

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

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	BOARD POLICY III.L. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
2	BOARD POLICY III.Z. PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND COURSES – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
3	BOARD POLICY III.O. COURSE PLACEMENT– SECOND READING	Motion to Approve
4	DUAL CREDIT RECOMMENDATIONS	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	Page 5
Attachment 2 – CAEL’s Final Report	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

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 _____

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 _____

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.