

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

<b>TAB</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>BOARD POLICY III.L. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING – FIRST READING</b>	Motion to Approve
<b>2</b>	<b>BOARD POLICY III.Z. PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND COURSES – FIRST READING</b>	Motion to Approve
<b>3</b>	<b>BOARD POLICY III.O. COURSE PLACEMENT– SECOND READING</b>	Motion to Approve
<b>4</b>	<b>DUAL CREDIT RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	Information Item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Board Policy III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning – First Reading

**REFERENCE**

June 2013                      The Board received recommendation from the Educational Attainment Task Force including recommendations for a statewide portfolio approval process for credit for prior learning.

December 2013              The Board approved changes to Board Policy III.L.

**APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) has been committed to providing Idahoans the opportunity to earn post-secondary credit(s) through the demonstration of knowledge. This process is generally called the assessment of prior learning, or prior learning assessment (PLA). PLAs provide a bridge for student learning acquired outside the traditional college setting. Prior learning should be evaluated upon the student's request and be eligible for credit through a PLA if it is demonstrated by successfully passing an appropriately rigorous assessment.

Research shows that students who earn credit through PLAs are more likely to persist, take more courses over a longer period of time, and graduate with credentials and degrees. For these reasons, PLAs are essential to achieving the State Board's goal that 60% of 25-34 year olds hold a certificate or degree by 2020.

At the June 2013 Board meeting the Workforce Development Council's Educational Attainment Task Force made three recommendations to the Board for reaching the Board's educational attainment goal. One of these recommendations was that the Board establish a statewide portfolio approval process for awarding credits based on prior learning and experience. The recommendation was forwarded to Board staff for further development.

In early 2014, the Board contracted with the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) to work with its institutions to strengthen the awareness of PLA on the campuses, determine the scope and nature of PLA services best suited to each institution, and identify opportunities for partnerships between and among institutions. As a national leader in the promotion of adult and experiential learning, CAEL was and remains well positioned to assist our institutions. Their final report is available upon request to the Board office.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

In its final report, CAEL acknowledged that over the course of the project:

“several institutions made specific changes that expanded PLA options for students: the provision of reliable challenge exams for high volume departments; intentional partnerships between academic affairs and student services to smooth the PLA path for students; the revision of portfolio development courses tailored to academic departments; proactive communications and marketing tools to inform students about PLA; a focus on implementing PLA for specific populations such as veterans and programs such as health care; and improving the quality and consistent use of course learning outcomes to guide assessment.”

The final report also noted disparateness in PLA efforts across the state noting that among institutions there is:

“a considerable range of approaches to PLA, including different credit limits and multiple ways that students could use PLA to accelerate their path to degree completion.... [Institutions] revealed different interpretations of accreditation guidelines as well as incomplete information about the nature of PLA methods; they expressed interest in pursuing additional information about lesser known methods...to determine the potential for these methods on their campuses.... [I]nstitutions discussed the challenges of transferability of PLA and the advantages of moving toward clearer articulation agreements and curriculum crosswalks.”

The proposed changes to policy aim to provide a solid floor for Board expectations regarding the use of PLAs and granting of credit for prior learning in Idaho.

### **IMPACT**

The proposed amendments to Board Policy III.L will establish modernized expectations for how and when PLAs are to be administered and when credit may be awarded.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Board Policy III.L – First Reading  
Attachment 2 – CAEL’s Final Report

Page 5  
Page 11

### **STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The use of PLAs and granting of credit is critical to achieving the Board’s 60% Goal. Current PLA efforts on the campuses are insufficiently employed by students or aspiring students. As a result, these opportunities are not marketed heavily which further leads to less usage. The proposed changes aim to stop this devolution of PLA use and create a new set of modern expectations for the usage of PLA and granting of credit.

Board staff recommends approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**Idaho State Board of Education**

**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

**SUBSECTION: L. Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Experiential Learning**

December 2016 December 2013

---

The purpose of this policy is to ensure access and opportunities for citizens to continue their education regardless of location, age, and job responsibilities. Colleges and Universities are charged with providing the Continuing Education Programs that address such needs. Subsection L. shall apply This policy applies to the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-State Clark College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, College of Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho, and North Idaho College (hereinafter "institutions"). Additionally, this policy establishes the foundation by which institutions shall provide students with opportunities to demonstrate competencies acquired through life experience by developing options for credit for prior learning.

**1. Definitions**

- a. Continuing Education: shall include Educational activities that extend postsecondary opportunities beyond an institution's the traditional campus experience and beyond traditional students, through both credit and noncredit programs. The general purpose of continuing education is to provide access to degree programs for citizens who are place-bound and or working full-time; workforce training; certification programs; and professional development opportunities to enhance lifelong learning, personal development and cultural enrichment of the individual and community.

- b. Prior Learning Assessment (PLA): A set of well established, researched, and validated methods for assessing learning. Allows students to demonstrate knowledge, competencies and skills and habits of mind in a particular field and have that learning evaluated for college credit by appropriate faculty. The following is an approved list of PLAs in Idaho:

i. Standardized tests, including but not limited to:

- a) College Level Examination Program (CLEP)
- b) DANTES Subject Standardized Test
- c) UExcel
- d) Advanced Placement (AP)
- e) International Baccalaureate (IB)
- f) Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)
- g) American College Testing (ACT)

ii. Credit recommenders, including but not limited to:

- a) American Council on Education (ACE)

iii. Faculty developed assessments, including but not limited to:

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

- a) Technical Competency Credit
- b) Course specific challenge exams
- c) Locally-evaluated industry and workplace education/training programs
- d) Portfolio

c. Credit for Prior Experiential Learning (CPEL): Credit earned as a result of the following PLAs:

- 1) Course specific challenge exams
- 2) Portfolio

- ~~b. shall include demonstration of learning outcomes for knowledge acquired from work and life experiences, independent reading and study, various tests like Advanced Placement (AP) and the College Level Examination (CLEP), and/or approved military education or experience~~
- ~~ii. Prior and College Level Examination Program DANTES Subject Standardize Test Advanced Placement~~

## 2. Minimum Standards

### a. Continuing Education Activities

- i. Institutions ~~are charged with providing~~must provide continuing education programs that are ~~conducive~~aligned with their mission and the needs of their service region(s) which is defined in Board Policy III.Z.
- ii. All continuing education activities must be accountable to and monitored by the appropriate undergraduate or graduate organization of the institution (i.e., the curriculum committee, respective administrators, graduate curriculum committee, and faculty council), and approved by the chief academic officer of the institution, or their designee, as meeting their standards.

a) All academic credit activities shall be equivalent in quality to comparable instructional courses and programs offered on the campuses of the institutions, especially with respect to:

- 1) The appointment, orientation, supervision, and evaluation of faculty members in the courses, programs, or activities;
- 2) Procedures for the approval of courses, programs, or activities;
- 3) The stature of the curriculum with respect to its organization, appropriateness, level, intellectual demands, instructional contact time, and out-of-class effort;
- 4) The admission of students, the advising process, and the evaluation of student performance in courses, programs, or activities;



**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

5) The support offered by library, classroom, laboratory, and other resources; the detailed as well as general responsibility for the quality of courses, programs, and activities accepted by the appropriate academic and administrative units on the campus; and

6) The keeping of student records for such activities as admission, academic performance, and transfer credit.

b) Non-credit activities and other special programs shall abide by nationally accepted practices:

1) The granting of Continuing Education Units (C-E-U) for courses and special learning activities is guided by generally accepted norms; based on institutional mission and policy; consistent across the institution, wherever offered and however delivered; appropriate to the objectives of the course; and determined by student achievement of identified learning outcomes.

2) The institution maintains records which describe the number of courses and nature of learning provided through noncredit instruction.

b. The Administration of Credit for Prior Learning Assessments

i. Prior learning should be evaluated upon a student's request and be eligible for credit through a PLA if it is demonstrated by successfully passing an appropriately rigorous assessment. CPEL is only awardable to enrolled students.

ii. The definitions outlined and recommended in section 1, above, shall apply statewide.

iii. Institutions are responsible for determining how best to implement PLAs within the context of its mission, culture, student needs and academic programs.

iv. The Institutions shall ensure students have access to the most appropriate and current prior learning assessment methods.

v. Each institution shall (a) assign oversight of PLAs to its highest ranking Academic Officer or his/her designee and (b) designate at least one liaison (person or place) to serve as a PLA resource for faculty, administrators, staff and students.

vi. Idaho's PLA infrastructure shall ensure maximum transferability of CPEL among the institutions.

vii. Institutions shall ensure information technology systems can consistently record and track PLA data, as well as enable accurate reporting.

viii. When appropriate and with approval from the faculty on campus, PLAs shall be made available for approved programs in a consistent, transferable and comparable manner.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

- ix. Institutions shall provide professional development for those faculty members, administrators, and staff working with PLA students to assure high quality, transparency, and consistency in evaluating and awarding CPEL.
- x. Fees charged to students for the administration of PLAs must be based on and reflect the operational costs of administering a PLA. Assessment fees may not be based on the number of credits awarded.
- xi. Institutions shall integrate the review of institutional PLA practices into existing curricular review cycles and NWCCU Accreditation reviews to maintain their currency and relevance.
  - ~~i. All credit for prior learning must be guided by approved institutional policies and procedures. These policies and procedures must include the awarding of credit for education, training or service completed by an individual as a member of the armed forces or reserves as outlined in Section 33-3727 Idaho Code. Institutions shall make no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution's review process. Institutional policies and procedures shall maintain the following minimum standards:~~
  - ~~ii. Credits shall be awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students.~~
  - ~~iii. Credits shall be awarded only for documented student achievement that is equivalent to expected learning outcomes for courses within the institution's regular curricular offerings.~~
  - ~~iv. Credits shall be awarded based on the recommendation of appropriately qualified faculty.~~
  - ~~v. Credits shall be limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits required for a degree.~~
  - ~~vi. Credits shall be identified on students' transcripts as prior learning credits and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements.~~

3. Service Regions and Inter-Institutional Collaboration

~~The Board has established primary service regions identified in Board Policy Section III.Z. for the college and universities and professional technical education based on the geography of the state. Service regions of North Idaho College, the College of Southern Idaho, and the College of Western Idaho have been established pursuant to Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Institutional chief academic officers will develop Memorandums of Understanding to facilitate collaboration between the institutions consistent with Board Policy Section III.Z.b.ii.~~

**3. Fees**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

Fees for continuing education and credit for prior [experiential](#) learning shall be assessed consistent with Board Policy Section V.R. [Such fees shall be made publicly available in a single online location.](#)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

To: Interested Parties (and to CAAP on Feb. 16, 2016)  
From: Christopher Mathias  
Date: January 25, 2016  
Re: PLA in Idaho and recommendations for making improvements

**1 INTRODUCTION**

---

The Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) is committed to providing Idahoans the opportunity to earn post-secondary credit(s) through the demonstration of knowledge. This process is generally called the assessment of prior learning, or *prior learning assessment* (PLA). PLAs provide a bridge for student learning acquired outside the traditional college setting. Research shows that students who earn credit through PLA are more likely to persist, take more courses over a longer period of time, and graduate with credentials and degrees. For these reasons, PLAs are essential to achieving the State Board's goal that 60% of 25-34 year olds hold some sort of post-secondary credential by 2020.

As this work moves through its various stages - from proposed recommendations in this white paper to decision making to program design and implementation - cost will increasingly come to bear. So a question that needs repeated asking is: *how committed are we all to providing a comprehensive, accessible, and navigable PLA infrastructure?* Equitable commitment from all parties is crucial.

This paper aims to do the following:

- Overview the recent work conducted jointly with the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning.
- Provide a comprehensive overview of structural and policy challenges facing PLA in Idaho that must be addressed prior to major statewide investment in PLA.
- Provide an informed and consensus-driven foundation for making updates to Board policy.

**2 WORKING WITH THE COUNCIL FOR ADULT AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (2014-2015)**

---

In early 2014, the SBOE contracted with the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) to work with its institutions to strengthen the awareness of PLA on the campuses, determine the scope and nature of PLA services best suited to each institution, and identify opportunities for partnerships between and among institutions. As a national leader in the promotion of adult and experiential learning, CAEL was and remains well positioned to assist our institutions. Their final report is available upon request to the SBOE Office.

In its final report, CAEL acknowledged that over the course of the project:

“several institutions made specific changes that expanded PLA options for students: the provision of reliable challenge exams for high volume departments; intentional partnerships between academic affairs and student services to smooth the PLA path for students; the revision of portfolio development courses tailored to academic departments; proactive communications and marketing tools to inform students about PLA; a focus on

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

implementing PLA for specific populations such as veterans and programs such as health care; and improving the quality and consistent use of course learning outcomes to guide assessment.”

The final report also noted disparateness in PLA efforts across the state noting that among institutions there is:

“a considerable range of approaches to PLA, including different credit limits and multiple ways that students could use PLA to accelerate their path to degree completion.... [Institutions] revealed different interpretations of accreditation guidelines as well as incomplete information about the nature of PLA methods; they expressed interest in pursuing additional information about lesser known methods...to determine the potential for these methods on their campuses.... [I]nstitutions discussed the challenges of transferability of PLA and the advantages of moving toward clearer articulation agreements and curriculum crosswalks.”

CAEL also observed that during the course of the project, about half the institutions were engaged in “active inquiry with CAEL to pursue goals that were both realistic and linked to measurable change.” While “the remaining institutions were passive participants in the project” some “institutions [a]re ready to steadily move forward” while others are “still deliberating the role of PLA on their campuses.”

While the final report provides an objective view of PLA in Idaho, it also provides some important information upon which to build a pathway forward. The report notes the agreement across institutions and the need to work towards the following:

1. Create a common language and definitions for PLAs to strengthen transferability of PLA credit and sustain quality assurance efforts across institutions.
2. Develop a statewide portfolio network.
3. Make transparent those standardized tests commonly used and their respective cut scores.
4. Create a transparent fee structure for PLA services that enables reasonable consistency while responding to differences among institutional PLA programs.

Similarly, meeting notes taken by Board Staff revealed:

5. The need to ensure our PLA infrastructure is simple to access, understand, navigate and administer.
6. The importance of clear and consistent marketing and messaging.
7. The importance of transferability and collaboration across campuses.
8. The value of tying PLA to multiple sets of circumstances and completion pathways.

### **3 CURRENT POLICIES REGARDING PLA**

---

An understanding of PLA in Idaho is contingent on awareness of the multiple policies and laws that govern its administration. Such an understanding is hereby provided.

Board Policy III.L.1.b defines *credit for prior learning* as a “demonstration of learning outcomes for knowledge acquired from work and life experiences, independent reading

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

and study, various tests like Advanced Placement (AP) and the College Level Examination (CLEP), and/or approved military education or experiences.”

The purpose of the policy is, in part, to establish “the foundation by which institutions...provide students with opportunities to demonstrate competencies acquired through life experience by developing options for credit for prior learning.”

Section 2.b (Credit for Prior Learning) reads in its entirety:

All credit for prior learning must be guided by approved institutional policies and procedures. These policies and procedures must include the awarding of credit for education, training or service completed by an individual as a member of the armed forces or reserves as outlined in Section 33-3727 Idaho Code. Institutions shall make no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution’s review process. Institutional policies and procedures shall maintain the following minimum standards:

- i. Credits shall be awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students.
- ii. Credits shall be awarded only for documented student achievement that is equivalent to expected learning outcomes for courses within the institution’s regular curricular offerings.
- iii. Credits shall be awarded based on the recommendation of appropriately qualified faculty.
- iv. Credits shall be limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits required for a degree.
- v. Credits shall be identified on students’ transcripts as prior learning credits and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements.

This language strictly adheres to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) standard 2.C.7 which reads:

“Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution’s regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students’ transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution’s review process.”

Additionally, Idaho Code Section 33-3727 reads, in pertinent part:

The State Board of Education...shall develop policies relating to the award of academic credit for education, training or service completed by an individual

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

as a member of the armed forces or reserves of the United States, the national guard of any state, the military reserves of any state or the naval militia of any state, where such education, training or service is determined to satisfy such established policies.

In sum, state and Board policy makes clear that PLA is an important tool for promoting educational attainment. However, aside from a clear requirement to craft PLA policies related to military training, the policies do not clearly require Idaho's public post-secondary institutions to offer or implement PLA generally and, perhaps more importantly, do not provide a foundation for administering PLA that is subject to a cycle of continuous improvement.

#### **4 CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS**

---

The concepts and definitions that underlie the administration of PLA are not fully encompassed in relevant policies. As the understanding of effective PLA has matured, so to have the concepts that guide its administration. Indeed, "credit for prior learning" is the end while PLA is the means, and Board Policy is largely silent on the means (this must change). This section aims to provide baseline definitions moving forward.

As discussed above, the State Board defines *credit for prior learning (CPL)* as a "demonstration of learning outcomes for knowledge acquired from work and life experiences, independent reading and study...." It is slightly confusing to equate credits (the end) with a demonstration (the means) when in fact it is the demonstration that results in credits. Thus, moving forward, a simpler and more accurate definition of CPL might simply be: credits earned via PLAs.

**PLAs** - a set of well-established, researched, and validated methods for assessing learning for college credit - allow students to demonstrate knowledge, competencies, skills and habits of mind in a particular field and have that learning evaluated for college credit by appropriate faculty.

Some states - neighboring [Montana, for example](#) - officially recognize two broad categories of prior learning evaluated through PLA. **Instructional-based prior learning (IBPL)** is learning that took place in a classroom but not within a two or four year institution. IBPL is commonly assessed, for example, using Advanced Placement (AP) tests and American Council on Education (ACE) credit recommendation. **Experiential-based prior learning (EBPL)** occurred outside of a traditional classroom. EBPL is commonly assessed, for example, using CLEP tests, challenge exams, or portfolio assessment reviews. Idaho should consider adopting this bi-furcated approach.

The following might serve as an exhaustive list of PLAs in Idaho:

1. Standardized tests, including:
  - a. CLEP
  - b. DSST
  - c. UExcel
  - d. AP
  - e. IB



**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

- f. SAT/ACT
- 2. Credit recommenders, including:
  - a. American Council on Education (ACE)
  - b. National College Credit Recommendation Service (NCCRS)
- 3. Faculty developed assessments, including:
  - a. Technical Competency Credit
  - b. Course specific challenge exams
  - c. Locally-Evaluated Industry and Workplace Education/Training Programs
  - d. Portfolio (Each institution's portfolio PLA shall exist within an statewide portfolio network)

This paper makes repeated use of the term **statewide portfolio network** (SPN). An SPN specific to Idaho must possess the following characteristics:

- a. CPL earned via the SPN are applicable only to particular academic and technical programs.
- b. Once CPL derives from the SPN, those credits shall be automatically transferable to Idaho's other public post-secondary institutions under circumstances to be prescribed later.
- c. Faculty who conduct PLAs in a SPN must maintain proper training.

## **5 OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVES**

---

The Legislature, State Board of Education, and Idaho's public post-secondary institutions are not the only entities with an interest in the administration of PLAs in Idaho. An increasing number of entities have taken a heightened interest in PLA; what follows are two examples.

During the 2014 Legislative session, both houses adopted House Concurrent Resolution 53 which directed members of the State Board, and the *Departments of Commerce and Labor* to convene a working group to develop a robust plan including proposed measures and benchmarks to strengthen the ties between our public education systems and Idaho's business and industry. The working group made eight recommendations first of which was to "create a statewide portfolio approval process for awarding credits based on prior learning and experience." The establishment of such a statewide process is discussed in section 6.

To achieve the State Board's 60% Goal, the *JK and Kathryn Albertson Foundation* (the Foundation) has also discussed the need to determine the "health" of higher education institutions in Idaho in their ability to recruit, retain and graduate adult learners. The Foundation has discussed this interest with CAEL and learned there are options for gauging "health." For example, the Adult Learner Focused Inventory (ALFI) assessments provide a snapshot of how institutional team members and adult students view the institutions through the lens of the nine principles of Effectively Serving Adult Learners. As this work moves forward, it may be prudent for our institutions to conduct ALFI assessments prior to any major investments in their PLA infrastructure.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

Idaho aims to establish a PLA infrastructure that is sustainable, navigable, and accessible with clear points of entry. For this to occur we must acknowledge that current policy has not provided a strong foundation for a sustainable and modern PLA infrastructure and additional policy guidance is necessary. At minimum, Board Policy III.L must be revised.

The following in conjunction with current policies (and appropriate changes thereto) would help provide a modernized foundation for creating a stronger PLA infrastructure in Idaho.

The statewide PLA advisory group recommends the adoption of the following basic principles into all relevant policy:

1. Prior learning should be evaluated upon a student's request and be eligible for credit through a PLA if it is demonstrated by successfully passing an appropriately rigorous assessment.
2. The definitions outlined and recommended in section 4, above, shall apply statewide.
3. Institutions are responsible for determining how best to implement PLAs within the context of its mission, culture, student needs and academic programs.
4. While the Institutions shall maintain the efficacy of this policy, as well as assuring students have access to the most appropriate and modern prior learning assessment methods, the State Board of Education shall oversee this policy and its administration.
5. Each institution shall (a) assign oversight of PLAs to its highest ranking Academic Officer or his/her designee and (b) designate at least one liaison (person or place) to serve as a PLA resource for faculty, administrators, staff and students.
6. Institutions reserve the right to award credit for prior learning beyond the 25% cap when they deem it academically appropriate for exceptional students, particularly in PTE programs; CPL earned through the assessment of IBPL is excluded from the 25% cap.
7. Idaho's PLA infrastructure shall ensure maximum transferability of CPL among the institutions as today's students are extremely mobile. To this end, once recorded on a transcript from an Idaho public post-secondary institution, CPL shall be viewed as if the credit had been earned through a regular in-class assessment at the awarding institution; CPL must be clearly noted if it applies to the 25% cap but need not be if it does not apply.
8. Institutions shall ensure information technology systems can consistently record and track PLA data, as well as enable accurate reporting.
9. When appropriate and with approval from the faculty on campus, PLAs shall be made available for approved programs in a consistent, transferable and comparable manner.
10. Institutions shall provide professional development for those faculty members, administrators, and staff working with PLA students to assure high quality, transparency, and consistency in evaluating and awarding CPL.
11. Fees charged to students for the administration of PLAs must be based on and reflect the operational costs of administering a PLA. Fees may not be based on the number of credits awarded.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

12. Institutions shall integrate the review of institutional PLA practices into existing curricular review cycles and NWCCU Accreditation reviews to maintain their currency and relevance.

---

**7 NEXT STEPS**

---

This paper contains a series of recommendations and observations about what *should* be done in Idaho regarding PLA. What it does not do is delineate in any detail *how* that work should be done. Thus, it is recommended that the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) take the lead on conceptualizing and implementing all necessary aspects of these recommendations, including but not limited to:

1. The development of a *statewide portfolio network*.
2. The identification of those cut scores for commonly used standardized tests in which there is uniformity across campuses, and making the results transparent.
3. Making more transparent a fee structure for PLA services that enables reasonable consistency while responding to differences among institutional PLA programs.

Board staff will work with CAAP on proposing appropriate changes to Board Policy III.L. Those changes will provide a strong foundation for all other PLA work. Once this policy is updated, the institutions will have a stronger basis for making the necessary changes to their policies and practices.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – First Reading

**REFERENCE**

April 2011	Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs to include the inclusion of statewide program responsibilities into policy.
June 2011	Board approved the second reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Academic Programs and Courses as amended.
June 19, 2013	The Board was presented with proposed corrections to institutions' statewide program responsibilities.
August 15, 2013	The Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses to include updating institutions statewide responsibilities.
December 2013	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.Z.
June 18, 2015	The Board approved the first reading of Board Policy III.Z.
August 13, 2015	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.Z.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses.  
Section 33-113, Idaho Code, Limits of Instruction.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Board Policy III.Z, provides “the purpose of the policy is to ensure Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions meet the educational and workforce needs of the state through academic planning, alignment of programs and courses, and collaboration and coordination.” On February 4, 2016, the Board’s Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) charged the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) to review Board Policy III.Z to determine if any amendments were necessary to the statewide program responsibilities section of policy. CAAP identified that several program names and degree titles needed to be updated within the Statewide Program Responsibility chart in Board Policy III.Z. CAAP also discussed the provision under subsection 2.b.i, which provides that the Board reviews the statewide program list for alignment every two years. CAAP and Board staff determined that the term “alignment” was not clear and

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

recommended an amendment to clarify that the statewide program responsibilities list will be “updated” by the Board every two years.

**IMPACT**

Proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z will bring program names and degree titles up-to-date and ensure such updates occur on a regular basis. The proposed amendments will also clarify the expectations of the Universities regarding the delivery of statewide program responsibilities.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.Z  
Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses

Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Current Board Policy requires the “statewide program list shall be reviewed for alignment by the Board every two years.” After close consultation between Board Staff, the institutions and IRSA members, it became clear that such alignment was a vague and infeasible activity, which explains why it has never occurred. The proposed language provides clarity and actionable guidance. Proposed amendments add the term “when necessary” regarding the delivery of statewide program responsibility programs. This term is vague and will need to be further defined prior to second reading.

Board staff and CAAP recommend approval as presented.

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**Idaho State Board of Education**

**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

**Subsection: Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses**

[December 2016 August 2015](#)

The purpose of this policy is to ensure Idaho's public postsecondary institutions meet the educational and workforce needs of the state through academic planning, alignment of programs and courses (hereinafter referred to collectively as "programs"), and collaboration and coordination. This subsection shall apply to the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-State Clark College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, College of Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho, and North Idaho College (hereinafter "institutions"). The State Board of Education (the Board) aims to optimize the delivery of academic programs while allowing institutions to grow and develop consistent with their vision and mission with an appropriate alignment of strengths and sharing of resources.

This policy requires the preparation and submission of academic plans to advise and inform the Board in its planning and coordination of educational programs in a manner that enhances access to quality programs, while concurrently increasing efficiency, avoiding unnecessary duplication and maximizing the cost-effective use of educational resources. As part of this process, the Board hereby identifies and reinforces the responsibilities of the institutions governed by the Board to deliver Statewide Programs. The provisions set forth herein serve as fundamental principles underlying the planning and delivery of programs pursuant to each institution's assigned Statewide and Service Region Program Responsibilities. These provisions also require collaborative and cooperative agreements, or memorandums of understanding, between and among the institutions.

This policy is applicable to campus-based face-to-face programs, including those that use technology to facilitate and/or supplement a physical classroom experience. It also applies to hybrid and blended programs where a substantial portion of the content is delivered on-line and typically has reduced seat time.

**1. Definitions**

- a. Designated Institution shall mean an institution whose main campus is located in a service region as identified in subsection 2.b.ii.1) and 2) below.
  - i. For purposes of this policy, with respect to academic programs, Designated Institutions and Partnering Institutions shall include only the University of Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State University, and Lewis- Clark State College and shall have Service Region Program Responsibility for those regions identified in subsection 2.b.ii.1).
  - ii. For purposes of this policy, with respect to career technical programs, Designated Institutions and Partnering Institutions shall include only the College of Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho, North Idaho College,

Eastern Idaho Technical College, Lewis-Clark State College, and Idaho State University and shall have Service Region Program Responsibility for those regions identified in subsection 2.b.ii.2).

- b. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is an agreement between two or more institutions offering programs within the same service region that details how such programs will be delivered in a collaborative manner. An MOU is intended to provide specific, practical details that build upon what has been provided in each Institution's Plan.
- c. Partnering Institution shall mean either (i) an institution whose main campus is located outside of a Designated Institution's identified service region but which, pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding, offers Regional Programs in the Designated Institution's primary service region, or (ii) an institution not assigned a Statewide Program Responsibility which, pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding with the institution assigned the Statewide Program Responsibility, offers and delivers a statewide educational program.
- d. Service Region Program shall mean an educational program identified by the Board to be delivered by a Designated Institution within its respective service region that meets regional educational and workforce needs.
- e. Service Region Program Responsibility shall mean an institution's responsibility to offer and deliver a Service Region Program to meet regional educational and workforce needs in its primary service region as defined in subsection 2.b.ii.1) and 2) below. Service Region Program Responsibilities are assigned to the Designated Institution in each service region, but may be offered and delivered by Partnering Institutions in accordance with the procedures outlined in this policy.
- f. Statewide Program shall mean an educational program identified by the Board to be delivered by a particular institution which meets statewide educational and workforce needs. Lewis-Clark State College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, North Idaho College, College of Southern Idaho, and College of Western Idaho do not have Statewide Program Responsibilities.
- g. Statewide Program Responsibility shall mean an institution's responsibility to offer and deliver a Statewide Program in all regions of the state. Statewide Program Responsibilities are assigned to a specific institution by the Board, taking into account the degree to which such program is uniquely provided by the institution.

## 2. Planning and Delivery Process and Requirements

- a. Planning
  - i. Five-Year Plan

The Board staff shall, using the Institution Plans submitted, create and maintain a rolling five (5) year academic plan (Five-Year Plan) which includes



all current and proposed institution programs. The Five-Year Plan shall be approved by the Board annually at its August Board meeting.

ii. Institution Plan

Each institution shall, in accordance with a template to be developed by the Board's Chief Academic Officer, create and submit to Board staff a rolling five (5) year academic plan, to be updated annually, that describes all current and proposed programs and services to be offered in alignment with each institution's Statewide and Service Region Program Responsibilities (the Institution Plan). Institution Plans shall be developed pursuant to a process of collaboration and communication with the other institutions in the state.

1) Statewide Programs

Institutions assigned a Statewide Program Responsibility shall plan for and determine the best means to deliver such program. Each institution assigned a Statewide Program Responsibility shall include in its Institution Plan all currently offered and proposed programs necessary to respond to the workforce and educational needs of the state relating to such Statewide Program Responsibilities. Each Institution Plan shall include the following information for proposed Statewide programs:

- a) A description of the Statewide Programs to be delivered throughout the state and the anticipated resources to be employed.
- b) A description of the Statewide Programs to be offered by a Designated or Partnering Institution.
- c) A summary of the Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's), if any, to be entered into with Partnering Institutions pursuant to Subsection 2.b.iii. below.

2) Service Region Programs

It is the responsibility of the Designated Institution to plan for and determine the best means to deliver Service Region Programs that respond to the educational and workforce needs of its service region. If, in the course of developing or updating its Institution Plan, the Designated Institution identifies a need for the delivery of a program within its service region, and the Designated Institution is unable to provide the program, then the Designated Institution shall coordinate with a Partnering Institution (including institutions with Statewide Program Responsibilities if applicable) located outside of the service region to deliver the program in the service region. The Institution Plan developed by a Designated Institution shall include the following:

- a) A description of the proposed academic programs to be delivered in

the service region, or outside of the service region, by the Designated Institution and the anticipated resources to be employed.

- b) A description of proposed programs to be offered in the service region by Partnering Institutions, including any anticipated transition of programs to the Designated Institution.
- c) A description of proposed Statewide Programs to be offered in the service region by an institution with Statewide Program Responsibilities, or by the Designated Institution in coordination with the institution holding the Statewide Program Responsibility.
- d) A summary of proposed MOU's, if any, to be entered into between the Designated Institution and any Partnering Institutions in accordance with Subsection 2.b.iii. below.

3) Institution Plan Updates

Institution Plans shall be updated and submitted to Board staff annually as follows:

- a) Preliminary Institution Plans shall be developed according to a template provided by the Board's Chief Academic Officer and submitted to the Council for Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) for review, discussion and coordination annually in April.
- b) Following review by CAAP, Institution Plans shall be submitted to Board staff. Upon submission of the Institution Plans to Board staff, the Board's Chief Academic Officer shall review the Institution Plans for the purpose of optimizing collaboration and coordination among institutions, ensuring efficient use of resources, and avoiding unnecessary duplication of programs.
- c) In the event the Board's Chief Academic Officer recommends material changes, he/she shall work with the institutions and then submit those recommendations to CAAP for discussion prior to submission to the Board for inclusion in the Five-Year Plan.
- d) The Board's Chief Academic Officer shall then provide their recommendations to the Board for enhancements, if any, to the Institution Plans at a subsequent Board meeting. The Board shall approve the Institution Plans annually through the Five-Year Plan submitted by Board staff. Board approval of Institution Plans acts as a roadmap for institutional planning and does not constitute Board approval of a program. Institutions are still required to follow the standard program approval process as identified in Board Policy Section III.G to gain program approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

b. Delivery of Programs

i. Statewide Program Delivery

The Board has established statewide program responsibilities for the following institutions. This statewide program list shall be ~~reviewed for alignment~~updated by the Board every two years.

Boise State University ~~shall have responsibility to~~must assess the need for and, when necessary, ensure the statewide delivery of all educational programs in the following degree program areas:

Program Name	Degrees
Public Policy <u>and Administration</u>	M.S., Ph.D.
<del>Public Administration</del>	<del>Ph.D.</del>
Community & Regional Planning	M.C.R.P., Ph.D.
Social Work (Region V-VI —shared with ISU)	M.S.W.
Social Work	Ph.D.

Idaho State University ~~shall have responsibility to~~must assess the need for and, when necessary, ensure the statewide delivery of all educational programs in the following degree program areas:

Program Name	Degrees
Audiology	Au.D., Ph.D.
Physical Therapy	D.P.T., Ph.D.
Occupational Therapy	M.O.T.
Pharmaceutical Science	M.S., Ph.D.
Pharmacy Practice	Pharm.D.
Nursing (Region III shared w/ BSU)	M.S., D.N.P.
Nursing	Ph.D.
Physician Assistant	M.P.A.S.
Speech Pathology	M.S.
Deaf Education	M.S.
<u>Educational Sign Language</u> Interpreting	B.S.
Health Education	M.H.E.
Public Health	M.P.H.
Health Physics	B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
Dental Hygiene	B.S., M.S.
Medical Lab Science	B.S., M.S.
Clinical Psychology	Ph.D.

University of Idaho ~~shall have responsibility to~~must assess the need for and, when necessary, ensure the statewide delivery of all educational programs in the following degree program areas:

Program Name	Degrees
Law	J.D.
Architecture	B.S. Arch., M. Arch.
Integrated Architecture & Design	M.S.
Landscape Architecture	B.S.L.A., M.L.A.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

Interior Design	B.I.D., M.S.
Animal & Veterinary Science	B.S.A.V.S.
Animal Science	M.S.
Veterinary Science	D.V.M.
Plant Science	M.S., Ph.D.
Agricultural Economics	B.S.Aq.Econ.
Applied Economics (Agricultural)	M.S.
Food Science	B.S.F.S., M.S., Ph.D.
<a href="#">Forest Resources Forestry</a>	B.S. <a href="#">For.Res.Forestry</a>
Renewable Materials	B.S.Renew.Mat.
Wildlife Resources	B.S.Wildl.Res.
Fishery Resources	B.S.Fish.Res.
Natural Resource Conservation	B.S.Nat.Resc.Consv.
Rangeland Ecology & Management	B.S.Rangeland.Ecol.Mgmt.
Fire Ecology & Management	B.S.Fire.Ecol.Mgt.
Natural Resource concentrations in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Forest Resources Forestry</a></li> <li>• Renewable Materials</li> <li>• Wildlife Resources</li> <li>• Fishery Resources</li> <li>• Natural Resource Conservation</li> <li>• Rangeland Ecology &amp; Management</li> <li>• Fire Ecology &amp; Management</li> </ul>	M.S., M.N.R., Ph.D.

ii. Service Region Program Delivery

The Board has established service regions for the institutions based on the six geographic areas identified in Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. A Designated Institution shall have the Service Region Program Responsibility to assess and ensure the delivery of all educational programs and services necessary to meet the educational and workforce needs within its assigned service region.

1) Academic Service Regions

Region I shall include the area within Area No.1 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Lewis-Clark State College and the University of Idaho are the Designated Institutions serving undergraduate needs. The University of Idaho is the Designated Institution serving the graduate education needs.

Region II shall include the area within Area No.2 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Lewis-Clark State College is the Designated Institution serving undergraduate needs. The University of Idaho is the Designated Institution serving the graduate education needs.

Region III shall include the area within Area No.3 under Section 33-

2101, Idaho Code. Boise State University is the Designated Institution serving undergraduate and graduate education needs.

Region IV shall include the area within Area No.4 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Idaho State University is the Designated Institution serving undergraduate and graduate needs; with the exception that Boise State University will meet undergraduate and graduate business program needs.

Region V shall include the area within Area No.5 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Idaho State University is the Designated Institution serving undergraduate and graduate education needs.

Region VI shall include the area within Area No.6 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Idaho State University is the Designated Institution serving undergraduate and graduate education needs.

## 2) Career Technical Service Regions

Postsecondary career technical education is delivered by six (6) institutions, each having responsibility for serving one of the six geographic areas identified in Section 33-2101.

Region I shall include the area within Area No.1 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. North Idaho College is the Designated Institution.

Region II shall include the area within Area No.2 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Lewis-Clark State College is the Designated Institution.

Region III shall include the area within Area No.3 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. College of Western Idaho is the Designated Institution

Region IV shall include the area within Area No.4 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. College of Southern Idaho is the Designated Institution.

Region V shall include the area within Area No.5 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Idaho State University is the Designated Institution.

Region VI shall include the area within Area No.6 under Section 33-2101, Idaho Code. Eastern Idaho Technical College is the Designated Institution.

## 3) Program Offerings by Partnering Institutions

If a Partnering Institution (other than an institution with Statewide Program Responsibilities) identifies a Service Region Program not identified, or anticipated to be identified, in a Designated Institution's Plan, and the Partnering Institution wishes to offer such program in the Designated

Institution's service region, then the Partnering Institution may communicate with the Designated Institution for the purpose of allowing the Partnering Institution to deliver such program in the service region and to include the program in the Designated Institution's Plan. In order to include the program in the Designated Institution's Plan, the Partnering Institution must demonstrate the need within the service region for delivery of the program, as determined by the Board (or by the Administrator of the Division of Career Technical Education in the case of career technical level programs). In order to demonstrate the need for the delivery of a program in a service region, the Partnering Institution shall complete and submit to the Chief Academic Officer of the Designated Institution, to CAAP and to Board staff, in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the Board's Chief Academic Officer, the following:

- a) A study of business and workforce trends in the service region indicating anticipated, ongoing demand for the educational program to be provided.
  - b) A survey of potential students evidencing demand by prospective students and attendance sufficient to justify the short-term and long-term costs of delivery of such program.
  - c) A complete description of the program requested to be delivered, including a plan for the delivery of the program, a timeline for delivery of the program, the anticipated costs of delivery, the resources and support required for delivery (including facilities needs and costs), and program syllabuses.
- 4) Designated Institution's First Right to Offer a Program

In the event the Partnering Institution has submitted the information set forth above to the Board's Chief Academic Officer) for inclusion in the Designated Institution's Plan, and a need is demonstrated by the Partnering Institution for such program in the service region, as determined by the Board (or by the Administrator for the Division of Career Technical Education in the case of career technical level programs), or prior to the submission of an updated Institution Plan by the Designated Institution, it is determined by the Board that an emergency need has arisen for such program in the service region the Designated Institution shall have a first right to offer such program.

The Designated Institution must within six (6) months (three (3) months in the case of associate level or career technical level programs) of receiving the request from a Partnering Institution to offer said program determine whether it will deliver such program on substantially the same terms (with respect to content and timing) described by the Partnering Institution. In the event the Designated Institution determines not to offer the program, the Partnering Institution may offer the program according to the terms

stated, pursuant to an MOU to be entered into with the Designated Institution. If the Partnering Institution materially changes the terms and manner in which the program is to be delivered, the Partnering Institution shall provide written notice to the Chief Academic Officer of the Designated Institution and to the Board's Chief Academic Officer of such changes and the Designated Institution shall be afforded the opportunity again to review the terms of delivery and determine within three (3) months of the date of notice whether it will deliver such program on substantially the same terms.

iii. Memoranda of Understanding

When a service region is served by more than one institution, an MOU shall be developed between such institutions as provided herein and submitted to the Board's Chief Academic Officer for review and approval by the Board prior to entering into such agreements. Each MOU shall be entered into based on the following guidelines, unless otherwise approved by the Board.

If an institution with Statewide Program Responsibility has submitted the information set forth in Subsection 2.a.ii. above to a Designated Institution and Board staff in a timely manner (as determined by the Board's Chief Academic Officer) for inclusion in the Designated Institution's Plan, then the Designated Institution shall identify the program in its Institution Plan and enter into an MOU with the institution with Statewide Program Responsibility in accordance with this policy. If, prior to the submission of an updated Institution Plan by the Designated Institution, it is determined by the Board that an emergency need has arisen for such program in the service region, then upon Board approval the institution with Statewide Program Responsibility and the Designated Institution shall enter into an MOU for the delivery of such program in accordance with the provisions of this policy.

iv. Facilities

For programs offered by a Partnering Institution (whether an institution with Statewide Program Responsibilities, or otherwise) within a municipal or metropolitan area that encompasses the campus of a Designated Institution, the Partnering Institution's programs offerings shall be conducted in facilities located on the campus of the Designated Institution to the extent the Designated Institution is able to provide adequate and appropriate property or facilities (taking into account financial resources and programmatic considerations), or in facilities immediately adjacent to the campus of the Designated Institution. Renting or building additional facilities shall be allowed only upon Board approval, based on the following:

- 1) The educational and workforce needs of the local community demand a separate facility at a location other than the campus of the Designated Institution or adjacent thereto as demonstrated in a manner similar to that set forth in Subsection 2.b.ii.1) above, and

- 2) The use or development of such facilities are not inconsistent with the Designated Institution's Plan.

Facilities rented or built by a Partnering Institution (whether an institution with Statewide Program Responsibilities, or otherwise) on, or immediately adjacent to, the "main" campus of a Designated Institution may be identified (by name) as a facility of the Partnering Institution, or, if the facility is rented or built jointly by such institutions, as the joint facility of the Partnering Institution and the Designated Institution. Otherwise, facilities utilized and programs offered by one or more Partnering Institutions within a service region shall be designated as "University Place at (name of municipality)."

For programs offered by a Partnering Institution (whether an institution with Statewide Program Responsibilities, or otherwise) within a municipality or metropolitan area encompassing a campus of a Designated Institution, to the extent programmatically possible, auxiliary services (including, but not limited to, bookstore, conference and other auxiliary enterprise services) and student services (including, but not limited to, library, information technology, and other auxiliary student services) shall be provided by the Designated Institution. To the extent programmatically appropriate, registration services shall also be provided by the Designated Institution. It is the goal of the Board that a uniform system of registration ultimately be developed for all institutions governed by the Board. The Designated Institution shall offer these services to students who are enrolled in programs offered by the Partnering Institution in the same manner, or at an increased level of service, where appropriate, as such services are offered to the Designated Institution's students. An MOU between the Designated Institution and the Partnering Institution shall outline how costs for these services will be allocated.

v. Duplication of Courses

If courses necessary to complete a Statewide Program are offered by the Designated Institution, they shall be used and articulated into the Statewide Program.

vi. Program Transitions

Institutions with Statewide Program or Service Region Program Responsibilities may plan and develop the capacity to offer a program within a service region where such program is currently being offered by another institution (the Withdrawing Institution) as follows:

- 1) The institution shall identify its intent to develop the program in the next update of its Institution Plan. The institution shall demonstrate its ability to offer the program through the requirements set forth in Subsection 2.b.ii.3) above.
- 2) Except as otherwise agreed between the institutions pursuant to an MOU,



the Withdrawing Institution shall be provided a minimum three (3) year transition period to withdraw its program. If the Withdrawing Institution wishes to withdraw its program prior to the end of the three (3) year transition period, it may do so but in no event earlier than two (2) years from the date of notice (unless otherwise agreed). The Withdrawing Institution shall enter into a transition MOU with the institution that will be taking over delivery of the program that includes an admissions plan between the institutions providing for continuity in student enrollment during the transition period.

vii. Discontinuance of Programs

Unless otherwise agreed between the applicable institutions pursuant to an MOU, if, for any reason, (i) a Designated Institution offering programs in its service region that supports a Statewide Program of another institution, (ii) a Partnering Institution offering programs in the service region of a Designated Institution, or (iii) an institution holding a Statewide Program Responsibility offering Statewide Programs in the service region of a Designated Institution, wishes to discontinue offering such program(s), it shall use its best efforts to provide the institution with Statewide or Service Region Program Responsibility, as appropriate, at least one (1) year's written notice of withdrawal, and shall also submit the same written notice to the Board and to oversight and advisory councils. In such case, the institution with Statewide or Service Region Program Responsibilities shall carefully evaluate the workforce need associated with such program and determine whether it is appropriate to provide such program. In no event will the institution responsible for the delivery of a Statewide or Service Region Program be required to offer such program (except as otherwise provided herein above).

3. Existing Programs

Programs being offered by a Partnering Institution (whether an institution with Statewide Program Responsibilities, or otherwise) in a service region prior to July 1, 2003, may continue to be offered pursuant to an MOU between the Designated Institution and the Partnering Institution, subject to the transition and notice periods and requirements set forth above.

4. Oversight and Advisory Councils

The Board acknowledges and supports the role of oversight and advisory councils to assist in coordinating, on an ongoing basis, the operational aspects of delivering programs among multiple institutions in a service region, including necessary resources and support and facility services, and the role of such councils in interacting and coordinating with local and regional advisory committees to address and communicate educational needs indicated by such committees. Such interactions and coordination, however, are subject to the terms of the MOU's entered into between the institutions and the policies set forth herein.

**5. Resolutions**

All disputes relating to items addressed in this policy shall be forwarded to the Board's Chief Academic Officer for review. The Board's Chief Academic Officer shall prescribe the method for resolution. The Board's Chief Academic Officer may forward disputes to CAAP and if necessary make recommendation regarding resolution to the Board. The Board will serve as the final arbiter of all disputes.

**6. Exceptions**

- a. This policy is not applicable to programs for which 90% or more of all activity is required or completed online, or dual credit courses for secondary education.
- b. This policy also does not apply to courses and programs specifically contracted to be offered to a private, corporate entity. However, in the event that an institution plans to contract with a private corporate entity (other than private entities in the business of providing educational programs and course) outside of their Service Region, the contracting institution shall notify the Designated Institutions in the Service Region and institutions with Statewide Program Responsibilities, as appropriate. If the corporate entity is located in a municipality that encompasses the campus of a Designated Institution, the Board encourages the contracting institution to include and draw upon the resources of the Designated Institution insomuch as is possible.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Board Policy III.O.—Course Placement—Second Reading

**REFERENCE**

February 2014	Board Approved second reading of Board Policy III.Q. Admissions Standards.
June 2015	Board approved Repeal of Board Policy III.O. Equivalency Schedules.
October 2015	Board approved extending the waiver of Board Policy III.Q.4.c, Admissions Placement Scores until the end of the Fall 2016 semester.

**APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.Q.4.c

**BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION**

At its October 2015 meeting, the State Board of Education (Board) extended the waiver of the placement section of Board policy III.Q.4.c. for a third time. This section of policy covers placement in entry-level college courses and was waived until the end of the Fall 2016 semester to allow for the creation and adoption of new placement mechanisms, especially in the wake of the news that ACT would be discontinuing the widely used COMPASS test at the end of CY2016.

The waiver required all new placement mechanisms and processes currently under development by the institutions to be reviewed by the Chief Academic Officer and the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) prior to implementation.

The adoption of this policy will serve two primary purposes. First, it will allow the institutions to design and implement placement processes and mechanisms that allow them to properly place their students based on their individual needs. Second, it will serve the Board's desire to ensure each institution's placement processes and expectations are found in a single location.

No changes have been made since first reading.

**IMPACT**

Approval of the proposed amendments would create a separate section of Board Policy regarding course placement and replace the current statewide placement policy.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Board Policy Section III.O. Course Placement –  
Second Reading.

Page 3

Attachment 2 – Board Policy Section III.Q.4.c.

Page 4

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

Given that course placement and college admissions are sufficiently separate areas of operation, CAAP recommends giving placement its own section of Board Policy. The proposed policy would create a new section of policy. CAAP recommends extracting Board Policy III.Q.4.c (currently under waiver) from III.Q and placing it in III.O. Board Policy III.Q is also in the early stage of being revised.

Currently, Board Policy III.Q.4.c sets a single placement policy for Idaho's public institutions under the Board's direct governance and the community colleges if the college's Board of Trustees does not set their own policy. A system-wide placement policy sets the postsecondary placement requirements in a single location, making it easier for potential students or parents of potential student and secondary school counselors/advisors to find and understand the requirements. While CAAP recommended eliminating a single system-wide placement policy it recognized the importance for critical placement related information to be located in a central location that is easy for students, parents, and school counselors to access.

This proposed policy was recommended for approval by CAAP at its May 26 meeting and recommended for approval by the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) at its July 21, 2016 meeting.

Staff recommends approval.

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the second reading of the new section of Board policy III.O. Course Placement, as presented in Attachment 1 and to extend the waiver of Board Policy III.Q.4.c. placement in entry-level college courses, until such time as amendments to the policy are brought forward removing the subsection from Board Policy III.Q.

Moved by\_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by\_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_

**Idaho State Board of Education  
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES  
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS  
SUBSECTION: O. Course Placement**

**October 2016**

**1. Coverage**

Boise State University, College of Western Idaho, College of Southern Idaho, Eastern Idaho Technical College, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, North Idaho College and University of Idaho are included in this subsection, herein referenced as “institution.”

**2. Academic College and University Course Placement**

- a. Each institution shall submit their academic course placement policies to the Office of the State Board of Education for publication in a single online location.
- b. Any amendments made to an institution’s academic course placement policy must immediately be submitted to the Office of the State Board of Education for updating the published policy.

**Idaho State Board of Education**  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**  
**SUBSECTION: Q. Admission Standards**

**February 2014**

4.

- c. Placement in entry-level college courses will be determined according to the following criteria.

**Placement Scores for English**

<b>Class</b>	<b>ACT English Score</b>	<b>SAT English Score</b>	<b>AP Exam</b>	<b>COMPASS Score</b>
English 90	<17	>200	NA	0 - 67
English 101	18-24	>450	NA	68 - 94
English 101 Credit English 102 Placement	25-30	>570	3 or 4	95 -99
Credit English 101 and English 102	>31	>700	5	

**Placement Scores for Math**

<b>Class</b>	<b>ACT Math Score</b>	<b>SAT Math Score</b>	<b>COMPASS Score</b>
Math 123 Math 127 Math 130	>19	>460	Algebra > 45
Math 143 Math 147 Math 253-254	>23	>540	Algebra >61
Math 144 Math 160	>27	>620	College Algebra >51
Math 170	>29	>650	College Algebra >51 Trigonometry >51

**NOTES:**

If a high school does not offer a required course, applicants may contact the institutional admission officer for clarification of provisional admission procedures.

High school credit counted in one (1) category (e.g., Humanities/Foreign Language) may not count in another category.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Dual Credit Work Group Recommendations

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Policy III.Y. Advanced Opportunities.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

At its February 2016 meeting, the State Board's Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee asked Board staff to assemble a temporary workgroup, consisting of representative stakeholders from both the higher education and K-12 education, to bring forward a set of recommendations to make improvements to Idaho's already successful dual credit programs.

In close consultation with State Department of Education staff, the substantive focus of the work was divided into three categories: Teachers, Courses and Administrative Procedures. Each of the three groups met approximately weekly over five weeks to develop their recommendations. The recommendations were discussed among Board and Department staff, distilled down to one set of recommendations, and then returned to the workgroup members for their approval. The recommendations are an amalgam of the three subcommittees' recommendations.

The recommendations were presented to and discussed by IRSA at its July 21 and September 29 meetings. Similarly, these recommendations were presented to and discussed by CAAP at its August 25 and September 15 meetings.

Additionally, during a September 1 phone call, Board staff discussed each recommendation with the Executive Director of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), Adam Lowe. Mr. Lowe commended the Board for undertaking this work and considering these recommendations, which he noted do not conflict with NACEP accreditation standards and are consistent with the direction NACEP and many states are moving.

The recommendations include:

1. Providing scholarships/incentives for current high school teachers who want to take the necessary courses to be certified to teach dual credit courses.
2. For those students who take academic dual credit courses, make the General Education Matriculation (GEM) framework the focus. Defined in Board Policy III.N. General Education.
3. Requiring institutions and high schools to work jointly to identify alternatives to commercial text books, especially for GEM courses.
4. Encouraging the institutions to offer more evening, summer, and online courses/programs specific to DC credentialing.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

5. Standardizing more meaningful intake processes and orientations for both post-secondary faculty and the approved high school faculty.
6. Standardizing the site visit process by which high school DC teachers are evaluated. Include a requirement that building administrators be notified of site visits prior to the classroom visit.
7. Identifying each institution's minimum requirements for an instructor to teach DC sorted by institution and discipline, and post this information in a single location.
8. Creating a standard template regarding compensation processes and amounts for DC teachers for use by the districts and institutions.
9. Beyond orientations, providing a state sponsored one or two day statewide institute for DC instructors to learn more about guidelines, policy requirements and changes, and other relevant matters.
10. Identifying who approves applicants to teach DC courses, how applicants are approved, and post this information in a single location.
11. Gathering from the institutions their hiring practices for DC instructors and find a place to centralize this information.
12. The Board Office should lead the administration of the Dual Credit enrollment participant survey.

**IMPACT**

The adoption and implementation of these recommendations offers an opportunity to provide consistency and transparency of processes; generate greater efficiencies, particularly as it relates to the streamlining and centralization of certain administrative functions; has the potential to create greater access for many rural students; and would create more accessible pathways for current (particularly rural) high school teachers to earn the necessary credentials to teach dual credit courses in their high schools.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Dual Credit Work Group Recommendations

Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

At this time, these recommendations are being brought forward for informational purposes and discussion. It is the intention of the IRSA to bring the recommendations back for approval at the December 2016 Board meeting.

**BOARD ACTION**

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.



## Final Recommendations 2016 Dual Credit Workgroup

### The Process

- In February 2016, the State Board's IRSA Committee requested the assemblage of a temporary work group to develop, for the full Board's consideration, recommendations for improving Idaho's already very successful Dual Credit programs.
- Subject matter focus was divided among 3 workgroups:
  - Teachers
  - Courses
  - Administrative Procedures
- February 11 – April 4: Workgroups and Board/Department staff met for an hour(ish) almost weekly via telephone.
- July 7: Final recommendations discussed in all-participant call\*

## Participants - *Teachers*

- Linda Gollberg, UI\*
- Stephen Crumrine, CWI\*
- Carol Cox, Parma High School
- Steven Millward, Grace High School
- Terri Mitton, Highland High School
- Lori Stinson, LCSC
- Mike Wiedenfeld, Kuna High School
- Selena Grace, ISU

## Participants - *Courses*

- Chelsea Rauh, ISU\*
- Marcy Hoggatt, NIC\*
- Connie Benke, Vallivue School District
- Dennis Waller, NNU
- Jennifer Caprile, IDLA
- Kandi Turley-Ames, ISU
- Ralph Bennett, Malad High School
- Scott Woolstenhulme, Bonneville School District
- Sherawn Reberry, IDLA

## Participants – *Admin. Procedures*

- Karrie Hornbacher, CSI\*
- Fabiola Juarez-Coca, BSU\*
- Adrian San Miguel, CTE
- Deb Pence, Idaho Distance Education Academy
- Jacky King, Marsing High School
- Jamie Metcalf, Bruneau Grand View High School
- Jen Thornfeldt, Fruitland School District
- Lisa Pennington, Middleton School District
- Mary Mellow, Teton School District
- Michelle Sanders, West Ada School District
- Mike Nelson, CDA School District

## Recommendations for SBOE/SDE Action

1. Provide scholarships/incentives for current high school teachers who want to take the necessary courses to be certified to teach DC courses.
2. For those students who take academic DC courses, make the GEM framework the focus.

## Recommendations for Institutional Action

3. Require institutions and high schools to work jointly to identify alternatives to commercial text books, especially for GEM courses.
4. Encourage the institutions to offer more evening, summer, and online courses/programs specific to DC credentialing.
5. Standardize more meaningful intake processes and orientations for both post-secondary faculty and the approved high school faculty.

## Institutional Action, continued

6. Standardize the site visit process by which high school DC teachers are evaluated. Include a requirement that building administrators be notified of site visits prior to the classroom visit.
7. Identify each institution's minimum requirements for an instructor to teach DC sorted by institution and discipline, and post this information in a single location.
8. Create a standard template regarding compensation processes and amounts for DC teachers for use by the districts and institutions.

## Recommendations for OSBE Action

9. Beyond orientations, consider a state sponsored one or two day statewide institute for DC instructors to learn more about guidelines, policy requirements and changes, and other relevant matters.
10. Identify who approves applicants to teach DC courses, how applicants are approved, and post this information in a single location.
11. Gather from the institutions their hiring practices for DC instructors and find a place to centralize this information.
12. The Board Office should lead the administration of the concurrent enrollment participant survey.

## Next Steps

1. Present to full Board on October 20 for general discussion
2. Return items to December Board Meeting for action by full Board.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK