for transcripts, and affords students clarity and consistency. Round One - college and universities will beta-test coding and related processes



**b. Grading Options:**

- i. Allow use of standard grading options in use for courses, including A-F grading, and/or Competence/No Competence or Pass/Fail, consistent with institutional practice for courses.
- ii. CC/CPL/CBE should be graded with no visible distinction from course grading options, other than registration coding to signify the CPL option.
- iii. Students needing a graded option for tuition reimbursement or other reasons should be able to choose that option, as for courses.

**c. Institutional Credit Award/Residency:**

- i. CBE/CBA/CPL credits awarded through internal assessment will count for institutional residency, and toward graduation residency requirements.
- ii. Graduation, General Education and program requirements typically frame a limit for the number of credits possible for each student to earn and use appropriately in an educational program.
- iii. No limits on the number of credits earned through CPL need to be set, and no limit is recommended. Institutions will monitor HLC and other relevant program accreditation requirements at the institution and program level for any exceptions

**d. Transfer:**

- i. CC/CPL/CBE credit awards will be accepted for transfer among all systems institutions.
- ii. Each institution will honor transfer as per Policy 3.35 and Procedure 3.35.1, and the Transfer policies. DARS and Transferology systems will implement methods to incorporate credit awards approved for course-equivalencies and General Education Goal Areas of Minnesota Transfer Curriculum, to ease transfer transparency and application.
- iii. Work Groups (Rounds One-Three) will address potential curricular alignments for programs and majors to promote transfer of CC/CPL/CBE credit awards, particularly to address program accreditation standards and related expectations

**e. Documentation:**

- i. For course-equivalency assessments and competence-based assessment tied to courses, programs, graduation requirements, etc., written documentation similar to a course/independent study syllabus should be kept on file.
- ii. Such a syllabus will provide evidence of expected learning outcomes, assessment methods, and standards for award of credit

**f. Certifications/Credit Recommendations:**

- i. Reinforce System Policy and Procedure (3.35 and 3.35.1) to accept in transfer the credit recommendations for external exams, training and certification already in MnSCU Policy 3.35, including but not limited to ACE, AP, IB, CLEP, DSST, NOCTI, TECEP and ExCEL (Excelsior)
- ii. Charter a policy work group to consider additional credit recommendation services for transfer and industry validated and reliable industry recognized assessments
- iii. Encourage institutions to conduct faculty reviews of Industry Certifications and external trainings that relate directly to programs, majors, or other graduation requirements, for course equivalencies or other forms of CC/CPL/CBE
- iv. Establish a mechanism such as "Recording of Other Learning" through faculty-assessed reviews of approved certifications/training. Charge students who have achieved such external learning outcomes and assessment no more than a nominal recording fee, reflecting initial costs of faculty review and assessment of the programs
- v. As long as student assessment is included in the certification/external training program to the satisfaction of faculty reviewers, require no further assessment of students, but set requirements for documenting the learning, time of award, and the sponsoring organization, and other standards determined in review protocols



- III. Business Model** – Develop a sustainable model that addresses programmatic capacity building and related financial implications
- a. Tuition and Fee Recommendations and Considerations:** MnSCU should establish a tiered-tuition and fee framework to maintain affordability of CC/CPL/CBE options for students, and to provide reasonable revenue to sustain a comprehensive array of learning assessment options.
- i. Tiers will reflect a range of student preparation and a range of involvement of faculty assessors, advisors, and other expenses
  - ii. Pricing set in relation to full-tuition, per credit, allows for comparability with course credits, yet differences between institutional types and levels of learning/credits. The tuition-based model also allows for changes in tuition as costs increase and increases are approved as part of consultation and governance processes
  - iii. Assessments done by institution faculty and registered as local/resident credits may qualify for financial aid, while external assessment and fee-based charges do not qualify
  - iv. Pricing models/levels for consideration include:
    1. Course-equivalency prior learning assessment: Flat Fee Model (e.g. \$75/credit) or Reduced-Tuition Model (e.g. 50% of full-tuition)
    2. Credit by Exam: Flat Fee Model (e.g., \$50 per credit) or Reduced Tuition Model (e.g. 30% of full-tuition)
    3. Individualized assessment, portfolio review, and other customized assessments: Reduced Tuition Model Recommended (See PLA reduced tuition of 40% reduction from regular course tuition approved at Board of Trustees in June 2015 for Metropolitan State University)
    4. Other formats developed in individual institutions and through Rounds One-Three should be reflected in the pricing structure, to maintain openness to innovation and improvements
  - v. Other policies, procedures and legislation should be aligned as part of implementation to assure compliance and consistency, for example, according to Minnesota legislation and System Procedure 5.11.1 Tuition and Fees, Part 5, Subpart B., “A fee shall not be charged for analysis and awarding of credit for training delivered by the United States military.” To provide for consistency and implementation, a fee/tuition waiver mechanism needs to be developed and directed for institutional application
- b. Address system allocation framework, budgetary allocation and funding sources.**
- i. Considerations:
    1. System allocation frameworks based on enrollment do not address competence-based assessment and CPL, which are not consistently part of enrollment tracking.
    2. Changes in coding/transcribing and mechanisms for including CC/CPL/CBE formats in enrollment reports need to be implemented credits awarded should be worked into institutional FTE’s for institutional allocation
- c. Examine workload assignments and recommend incentives and compensation levels for CC/CPL/CBE that reflect a range of workload and an array of assessment options**
- i. The below principles align with goals to scale up availability of CC/CPL/CBE, and with best practices in the field of CBE/CPL
    1. Address mechanisms for CC/CPL/CBE faculty/staff workload assignments, overload assignments, tenure and promotion criteria, and other incentives, in order to encourage faculty/staff involvement with and development of CBE innovations and CPL assessment
    2. Recognize faculty expertise and encourage participation in developing CBE or doing CPL assessments



3. Recognize variation in preparation. Some assessments can be prepared in advance and delivered the same way to multiple students, such as course-equivalency exams; other assessments involve a high level of faculty customization for individual students.
4. Compensation rates should reflect these variations and a tiered approach, comparable to the tiered-tuition model, would provide one model.
5. A base amount of work--covering development, consultation, advising and finally assessment--is involved in even a one-credit assessment; a tiered model should therefore include a minimum amount, rather than be strictly on a per-credit basis
6. Consider increasing the minimum rate of compensation across institutions in the system as part of the system promotion of CC /CPL/CBE initiative