

# CPL Policy Framework with Examples

Policy Framework	Examples
<p><b>I Establish Guiding Principles</b></p> <p>Such principles might cover the value of offering credit for prior learning, the essential role of the faculty, or the application of assessment methods to MOOCs and other emerging sites of learning.</p>	<p>The <b>Tennessee</b> Prior Learning Assessment Task Force drafted a one-page value statement located on page 2 of the <a href="#">Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy and Practice report</a> published in August 2012.</p> <p>Example from the <b>Washington</b> State Board for Community and Technical Colleges:  “Guidelines for Prior Learning Assessment  Prior learning assessment methods include portfolio development; course challenge and oral examinations; standardized tests; credits earned through the American Council of Education’s Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services (ACE Guide); the systematic observation of skill demonstrations, including role plays and simulations; and the evaluation of case studies or other assignments.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of the learning should be the responsibility of faculty who are content specialists from the awarding institution, and the names and qualifications of those making an assessment should be recorded.</li> <li>• Practices used in assessing prior learning should be consistent with good contemporary assessment methodology.</li> <li>• Learning assessed for post-secondary credit should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Linked to established learning outcomes or other criteria consistent with institutional standards for a given course. It should not be linked to time spent;</li> <li>○ Transferable to contexts other than the one in which it was learned;</li> <li>○ Current and relevant;</li> <li>○ At a level of achievement equivalent to that of other learners engaged in studies at that level in that program or subject area;</li> <li>○ Assessed using a range of strategies consistent with institutional standards for a given course.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Credit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty, as the content specialists, will assess and recognize prior learning and will make the determination of credit awards, with external advice as necessary. Credit may be granted only upon the recommendation of faculty who are appropriately qualified and who are on a regular appointment with the college on a continuing basis.</li> <li>• Learners may be awarded recognition for demonstrating college-level learning that combines theory and practice, not for experience alone.</li> <li>• The number of credits to be granted should be determined by the institution, based on their identified learning outcomes or other criteria.</li> <li>• Credit will be awarded for demonstrated learning outcomes that are appropriate to the subject, course or program</li> </ul>

	<p>offered at the awarding institution.”<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Example from University of <b>Wisconsin</b>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“1. All UW System institutions establish and articulate clear basic principles regarding credit for prior learning.</li> <li>2. All shared governance bodies within the UW System institution recognize the processes for awarding prior learning credit as credible.</li> <li>3. Credit is awarded only for assessed learning, not for experience.</li> <li>4. Prior Learning Assessment is based upon standards and criteria that measure an appropriate level of learning using established practices and methodologies.</li> <li>5. Determination of credit awards and competence levels is made by appropriate academic subject matter or credentialing experts.”<sup>2</sup></li> </ol>
<p><b>II Types of Assessment Accepted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i Portfolio-Based Assessment;<sup>3</sup></li> <li>ii Standardized Exams;<sup>4</sup> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Advanced Placement (AP) examinations;</li> <li>2 International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations;</li> <li>3 College Level Examination Program (CLEP) examinations;</li> <li>4 Excelsior examination;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>The University of <b>Connecticut</b>’s and <b>Iowa</b> Central Community College’s documentation in their respective course catalogs are a somewhat typical example of institutional policies in its incomplete coverage of acceptable assessment types. At UConn, procedures are provided only for receiving credit through Advanced Placement and Challenge Exam assessments. All other assessment types are omitted from the policy. See pages <a href="#">23-24 of the UConn catalog</a>. At ICCC procedures are provided for AP, CLEP, an in-house challenge exam program called Iowa Central Community College Proficiency Exam, and an in-house rubric of credit awarded for particular training programs. See pages <a href="#">17-19 of the ICCC catalog</a>.</p> <p><b>Wisconsin</b>’s 2010 CPL program review includes a section on assessment policy. See pages 11-12 of the <a href="#">University of Wisconsin System, Program Review: Credit for Prior Learning Prior Learning</a>.</p> <p><b>Minnesota</b> State Colleges and Universities’ procedure has a comprehensive policy/procedure. posted regarding types of credit accepted.</p>

<sup>1</sup>\*Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) is the evaluation and assessment of a student’s life learning for undergraduate credit, certification, or advanced standing toward further education or training.

<sup>1</sup> See [the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges ‘ Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning](#), January 2000.

<sup>2</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System’s Prior Learning Assessment Academic Planning and Policy Task Force Findings and Report](#), May 2011, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> A longer list of 10 principles can be found on page three of Wisconsin’s audit document: <http://www.wisconsin.edu/audit/Credit4PriorLearn.pdf><http://www.wisconsin.edu/audit/Credit4PriorLearn.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Through portfolio-based assessment, students produce evidence of prior learning comparable to identified course outcomes. CAEL offers a portfolio-based review service, but many institutions develop their portfolio review processes in closer partnership with faculty in the appropriate area of expertise.

<sup>4</sup> The minimum score to earn academic credit should be clearly identified in the policy, as should the courses at each institution that can be earned through specific standardized tests.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSST). NOTE: Many schools do not accept DANTES and DSST.</li> <li>ii Challenge Exams;<sup>5</sup></li> <li>iii Published Guides; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 American Council on Education (ACE) for military training and experience and corporate training;</li> <li>2 ACE (non-collegiate) for industrial and corporate training programs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>iv “Other” category reserved for new assessments addressing emerging types of learning, e.g. MOOCs.</li> </ul>	<p>See <a href="#">Procedure 3.35.1 Credit for Prior Learning</a>, Parts 2 and 3.</p> <p>The <b>Tennessee</b> Prior Learning Assessment Task Force documents assessment types on pages 4-6 of the <a href="#">Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy and Practice report</a> published in August 2012.</p>
<p><b>III Standards/Criteria for Awarding CPL</b></p> <p><b>a Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <b>Enrollment.</b> For how long or how many credits should a student have been enrolled prior to receiving or applying for CPL?</li> <li>ii <b>Type of credits:</b> Can CPL apply to only general education courses? Electives? Major requirements? Lower division only?</li> <li>iii <b>Number of credits<sup>6</sup>:</b> How many CPL credits can a student apply to his or her degree? To major requirements?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minnesota</b> State Colleges and Universities’ procedure establishes residency standards by type of assessment program. See <a href="#">Procedure 3.35.1 Credit for Prior Learning</a>, Part 3 Subpart B.3</p> <p>Example from <b>Missouri</b>’s draft policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“1. Academic credit will be awarded only for those courses directly applicable to curriculum requirements at the college of enrollment and to the student’s declared certificate or degree program as outlined in college publications.</li> <li>2. A student may use CPL to fulfill all degree/certificate graduation requirements except for mandatory institutional requirements.</li> <li>3. CPL may be applied toward the courses in the AA, AS, AAT, AGS-Articulated or AAS degree programs only for the purpose of satisfying graduation requirements.</li> <li>4. All work assessed for CPL must meet or exceed “C” level work. “C” level work criteria to be determined by each institution.”<sup>7</sup></li> </ul> <p>Example from the Commonwealth of <b>Pennsylvania</b> Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines:</p>

<sup>5</sup> Challenge exams are faculty created and graded examinations.

<p>iv <b>Residency:</b> Do CPL credits count toward institutional residency requirement?</p> <p>v <b>Other</b> credit thresholds: For instance, many colleges and departments have professional school models where students must meet certain undergraduate requirements before being admitted or allowed to take upper division courses. CPL policies should take care to account for such requirements to prevent lengthening time to degree or risking financial aid eligibility.</p>	<p>“Student Eligibility for Prior Learning Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students should be accepted and enrolled in the institution.</li> <li>• Students should be eligible to take the course for credit within the institution.”<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>IV Cost/Tuition Structure</b><sup>9</sup></p> <p>A comprehensive policy should determine either as a system or at the institutional level a tuition or fee structure for awarding various types of CPL.<sup>10</sup> Policy makers should keep in mind that CPL may cause new patterns of enrollment that will impact university finances. Upper division courses are often more expensive to deliver. The more students who “bypass”</p>	<p>The CAEL College Productivity Resource Guide provides several excellent system-wide examples:</p> <p>“Some state systems stipulate what their colleges and programs should charge for [Prior Learning Assessment] PLA services. <b>Oklahoma</b> provides some basic guidelines, in that ‘Costs to students for establishment of credit should be comparable throughout the State System, and should reflect as closely as possible the actual costs for institutional administration of the program.’ <b>Minnesota</b> system policy provides similar guidelines but adds that fees may also be charged for entering the credits awarded into the transcript. <b>Colorado</b> policy stipulates, ‘The evaluation fee to be charged will be determined by each college, but shall not exceed 50% of the standard tuition rate.’ <b>Alabama</b> policy specifies that the charge for portfolio review shall be \$25 for each portfolio (one portfolio for each course for which credit through experiential learning is requested), and students seeking credit ‘through</p>

<sup>6</sup> CPL credits awarded must not exceed 25% per accreditation standards. See [NWCCU’s Standards for Accreditation](#) Section 2.c.7. Furthermore, institutions should align CPL policies with potential excess credit differential policies so as not to inappropriately penalize students for taking advantage of CPL.

<sup>7</sup> See [Missouri’s Draft CPL Model Document](#), p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> See the [Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines](#), May 2009, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Note: CPL does not count as part of a student’s financial aid eligibility.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. EOU APEL fees are \$50 per credit. CAEL Portfolio Review fees are \$250 for up to 12 credits in any one discipline (For example, 1-12 credits attempted in business: \$250; 12-24 credits attempted in the same discipline: \$500. Credits attempted in additional disciplines follow the same structure). ACE credit transcription requires a registration fee of \$40 which includes one copy of a student transcript. Each additional copy is \$15.

lower division courses, the more resources are diverted from other services on campus.

examination or nationally recognized guidelines are not charged a fee for PLA or for credits awarded through PLA.”<sup>11</sup>

**Minnesota** State Colleges and Universities’ procedure establishes a policy for setting prior learning assessment fees:

“Fees for prior learning assessment. When applicable, a student shall be charged for the services related to the prior learning assessment process in accordance with Policy 5.11 and Procedure 5.11.1, Tuition and Fees.”<sup>12</sup>

Example from the Commonwealth of **Pennsylvania** Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines:

“Fees for Prior Learning Assessment: PLA fees should be based on the services performed for review and assessment, not determined by the amount of credit awarded.”<sup>13</sup>

Example from the **Washington** State Board for Community and Technical Colleges:

“Fees/Enrollment

- The fees for assessment will be based on actual costs plus reasonable. The fees will be based on the amount of credit requested, not the amount of credit awarded.
- Fees should be published and consistently applied.
- Fees should be consistent to the extent possible across the system.”<sup>14</sup>

**Wisconsin**’s Task Force on PLA provided the following policy recommendation, which leaves the authority to set fees with the institution:

“Currently, how and what fees are charged for PLA assessment, and the accounts to which fees are receipted, is determined at the institution level. Given the diversity of PLA methodology and implementation, UW System institutions should be provided autonomy to establish PLA fee structures so as to improve an institution’s ability to control sustainability of the program. At the same time, the PLA Task Force noted the importance of developing system wide guidelines that will support consistent and equitable fee policy across institutions.

Recommendations and Observations

1. Systemwide guidelines regarding PLA fee structures may serve to coordinate and guide institutional establishment of fee policies and structures; however, the setting of fee structures should take place at that

<sup>11</sup> See [CAEL’s College Productive Resource Guide](#), page 6

<sup>12</sup> See Minnesota’s State Colleges and Universities’ [Procedure 3.35.1 Credit for Prior Learning](#), Part 3 Subpart B.2.

<sup>13</sup> See the [Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines](#), May 2009, p. 3.

<sup>14</sup> See [the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges’ Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning](#), January 2000.

	<p>institution level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Fees and financial structures for prior learning should consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The cost to sustain services required to conduct assessments;</li> <li>b. The cost to sustain student services required to support assessment completion;</li> <li>c. How to recognize and support the contribution of personnel involved in the assessment;</li> <li>d. The cost to administer the PLA program;</li> <li>e. GPR and other program revenue available to provide the program with a base of support.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Fee structures should ensure student populations have equitable access to PLA.</li> <li>4. Fees charged for assessment of prior learning should be based on the services performed in the process and not determined by the amount of credit awarded.</li> <li>5. UW System institutions should clearly communicate tuition and fee structures related to PLA to applicants and students.”<sup>15</sup></li> </ol>
<p><b>V Transferability</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a Transfer between Oregon institutions</li> <li>b Articulation agreements</li> </ol> <p>Institutions or systems may consider articulation agreements with “feeder” schools or in response to recognized patterns in awarding CPL.</p>	<p><b>Oklahoma’s</b> policy addresses credit transfer by stipulating that once a State institution records the credit, it is transferable within the system as if it were earned through traditional enrollment at the awarding institution.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>The <b>Tennessee</b> Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations to ease the transferability of CPL credits on page 9 of the <a href="#">Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy and Practice report</a> published in August 2012.</p> <p><b>Wisconsin’s</b> task force recommended that the current language stating that CPL on a student’s transcript should be evaluated for “possible” transfer between institutions be changed so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“1. Credit for prior learning granted by one UW System institution should be accepted and transferred by all UW System institutions.</li> <li>2. The receiving UW System institution should determine how the credit will apply to the major and/or degree.</li> <li>3. Students who earn credit for prior learning should be informed that they can expect the receiving UW System institution to evaluate how such credit will be applied to their degree.”<sup>17</sup></li> </ol>

<sup>15</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System’s Prior Learning Assessment Academic Planning and Policy Task Force Findings and Report](#), May 2011, p. 18.

<sup>16</sup> See [the brochure on Extracurricular Learning Credit](#), Oklahoma State University.

<sup>17</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System’s Prior Learning Assessment Academic Planning and Policy Task Force Findings and Report](#), May 2011, p. 15.

## VI Transcription

The system or institution should mandate a clear and consistent method of transcription.

**Missouri's** draft policy recommends that:

“At least one credit hour must be successfully completed and transcribed on the student’s records before any CPL credit can be awarded. For all prior learning methods, the course number, course title, number of semester hours, and grade of “CPL” will be posted on the student’s transcript and labeled CPL.”<sup>18</sup> Whereas, Minnesota’s policy states that “Credit awarded for prior learning or earned by examination may be noted either in the term when it was earned or in the transfer section. If placed in the term section, the type of special credit must be noted in parentheses immediately below the course.”<sup>19</sup>

In the Vermont State College System, CPL is transcribed as transfer credit.

**Minnesota** State Colleges and Universities’ procedure establishes a policy recording credit granted:

“Recording of credit granted. Each system college and university shall record the credit earned through prior learning assessment on the official student transcript in compliance with Board Policy 3.29 and Procedure 3.29.1, College and University Transcripts.”<sup>20</sup>

The **Tennessee** Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations on the transcription of CPL credits on pages 10-12 of the [Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment \(PLA\) Policy and Practice report](#) published in August 2012.

Example from the **Washington** State Board for Community and Technical Colleges:

“**Transcripts/Transfer**

- Grades or credits will be assigned to PLA awards and will be entered accordingly on the learner’s transcript.
- Credits earned through PLA at Washington Community and Technical Colleges will be accepted toward the appropriate course or program at any other Washington Community and Technical College.
- The percentage of a program’s credits that can be obtained through PLA will be determined by the institution awarding the credential in accordance with Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges’ policies.”<sup>21</sup>

Example from **Wisconsin's** recommendation:

<sup>18</sup> See [Missouri’s Draft CPL Model Document](#), p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> See [Minnesota State Colleges & Universities’ Procedure 3.29.1](http://www.mnscu.edu/board/procedure/329p1.html) <http://www.mnscu.edu/board/procedure/329p1.html>

<sup>20</sup> See Minnesota’s State Colleges and Universities’ [Procedure 3.35.1 Credit for Prior Learning](#), Part 3 Subpart B.1

<sup>21</sup> See [the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges’ Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning](#), January 2000.

	<p>“A standard method or practice of transcript notation for credit earned through PLA be developed and adopted on a system-wide basis to create consistency across the UW System and to help facilitate transfer of PLA-earned credits between institutions.”<sup>22</sup></p> <p>Example from the Commonwealth of <b>Pennsylvania</b> Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines:  “Transcription and Transfer of Prior Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transcribed credit should be equivalent to a grade of C or higher.</li> <li>• The transcript should include the equivalent course number, course title, grade, and credits earned.</li> <li>• Transcribed credit for prior learning should be seamlessly transferable.”<sup>23</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>VII Data Collection and Reporting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a System-wide collection and tracking methodology;</li> <li>b Evaluation and reporting policy.</li> </ul>	<p>The <b>Wisconsin</b> Task Force recommended “that all UW institutions document the awarding of credit by PLA method, and that a uniform process and format be developed by the UW System Office of Academic Affairs for collecting, recording, and reporting this data.”<sup>24</sup></p>
<p><b>VIII Faculty and Staff Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a Develop faculty designed learning outcomes in each course for which portfolio based assessment should be a means for earning CPL. These are essential for quality assessment of student portfolios.<sup>25</sup></li> <li>b Build capacity amongst faculty/staff to support CPL advising and portfolio or other assessment;</li> <li>c Provide space and support for developing these shared assessment tools.</li> </ul>	<p>Example from the Commonwealth of <b>Pennsylvania</b> Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines:  “Professional Development for Prior Learning Assessment  All PLA personnel should receive training in the institution’s PLA Program Policies and Procedures including, but not limited to: PLA benefits and opportunities; assessment tools; student eligibility; the recommending, awarding, transcribing, and transferring of credit; the assessment appeal processes; fees; and communication of current Program Policies and Procedures.”<sup>26</sup></p> <p>Example from the <b>Washington</b> State Board for Community and Technical Colleges:  “Professional Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All personnel involved in PLA (PLA assessors, learner advisors, instructors of portfolio development/career/educational planning courses) should have appropriate skills and knowledge relevant to their</li> </ul>

<sup>22</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System, Program Review: Credit for Prior Learning Prior Learning](#), November 2010, p. 14.

<sup>23</sup> See the [Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines](#), May 2009, p. 3.

<sup>24</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System, Program Review: Credit for Prior Learning Prior Learning](#), November 2010, p. 5.

<sup>25</sup> Proposed edit only. Based on Melanie Booth’s 2.19.2013 training.

<sup>26</sup> See the [Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines](#), May 2009, p. 3.



	<p>roles and responsibilities in the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All personnel should work systematically towards continuous improvement in their own practice.</li> <li>• Institutions should assume the responsibility for supporting staff to acquire and maintain expertise in prior learning assessment services and provide opportunities for sharing information and expertise with other institutions.”<sup>27</sup></li> </ul> <p>The <b>Wisconsin</b> Task Force recommended building “a repository of available exams and portfolio assessment tools” in order to “facilitate both expansion of PLA and alignment of learning outcomes and standards within a specific discipline.”<sup>28</sup></p>
<p><b>IX Authority</b></p> <p>a Identify the body with decision-making authority regarding CPL policy on an institutional or system-wide level;</p> <p>b Establish an ongoing, system-wide coordinating or advisory group.</p>	<p>This can be a system-wide group or committees on individual campuses. Vermont, a unique example, has a system-wide approach offering a portfolio course out of its Office of External Programs with a flat fee in which students can earn as many credits as they can cover in a semester’s time.<sup>29</sup> This seems similar to the model of the new Wisconsin flexible degree program.</p> <p>Many states, like Oregon, have responded to a legislative mandate requiring the creation of a coordinating body to periodically review CPL and other initiatives.</p>
<p><b>II Policy Transparency and Accessibility</b></p> <p>a Access: Establish how students should be able to locate this information in the catalog and on the web.</p> <p>b Transparency: Set expectations around how easily a student should be able to make accurate judgments about and act on this policy given the information it</p>	<p>Example from <b>Minnesota</b> State Colleges and Universities’ policy and procedure:</p> <p>“Part 4. Information Dissemination. Each system college and university shall provide accessible and timely information to prospective and admitted students regarding opportunities for credit for prior learning.”<sup>31</sup></p> <p>“Subpart E. College or university responsibility. Each system college and university shall provide a student with timely and readily accessible information about opportunities for credit for prior learning in official publications, such as the college catalog, Web sites, and advising materials and a timely decision regarding the evaluation process.”<sup>32</sup></p>

<sup>27</sup> See [the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges ‘ Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning](#), January 2000.

<sup>28</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System’s Prior Learning Assessment Academic Planning and Policy Task Force Findings and Report](#), May 2011, p. 17.

<sup>29</sup> See the [Community College of Vermont’s page on Assessment of Prior Learning](#).

<sup>31</sup> See Minnesota’s State Colleges and Universities [Policy 3.35 Credit for Prior Learning](#), Part 4.

includes. Important elements include identifying a single point of contact on campus, linking to important forms, minimum standardized score information, and more.

c Dissemination

- i Set expectations about how this information is disseminated through advisors, faculty, department websites, advising documents, and events such as Orientation.<sup>30</sup>
- ii Communicate the various pathways for earning CPL, e.g. earning credit for learning that took place in MOOC through a portfolio or challenge assessment.

d Other marketing or promotional decisions to draw attention to CPL availability. For example, Indiana introduced a partnership with the State Workforce Innovation Council to promote CPL through workforce development programs.

Example from **Wisconsin**'s recommendation:

“UW institutions or departments ensure transparency regarding the academic and administrative criteria under which students may be awarded credit for prior learning when examinations or portfolios are not used; the UW System Office of Academic Affairs develop a strategy to introduce PLA and encourage ongoing dialogue among faculty and the adult learning community; and UW institutions that intend to increase PLA usage identify a student population that provides a good match with their institutional objectives and target their limited resources accordingly.”<sup>33</sup>

The **Tennessee** Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations on information dissemination and communication regarding CPL on pages 13-14 of the [Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment \(PLA\) Policy and Practice report](#) published in August 2012.

Example from the **Washington** State Board for Community and Technical Colleges:

“Learner Orientation/Preparation

- Learners should have access to adequate information about and orientation to all PLA processes. Information could be available in quarterly schedules and in other marketing materials from a single point of contact.
- Institutions should offer a variety of opportunities to support learners’ progress through the assessment process; for example, single point of contact, advisors, onestop access, and portfolio templates.

....

- Policies and information about prior learning assessment processes, including provision for appeal, will be readily available.
- Nationally administered examinations, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Dantes and CLEP could be brought into a course in the college catalog or can be handled separately based on local college decisions.
- The Instruction Commission recommends that PLA must be tied to catalogue offerings.”<sup>34</sup>

Example from the Commonwealth of **Pennsylvania** Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines:

<sup>32</sup> See Minnesota’s State Colleges and Universities’ [Procedure 3.35.1 Credit for Prior Learning](#), Part 3 Subpart E.

<sup>30</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System’s Prior Learning Assessment Academic Planning and Policy Task Force Findings and Report](#), May 2011, p. 19.

<sup>33</sup> See [University of Wisconsin System, Program Review: Credit for Prior Learning Prior Learning](#), November 2010, p. 17.

<sup>34</sup> See [the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges’ Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning](#), January 2000.

	<p>“Communication about Prior Learning Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Program Departments and faculty should refer students to the institution’s PLA Program Policies and Procedures.</li> <li>• PLA Program Policies and Procedures should include, but are not limited to, student eligibility, opportunities, assessment tools, recommendations, awards, transcription, transfer, appeals, and fees.</li> <li>• PLA Program Policies and Procedures should be clearly communicated and fully disclosed to students through, but not limited to, face-to-face meetings with Registrars, Admissions Offices, and Academic Advisors, and by various media such as brochures, catalogues, handbooks, and institution websites.”<sup>35</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>III Incentivizing CPL at the institutional level</b></p>	<p>CAEL recommends a funding system that rewards degree progression and completion, as practiced in Tennessee, in order to enhance the institutions’ interest and commitment to this tool.<sup>36</sup> This is essentially a piece of their performance-based funding model outlined in the “Public Agenda for Tennessee 2010-2015 that ties completion metrics to the funding formula, rather than to total enrollment alone.”<sup>37</sup></p>
<p><b>IV Policy Review</b> Determining how often and by which body this policy should be reviewed. E.g. The Credit for Prior Learning Policy should be reviewed annually by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.</p>	<p>Example from the <b>Tennessee</b> Prior Learning Assessment Task Force:  <b>“Periodic review of PLA policies</b>  Institutions are to review PLA program policies and procedures at least every five years corresponding with each institution’s SACS Ten-Year Re-Affirmation and the Five-Year Review. The review should involve evaluating all aspects of PLA policy, procedures, and portfolio audits, for consistency with state, regional and national practices. Additionally, institutions are encouraged to report a PLA Program Profile detailing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Volume of PLA credits awarded annually (per PLA subcategory and total)</li> <li>b. Average volume of PLA credits per award</li> <li>c. PLA recipient data including, but not limited to, a demographic summary of PLA recipients (age, race, and GPA) as well as measures of recipient success (per PLA subcategory and total).”<sup>38</sup></li> </ol>

<sup>35</sup> See the [Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Prior Learning Assessment Initiative General Guidelines](#), May 2009, p. 3.

<sup>36</sup> See [CAEL’s College Productive Resource Guide](#), p. 11.

<sup>37</sup> See the [Public Agenda for Tennessee 2010-2015](#).

<sup>38</sup> See the **Tennessee** Prior Learning Assessment Task Force’s [Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment \(PLA\) Policy and Practice report](#), August 2012, 9. 13.

	<p>Example from the <b>Washington</b> State Board for Community and Technical Colleges: “Institutions will regularly monitor, review, evaluate and revise prior learning assessment policies and practices to maintain and improve institutional standards.”<sup>39</sup></p>
--	---

---

<sup>39</sup> See [the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges ‘ Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning](#), January 2000.