



## ACCELERATED LEARNING WORKGROUP UPDATE DOCKET ITEM APPENDIX

*(Documents Presented to Provosts Council & Chief Academic Officers by Elizabeth Lundy December 2, 2015)*

Overview of the Progress of the Accelerated Learning Workgroup	2
ALWG Draft Standards: Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships	8
ALWG Discussion Draft Standards: Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning	12
Revised Oregon Dual Credit Standards	16
Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards	18

## Provosts Council & Chief Academic Officers 12/1/15

### Overview of the Progress of the Accelerated Learning Workgroup

As we focus on increasing access to opportunities for high school students to earn college credit, it is critically important to create broad-based understandings of these programs. These understandings provide the foundation for acceptance of transcribed courses and credits to meet the requirements for certificates and degrees across the 24 public institutions of higher education in Oregon.

Working together, Oregon's colleges and universities can establish standards that provide confidence in the quality, applicability, and accuracy of documented achievement of student learning. These standards, established and monitored through a peer review process, strengthen a seamless pathway into higher education for students.

While each institution determines the desirability and feasibility of offering various programs, should a college or university offer models of Accelerated Learning, it agrees to abide by these collaboratively developed standards and to periodically demonstrate to its peers how its programs comply with applicable standards. Similarly, fellow colleges and universities agree to accept such transcribed credits in transfer, if applicable to a student's program.

The term **Accelerated Learning Program** refers to a program that allows students to earn college credit while in high school. Note, it does not refer to the speed with which the learning takes place, but rather the acceleration of the movement along the K-20 continuum.

The following describe the four broad strategies the Accelerated Learning Workgroup has been discussing for earning college credit AT THE HIGH SCHOOL while in high school. Please note, this is only a subset of the universe of accelerated learning options for students.

#### **Dual Credit**

Dual credit refers to a course that is

- a) offered during the day at a high school,
- b) taught by a high school teacher, acting as a proxy instructor for the college, who meets the qualifications to teach the course for the college/university, and
- c) sufficiently similar to the college/university course to enable the student to be described as "taking a course from the college or university". Dual credit courses are transcribed in a manner that is reasonably consistent with those of like courses at the college and without special designation.

Dual Credit programs involve an intentional partnership between high school and college/university faculty; the primary requirement for the partnership activities is to ensure alignment and consistency with on-campus sections.

Oregon Dual Credit Standards have been in place for a number of years and are modeled after, but not identical to, the National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Programs (NACEP) standards. At least one higher education institution in Oregon is NACEP certified.

Because this model involves “taking a course from the college or university”, the standards focus on those elements that are the responsibility of the sponsoring institution for all courses offered and transcribed: curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and continuous improvement (program evaluation).

*The Oregon Dual Credit Standards are attached as an FYI.*

### **Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships**

A Dual Credit Teaching Partnership refers to a course that is

- a) offered during the day at a high school,
- b) taught by a high school teacher in partnership with a college/university faculty member who meets the qualifications to teach the course for the college/university, and
- b) sufficiently similar to the college/university course to enable the student to be described as “taking a course from the college or university”. Dual credit teaching partnership courses are transcribed in a manner that is reasonably consistent with those of like courses at the college and without special designation.

There is intentional partnership between high school and college/university faculty; the primary requirements for the partnership activities are to ensure sufficiently qualified faculty are providing leadership, guidance, and expertise regarding the college courses and to ensure alignment and consistency with on-campus sections.

The draft Dual Credit Teaching Partnership standards are modeled after the Oregon Dual Credit Standards (and hence the aforementioned NACEP standards). They broaden the options for offering college or university courses at the high school by providing standards for partnerships between college or university faculty and high school teachers to ensure appropriate expertise and alignment. This allows the high school the opportunity to work closely with the college or university to offer these courses even though it may not have teachers who individually meet the qualifications for teaching the college or university courses.

Because this model involves “taking a course from the college or university”, the standards focus on those elements that are the responsibility of the sponsoring institution for all courses offered and transcribed: curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and continuous improvement (program evaluation). These draft standards were developed by this workgroup in the context of the bigger picture of how colleges and universities offer courses and the importance of consistency wherever offered and however delivered.

*The draft Dual Credit Teaching Partnership standards and key discussion questions for Provosts Council and Chief Academic Officers are attached.*

Ongoing discussions and activity around the Dual Credit and Dual Credit Teaching Partnership standards include:

- a) Cross-sector, inter-institutional, and intra-institutional vetting of proposed standards
- b) Recognition that there continues to be concerns with the specifics of the standards related to registration, add/drop, and transcription timing and options.  
Specifically
  - For some, registering a student after the assessment has been completed and the grade determined does NOT prevent the course from being “sufficiently similar to the college/university course” and would not require a special designator on the transcript, if all other standards are met.
  - For some, giving the student the choice to register (or not) after the assessment has been completed and the grade determined does NOT prevent the course from being “sufficiently similar to the college/university course” and would not require a special designator on the transcript, if all other standards are met.
- c) There is a lack of comfort about the terminology Dual Credit and Dual Credit Teaching Partnership for the following reasons:
  - Both of these accelerated learning options require partnerships between the high school and college/university faculty and thus the phrase teaching partnership may not accurately reflect the difference between the models.
  - Dual credit has different meanings in community college and university related documents and procedures.
  - Dual credit generally refers to a broader category wherein a student who earns college credit (even if it is earned by coming to the college and taking a class as any other community member might) can also use that credit to meet high school graduation credit requirements. This may not involve enrollment in any high school course.
  - The most defining characteristic of these two models is that both reflect situations wherein students are concurrently enrolled in a college/university course and their high school course, hence the term concurrent enrollment might be better and less confusing.
- d) Dual credit and dual credit teaching partnership activities can require significant expenditures of resources by high schools and their college/university partners.
- e) It is important to understand and respond appropriately to any differences that may exist in how these models are treated in state funding rules and formulas across higher education sectors.

### **Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning**

Additional access to accelerated learning options may be beneficial to increase participation, especially for underrepresented groups. Providing options that are non-punitive and encourage students to try without potential negative consequence require models that may not rely upon taking a college course in order to earn credit. Providing a means by which students can demonstrate attainment of student learning outcomes without participating in a course offered by the higher education institution is not new.

Such options exist in a number of forms, including AP, IB and placing out of courses. Other examples include intentional partnerships that result in high school courses specifically designed to prepare students to demonstrate that they have achieved college-level learning outcomes. Those studying accelerated learning options in Illinois, for example, call their strategy “articulated credit” and describe it as follows:

*Articulated credit: Articulated credit programs align secondary and postsecondary courses in order to allow students who successfully complete selected high school courses to become eligible to apply for credit in the corresponding college course in the future. (CUNY Dual Enrolment Literature Review Aug 2010)*

Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning refers to program that includes

- a) an enhanced high school course(s) offered at the high school and taught by a high school teacher,
- b) a focus on student attainment of specific, targeted student learning outcomes, and
- c) the opportunity for students to demonstrate that they have attained those student learning outcomes and thereby earn credit for a course from the sponsoring college or university. Courses and credit earned through Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning programs are transcribed with a special designation.

Unlike the Dual Credit and Dual Credit Teaching Partnership programs, where the emphasis is on “taking a course from the college or university”, Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning focuses on partnerships between the college or university to enhance the high school curriculum and provide opportunities for the student to demonstrate attainment of the student learning outcomes associated with a college course. As such, standards for these models focus primarily on those elements that provide assurance of and document student learning that occurred outside of taking a course from the college or university. While this has many of the characteristics of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL), the intentional partnership between the high school and college or university to enhance the high school courses and focus on achievement of specifically identified student learning outcomes for college courses goes beyond any expectation for CPL.

The state has done significant, collaborative work to establish CPL standards for colleges and universities when assessing and documenting student learning attained prior to coming to the college or university. Although, these do not contemplate the types of alignment and partnership activities between high schools and post-secondary partners that define Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning, the principles that underlie the CPL standards are applicable and visible in the proposed standards. However, the robust nature of the Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning partnership would indicate that these models are not what one generally associates with CPL and hence a set of standards and more descriptive designator is warranted.

*The initial draft of the Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning standards and key discussion questions for Provosts Council and the Chief Academic Officers are attached.*

*The Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards are attached as an FYI.*

Ongoing discussions around Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning include:

- a) Cross-sector, inter-institutional, and intra-institutional vetting of proposed standards
- b) Recognition that some would consider as Dual Credit or Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships any model that meets all of the Dual Credit or Dual Credit Teaching Partnership standards except those related to registration, add/drop, grading and transcription timelines
- c) Providing these options can require significant expenditures of resources by high schools and their college/university partners.
- d) It is important to understand and respond appropriately to any differences that may exist in how these models are treated in state funding rules and formulas across higher education sectors.
- e) Additional criteria need to be developed if funding for Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning activities is to be included in state funding rules and formulas. Currently, CPL is not funded as part of state funding models. However, RFP funding is available to support proposals that include models that may fall into Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning categories. While RFPs may be an appropriate funding mechanism for testing new ideas, they are not a mechanism for long-term sustainability of successful programs.

**Some of the overarching questions still to be addressed in 2016 regarding Accelerated Learning opportunities:**

What does research tell us about the effectiveness and return on investment for each of these models in Oregon? Where are new models needed to fill access or equity gaps? Which students benefit the most from which models? Where should we focus limited resources? There is some recent research into these questions nationally that can guide our initial work, but more research specific to Oregon models is needed.

How does the effectiveness and return on investment for these and other current accelerated learning opportunities compare? How do they compare with 5<sup>th</sup> year and other free CC programs?

How do prior course-taking behavior, student readiness, availability of student support services, and participation in accelerated learning intertwine and what combinations are most effective and provide the highest return on investment with regard to persistence, completion and employment?

When, if ever, should credits earned through ALO be treated differently than credits earned by taking courses at the college or university. How should these be credit be used when determining who is a new student and who is a transfer student? There are some who believe that all Dual Credit, Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships, and Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning should be considered CPL, transcribed under the CPL umbrella and subject to the limitation to 25% of the credits earned toward a degree or certificate.

What life knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes are developed through the college experience that may not be captured in the student learning outcomes of individual courses? Will this put some students at a disadvantage?

How do Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning registration and transcription processes align (or conflict) with the rules and requirements that other students at the college or university are subject to with regard to transcription? (Include consideration of the rules and processes for students who retake courses for a higher grade.)

DRAFT

# ALWG DRAFT STANDARDS

## DUAL CREDIT TEACHING PARTNERSHIPS

12/1/15

The category of Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships broadens the options for offering college or university courses by high school teachers at the high school during the normal high school day. It provides standards for models where partnerships between sponsoring college or university faculty and high school teachers are used to provide the expertise to offer the college or university course. This allows the high school the opportunity to work with the college or university to offer these courses even though it may not have teachers who individually meet the qualifications for teaching the college or university courses. In addition, these standards ensure that the students are taking the course from the sponsoring college or university by requiring such courses to be appropriately similar, therefore enabling them to be transcribed without special designation on the record of the sponsoring college or university. Current examples of this partnership model include instructor of record partnerships and some professional learning communities.

**Curriculum:** *Comparison to exiting Dual Credit standards: Applies three existing Dual Credit standards to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships. Modifies C1 to add reference to student learning outcomes and modifies C2 for clarity and specificity. Adds new standards applying to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships in C4 & C5.*

(C1) - College or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program are catalogued courses and approved through the regular course approval process of the sponsoring college and/or university. These courses have the same departmental designation, number, title, and credits as their college counterparts, and they adhere to the same course descriptions and student learning outcomes.

(C2) - College or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program are administered in a manner that is reasonably consistent with like courses at the sponsoring college or university and recorded similarly on the official academic record for the sponsoring college or university.

(C3) - College or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the college's or university's sponsoring academic departments.

(C4) - The syllabi for college or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership include clearly defined learning outcomes and student expectations and are reviewed and approved by the academic faculty in the partnership from the college or university department/program where the credit will be awarded.

(C5) - Credit for college or university courses administered through a Dual Credit teaching Partnership Program are awarded based on documented student achievement consistent with the student learning outcomes and course content.

**Faculty:** *Comparison to existing dual credit standards: Modifies two of the four existing Dual Credit standards to apply them to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships. Adds new standards specific to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships in F1, F2, F3, F5, and F6.*

(F1) - High School teachers teaching college or university courses as part of a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership are approved and authorized by the sponsoring college or university.

(F2) - Teaching partnerships demonstrate that the aggregate of the faculty roles within the partnership provides appropriate expertise in the content or professional area, and performs the duties, responsibilities and functions of traditional faculty, through clearly stated criteria, qualifications, and procedures.

(F3) - High school teachers teaching college or university courses in a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership have access to essential academic resources comparable to those of the sponsoring college or university as deemed appropriate by faculty in the department/program where credit will be awarded.

(F4) - The college or university provides high school instructors in Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships with training and orientation in course curriculum, assessment criteria, course philosophy, and Dual Credit administrative requirements before authorizing the instructors to teach the college or university courses.

(F5) - The sponsoring college or university has a well documented process for regular, ongoing, and substantive interaction between high school and college or university faculty in Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships to address student learning outcomes, course content, delivery, and assessment to maintain consistency across course sections offered by the college or university. This interaction occurs at least once a quarter/semester\* and includes a site visit at least annually.

\*College or university faculty partners may determine that more or fewer interactions are appropriate, based on the level of expertise of the instructor and experience working in teaching partnerships. However, in all cases, the interaction must occur at least annually.

(F6) - High school teachers teaching college or university classes as part of a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership receive feedback for continuous improvement to ensure that student learning outcomes, course content, and assessment are consistent with the institution's course, including annual teaching observations for at least three years, and thereafter following institutional practice.

(F7) - Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program policies at each sponsoring college or university address teacher non-compliance with the college's or university's expectations for courses offered through Dual Credit Partnership Programs (for example, non-participation in Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program training and/or activities).

**Student:** *Comparison to exiting Dual Credit standards: Modifies existing Dual Credit standards to apply to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships and adds specificity in S1.*

(S1) - The college or university officially registers or admits Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program students as degree-seeking, non-degree seeking, or non-matriculated students of the college or university and records courses administered through a Dual Credit Program on official sponsoring college or university transcripts. Registration, grading, and transcription procedures and timelines are reasonably consistent with those for other students taking the same courses from the sponsoring college or university.

(S2) - Colleges or universities outline specific course requirements and prerequisites for students in Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Programs.

(S3) - High school students in Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Programs are provided with a student guide that outlines students' rights and responsibilities as well as providing guidelines for the transfer of credit.

**Assessment:** *Comparison to exiting Dual Credit standards: Identifies existing three Dual Credit standards as applying to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships. Calls out student learning outcomes in A1.*

(A1) - Dual credit teaching partnership students are held to comparable standards of achievement of student learning outcomes as those expected of students in on-campus sections.

(A2) - The college or university ensures that Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program students are held to comparable grading standards as those expected of students in on-campus sections.

(A3) - Dual Credit Teaching Partnership students are assessed using comparable methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as their on-campus counterparts.

**Program Improvement:** *Comparison to exiting Dual Credit standards: Identifies the existing Dual Credit **Evaluation** standard as applying to Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships. Changes the name of this section from **Evaluation** to **Program Improvement**.*

(E1) - The college or university conducts an end-of-term student course evaluation for courses offered through a Dual Credit Teaching Partnership Program. The course evaluation is intended to influence program improvement rather than instructor evaluation. Names (of the instructor or students) should not be included in the evaluation.

### **Key Questions**

- 1) The ALWG has developed the draft standards above with input from the Chief Academic Officers, Provosts Council, the Dual Credit Oversight Committee, the state Dual Credit Coordinators, and the CPL advisory committee. This was critical to develop common understanding of the issues and needs by the colleges and universities that may be sponsoring this type of accelerated learning opportunity.

The ALWG believes these draft standards are ready to be vetted broadly by the following stakeholders between January and March:

High School Superintendents using COSA

The joint superintendents and CC presidents workgroup that had been meeting on Accelerated Learning

CTE deans

Statewide CTE leadership (joint meeting with HS and CC representatives)

Dual Credit Oversight Committee

Dual Credit Coordinators

Statewide gathering of faculty representatives from the 24 colleges and university

Intra campus discussion at the 24 colleges and universities

Dual Credit/Accelerated Learning coordinators and their High School Partners at the 24 colleges and universities

Registrars

What would you add to or modify on this list?

DRAFT

# ALWG Discussion Draft Standards

## Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning

12/1/15

Dual Credit and Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships focus on “taking a course from the sponsoring college or university”. In contrast, this strategy focuses on partnerships between a sponsoring college or university and the high school that provide the opportunity for high school students to take high school courses that are designed to prepare them to demonstrate that they have attained the associated student learning outcomes of a given course at the sponsoring college or university. As such, standards for this model focus primarily on those elements that provide guidance and understanding of specific expected student learning outcomes, and appropriate assessment and documentation of learning that occurred outside of taking a course from the college or university. While this has many of the characteristics of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL), the intentional partnership between the high school and college or university to enhance the high school courses and focus on achievement of specifically identified student learning outcomes for college courses goes beyond any expectation for CPL.

The state has done significant, collaborative work to establish CPL standards for colleges and universities when assessing and documenting student learning attained prior to coming to the college or university. Although, these do not contemplate the types of alignment and partnership activities between high schools and post-secondary partners that define Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning, the principles that underlie the CPL standards are applicable and visible in the proposed standards. However, these standards also reflect the robust nature of Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning Programs and provide receiving institutions with significant assurance regarding courses transcribed with the Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning designator.

### **Standard 1: Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning Requisites**

- 1.1 For those areas in which Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning is awarded, each institution shall develop institutional policies and procedures for awarding credit in response to the Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning Standards. The procedures must ensure credit is awarded only for high quality college-level competencies. The policies and procedures must be transparent to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders.
- 1.2 Academic credit will be awarded and transcribed only for those courses formally approved by the institution’s curriculum approval process(es). Credit must be directly applicable to meet requirements for general education, a certificate, a degree or electives as outlined in college publications. Credit may be awarded through portfolio or other forms of authentic assessment.

- 1.3 The college or university provides high school instructors in Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning Programs with ongoing training and orientation in course learning outcomes and assessment criteria and expectations.

### **Standard 2: Evidence - Based Assessment**

- 2.1 Each institution shall provide a guided process to assess student learning and to provide the required evidence for awarding credit. Through the Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning partnership, students will have the opportunity to demonstrate attainment of the course-specific learning outcomes associated with the credit to be awarded.
- 2.2 Evidence shall be evaluated by appropriately qualified teaching faculty.
- 2.3 All Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning credit must be based on sufficient evidence provided by the student. Evidence required by the institution must be based on academically sound assessment methods, including, but not limited to, institutionally developed tests, final examinations, performance-based assessments, demonstrations, presentations, and portfolios.

### **Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure**

Each institution shall develop a tuition and fee structure for Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning that is transparent and accessible to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. The basis for determining direct and indirect costs may include but are not limited to the following.

- Costs for student services to guide the student and to support the assessment process
- Costs associated with faculty workload for the evaluation of Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning
- Costs associated with recognizing and supporting faculty and staff who are involved in partnership and assessment processes including any costs related to training and staff development
- Costs related to transcribing credit
- Costs related to scanning documents or archiving material
- Costs for developing a portfolio infrastructure and conducting portfolio assessments
- Other costs associated with assessments as identified by the institution

### **Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription**

- 4.1 Institutions that award Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning shall work with receiving institutions to promote transferability of credits earned.
- 4.2 Each receiving institution shall determine the transferability of Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning credit granted from other institutions.
- 4.3 Documentation used to support credits awarded will be maintained as part of the student's official institutional academic record to ensure compliance with standards set forth by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Northwest Commission on Colleges and University, and state administrative rules.
- 4.4 All Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning credit that is awarded institutionally must be transcribed to comply with applicable state, federal regulations and accreditation

policies and standards. Notations on the transcript should identify Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning.

### **Standard 5: Transparency/Access**

- 5.1 Institutional Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning policies and expectations shall be clearly communicated to high school students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. The following information shall be included:
- Institutional Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning contacts
  - Available Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning opportunities and preparation requirements
  - Tuition and Fee Structure(s)
  - Risks to students and the cost of assessment where credit may not be awarded
  - Information about the effects of accelerated learning credits on financial aid
  - Information regarding the applicability of Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning credits towards certificate or degree programs
- 5.2 Processes must be in place for a student to request Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning credit based on processes established by the high school and sponsoring college or university for Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning designated courses.

### **Key Questions**

- 1) The initial draft of the standards above was created using the framework/style of the CPL standards. Should the Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning standards be organized in a manner more closely aligned with the framework/style for Dual Credit and Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships standards? [Curriculum; Faculty; Students; Assessment; Program Improvement]
- 2) What other standards, if any, from the Dual Credit Partnership Program standards should be included to differential Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning from CPL?
- 3) Is an additional statement needed in Standard 4 above to address timely transcription that reflects when the assessment occurred? [Note: in some models, students are given time to decide whether to transcript the credit and grade earned.]
- 4) These standards need additional vetting with initial stakeholder groups (such as the Provosts Council, Chief Academic Officers, Dual Credit Coordinators, and Dual Credit Oversight Committee) in December and January and would then go through the vetting process previously described. This would allow the two new sets of standards to be reviewed together in the context of all four sets of standards (Dual Credit, Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships, Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning, CPL). Should all models for Accelerated Learning fit into one of the four models and comply with the associated standards?

- 5) There is a significant difference in state funding for Dual Credit and CPL. The partnership activities of both Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships and Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning programs are resource intensive. If these models are funded, additional criteria associated with the details of partnership and assessment activities would likely need to be identified to determine funding levels. What initial thoughts do you have about these criteria?
- 6) What names might better describe Dual Credit, Dual Credit Teaching Partnerships, and Proficiency-based Accelerated Learning?
- 7) Other?

DRAFT

Revised Oregon Dual Credit Standards

Recommended by the Dual Credit Oversight Committee April 22, 2014

Adopted by Higher Education Coordinating Commission June 12, 2014

<b>Curriculum</b>	
<b>Curriculum 1 (C1)</b>	(C1) - College or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Program are catalogued courses and approved through the regular course approval process of the sponsoring college and/or university. These courses have the same departmental designation, number, title, and credits as their college counterparts, and they adhere to the same course descriptions.
<b>Curriculum 2 (C2)</b>	(C2) - College or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Program are recorded on the official academic record for students at the sponsoring college or university.
<b>Curriculum 3 (C3)</b>	(C3) - College or university courses administered through a Dual Credit Program reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the college's or university's sponsoring academic departments.
<b>Faculty</b>	
<b>Faculty 1 (F1)</b>	(F1) - Instructors teaching college or university courses through Dual Credit meet the academic requirements for faculty and instructors teaching in the college or university.
<b>Faculty 2 (F2)</b>	(F2) - The college or university provides high school instructors with training and orientation in course curriculum, assessment criteria, course philosophy, and Dual Credit administrative requirements before certifying the instructors to teach the college or university courses.
<b>Faculty 3 (F3)</b>	(F3) - Instructors teaching Dual Credit sections are part of a continuing collegial interaction through professional development, seminars, site visits, and ongoing communication with the college's or university's faculty and Dual Credit administrators. This interaction must occur at least annually and address issues such as course content, course delivery, assessment, evaluation, and professional development in the field of study.
<b>Faculty 4 (F4)</b>	(F4) – Dual Credit Program policies address instructor non-compliance with the college's or university's expectations for courses offered through the Dual Credit Program (for example, non-participation in Dual Credit Program training and/or activities).
<b>Student</b>	
<b>Student 1 (S1)</b>	(S1) - The college or university officially registers or admits Dual Credit Program students as degree-seeking, non-degree seeking, or non-matriculated students of the college or university and records courses administered through a Dual Credit Program on official sponsoring college or university transcripts.
<b>Student 2 (S2)</b>	(S2) - Colleges or universities outline specific course requirements and prerequisites for students.
<b>Student 3 (S3)</b>	(S3) - High school students are provided with a student guide that outlines students' rights and responsibilities as well as providing guidelines for the transfer of credit.

<b>Assessment</b>	
<b>Assessment 1 (A1)</b>	(A1) - Dual credit students are held to comparable standards of achievement as those expected of students in on-campus sections.
<b>Assessment 2 (A2)</b>	(A2) - The college or university ensures that Dual Credit Program students are held to comparable grading standards as those expected of students in on-campus sections.
<b>Assessment 3 (A3)</b>	(A3) - Dual Credit students are assessed using comparable methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as their on-campus counterparts.
<b>Evaluation</b>	
<b>Evaluation 1 (E1)</b>	(E1) - The college or university conducts an end-of-term student course evaluation for courses offered through the Dual Credit Program. The course evaluation is intended to influence program improvement rather than instructor evaluation. Names (of the instructor or students) should not be included in the evaluation.

DRAFT

# Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards

## Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning Requisites

- 1.1 For those areas in which CPL is awarded, each institution shall develop institutional policies and procedures for awarding credit in response to the CPL Standards. The procedures must ensure credit is awarded only for high quality college-level competencies. The policies and procedures must be transparent to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. To ensure quality, each institution shall organize a cross-functional CPL Leadership Team with suggested members including student services, instruction, faculty, the registrar's office, financial aid and other personnel associated with awarding or processing CPL credit.
- 1.2 Academic credit will be awarded and transcribed only for those courses formally approved by the institution's curriculum approval process(es). Credit must be directly applicable to meet requirements for general education, a certificate, a degree or electives as outlined in college publications. Credit may be awarded through these types of CPL:
  - Credit - By - Exam (CLEP, DAN TES, etc.)
  - Industry Certifications
  - Institutional Challenge Exams and other exams
  - Military Credit (ACE Credit Recommendation Service)
  - Portfolios
  - Professional Licensure
  - Other forms of authentic assessment to award CPL credit

## Standard 2: Evidence - Based Assessment

- 2.1 Each institution shall provide a guided process to assess student learning and to provide the required evidence for awarding credit. The student must document the connection between what they have learned in another setting and the theoretical foundation, knowledge and skills as defined by the course-specific learner outcomes of the credit to be awarded.
- 2.2 Evidence shall be evaluated by appropriately qualified teaching faculty.
- 2.3 All CPL credit must be based on sufficient evidence provided by the student, the institution, and/or an outside entity such as CLEP, CAEL, ACE, etc. Evidence required by the institution must be based on academically sound CPL assessment methods, including, but not limited to, institutionally developed tests, final examinations, performance-based assessments, demonstrations, presentations, portfolios, or industry certifications.

## Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure

Each institution shall develop a tuition and fee structure for CPL that is transparent and accessible to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. The basis for determining direct and indirect costs may include but are not limited to the following.

- Costs for student services to guide the student and to support the assessment process
- Costs associated with faculty workload for the evaluation of CPL
- Costs associated with recognizing and supporting faculty and staff who are involved in the assessment process including any costs related to training and staff development
- Costs related to transcribing credit
- Costs related to scanning documents or archiving material
- Costs for developing a portfolio infrastructure and conducting portfolio assessments
- Other costs associated with assessments as identified by the institution

#### **Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription**

- 4.1 Institutions that award CPL shall work with receiving institutions to promote transferability of CPL.
- 4.2 Each receiving institution shall determine the transferability of CPL credit granted from other institutions.
- 4.3 Documentation used to support credits awarded will be maintained as part of the student's official institutional academic record to ensure compliance with standards set forth by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and state administrative rules.
- 4.4 All CPL credit that is awarded institutionally must be transcribed to comply with applicable state, federal regulations and accreditation policies and standards. Notations on the transcript should identify CPL.

#### **Standard 5: Data Collection & Reporting**

Institutions shall collect and report data on the types of CPL awarded based on data points collaboratively developed and agreed upon by the state and the institutions. Data to be collected include the number of credits granted and the number of students who receive credit through the types of CPL identified in Standard 1.

#### **Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development**

Each institution shall have a policy and a strategic plan for faculty and staff development for CPL which includes professional development activities. Widespread, overarching knowledge of the institutional opportunities for developing, assessing and recommending CPL should be foundational to this plan.

#### **Standard 7: Quality Assurance in Response to HB 4059**

- 7.1 The Cross Functional Team (refer to Standard 1) shall be responsible for conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices including an evaluation of student performance in subsequent classes within the same field for which CPL was awarded, as well as overall academic performance.
- 7.2 Institutions will submit evaluative data to the HECC. The HECC shall review the accomplishments of each CPL Leadership Team through a periodic audit process to ensure credit is awarded for high quality assessment activities.

Standard 8: Transparency/Access

8.1 Institutional CPL policies and expectations shall be clearly communicated to students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. CPL Information must be in the college catalog, be available electronically on the institution's website and be searchable using the term "Credit for Prior Learning". The following information shall be included:

- Institutional CPL contacts
- Available CPL opportunities and preparation requirements
- Tuition and Fee Structure(s)
- Risks to students and the cost of assessment where credit may not be awarded
- Information about financial aid
- Information regarding the applicability of CPL towards certificate or degree programs

8.2 Processes must be in place for a student to request CPL based on processes established by the institution and for CPL designated courses.

DRAFT