

SYSTEM COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS

AGENDA

March 15, 2017
8:30 am – 9:15 am

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers will meet in the Kathy Rupp Room located in the Curtis State Office Building at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612.

- I. Call To Order** Neeli Bendapudi, Co-Chair
A. *Approve Minutes*
February 15, 2017 Meeting *p. 2*
- II. Update**
A. *Transfer and Articulation Council* Karla Wiscombe
B. *Credit for Prior Learning* Karla Wiscombe
Connie Beene
- III. Other Matters**
A. *Placement Recommendations from the Developmental Education Working Group* Jean Redeker *p.4*
Regena Aye
Jennifer Brown
B. *Performance Report deadline* Karla Wiscombe
- IV. Adjournment**

SCOCAO Schedule

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES
February 22, 2017	March 15, 2017
March 29, 2017	April 19, 2017 at KU
April 26, 2017	May 17, 2017
May 24, 2017	June 14, 2017

**Kansas Board of Regents
System Council of Chief Academic Officers**

**Wednesday, February 15, 2017
MINUTES**

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room of the Kansas Board of Regents at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 15, 2017.

In Attendance:

Co-Chairs:	Peggy Forsberg, Highland CC	Neeli Bendapudi, KU	
Staff:	Jean Redeker Scott Smathers Max Fridell	Karla Wiscombe Connie Beene Tim Peterson	Cindy Farrier Jacqueline Johnson Tobias Wood
Others:	Lynette Olson, PSU David Cordle, ESU L. Michael McCloud, JCCC April Mason, KSU Robert Klein, KUMC Andrew Bennett, KSU Tim Crowley, FHSU Stuart Day, KU Brian Lindshield, KSU	Jon Marshall, Allen CC Kim Krull, Barton CC Pam Keller, KU Tony Vizzini, WSU Rick Muma, WSU Tiffany Bohm, KCKCC Brian Niehoff, KSU Bayram Yildirim, WSU Brad Bennett, Colby CC	Lori Winningham, Butler CC JuliAnn Mazacheck, Washburn Brenda Chatfield, NWKTC Cindy Hoss, Highland CC Todd Carter, Seward County CC Ruth Dyer, KSU Janice Jewett, PSU Brenda Edleston, Cloud County CC

Peggy Forsberg called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Approve December 14, 2016 Minutes

Tony Vizzini moved to approve the December 14, 2016 minutes. Lynette Olson seconded, and the motion carried.

Updates

- Karla Wiscombe provided an update on multiple projects
 - Articulation agreements due Feb 6th, submit if you have not done so
 - Concurrent enrollment partnership due Feb 22nd
 - Transfer and Articulation Council
 - Institutions need to verify course information for courses approved January 2017
 - E-mail with information to be sent to Chief Academic Officers, Registrars, and Institutional Research staff
 - On Oct 13, 2017 KCOG will review courses approved in 2012
 - Information to be sent in April for faculty attendance for the 2017 KCOG meeting
- Credit for Prior Learning update was presented by Connie Beene
 - Distributed curriculum for healthcare programs to institutions
 - March 3 hosting workshop American Council of Education (ACE)
 - Goal 1 Understand process used when ACE makes credit recommendations
 - Goal 2 Convene faculty groups to review and compare Medical Education Training Center curriculum and outcomes to begin process of determining alignment for Credit for Prior Learning
 - Human Resource workgroup
 - General Education workgroup
 - Looking at other course articulation recommendations
 - Behavioral Health Technician program
 - If you have courses or programs that align with the military curriculum, contact Connie Beene

- Assisting with alignment to Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) standards for Practical Nursing Group
- GED information provided by Tobias Wood.
 - The GED Program – A Guide for Admissions Officer was distributed
 - Updates to GED test and recommendations by ACE
 - 43% of individuals testing with intent of continuing education
 - GED Testing Levels and Scores changed March 1, 2016
 - Level 1 - minimum Score 145 – GED Passing Score for High School Equivalency
 - Level 2 – minimum Score 165 – GED College Ready
 - Level 3 – minimum Score 175 – GED College Ready + Credit

Based upon GED passing test scores from 2014 to 2016 for Kansas, 24% of individuals who passed qualified for College Ready (level 2) and 16% qualified for College Ready plus Credit (level 3). Individuals may apply for an ACE transcript and potentially receive credit based upon GED Test scores. Encourage institutions to review this information with faculty and registrars as it is another way to recognize the learning these students have accomplished.

Other Matters

- Proposed amendments to the Board’s Policy on Participation in the Midwest Student Exchange Program was presented by Jean Redeker. Proposed changes will update the policy to align with current practice. Discussion was held with each of the proposed changes, and SCOCOA approval was requested to move the proposed amendments forward.

Lynette Olson moved to approve the amendments to the Participation in the Midwest Student Exchange Program. Neeli Bendapudi seconded, and the motion carried.

- Jean Redeker and Tim Peterson presented an update to Board Goal 1 “The Board will receive a proposal to attract Kansans with some college credit, but no degree, back to higher education to complete a credential, as well as the projected costs to implement the proposal”
 - Get *AHEAD* - Adult Higher Education Accessible Degrees initiative
 - 306,389 Kansans have earned some college credit but no degree
 - 37,673 are “potential completers” who have two or more years’ worth of academic credit
 - The proposal reflects the SHEEO Adult Promise Program: A Pilot Design Template for States
 - The three-year Get *AHEAD* initiative would require an investment of \$2 million
 - Three-fourths of the funds would be allocated for returning adult tuition scholarships
 - The proposal would assist 1,500 Kansas adults to complete an online baccalaureate degree
 - The proposal would assist another 500 Kansas adults to complete an online associate degree
 - A low-cost *Finish What You Started* alternative initiative would have less impact

Discussion was held on various aspects of the proposal.

- Peggy Forsberg requested the universities review their online programs that are discipline specific as faculty members are looking for courses that assist them in qualifying as a Concurrent Instructor under HLC requirements.

There being no other business, April Mason moved to adjourn. Jon Marshall seconded, and the motion carried. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:10 a.m.

Discuss Placement/Assessment Recommendations from the Developmental Education Working Group

Background

An area of significant concern for remedial education is the mechanism used to determine whether students should be placed in remedial education. In September 2013, the Board initiated a study of developmental education calling for “a set of recommendations for redesigning developmental education across the system.” It charged a working group with three actions in response to its goal of initiating a study on developmental education in the higher education system in Kansas:

To assess the level and types of remedial education at state community and technical colleges and make recommendations about: (1) state level policy and actions to promote effective remediation; (2) strategies that may be implemented locally, at the discretion of individual institutions; and (3) appropriate state level goals and local performance measures.

The Developmental Education Working Group, which consisted of twenty faculty and staff from fifteen universities, community colleges, and technical colleges, presented its final report to the Board of Regents in June 2014. The report provided data about the state of developmental education at public colleges in Kansas, outlined national initiatives to improve developmental education, and recommended state and local policies, actions, and goals. One recommendation was for placement assessment test options and cut-off scores be standardized statewide.

Placement Assessment

To increase consistency among two-year colleges in Kansas and reduce the number of over- or under-placed students, the Placement Assessment Policy Committee, a subcommittee of the Developmental Education Working Group, further refined the recommendation that placement assessment test options and cut-off scores be standardized statewide.

Standardization of Cut-off Scores

The recommendations follow and would apply to degree or certificate-seeking students.

1. Institutions should administer placement tests prior to student enrollment.
2. Institutions should communicate the high-stakes nature of placement testing to students.
3. Institutions should have published re-test policies.
4. Institutions should promote and provide test and re-test preparation materials.
5. To assess reading, writing, and math skills, institutions should use one of the following:
 - College admissions tests, e.g., ACT or SAT
 - Transcript(s) of transfer courses
 - ACCUPLACER
 - GED® 2014 Test
6. For technical programs (certificate and/or AAS levels), institutions should use one or more of the following to assess the reading, writing, or mathematics skills as required by the technical program students intend to pursue. If students change programs, they should be required to take any additional placement portions required.

- College admissions tests, e.g., ACT or SAT
 - Transcript(s) of transfer courses
 - ACCUPLACER
 - GED® 2014 Test
7. Institutions should follow the testing procedures given by the test publisher to increase the likelihood of accurate placement.
8. Institutions should use the cut-scores below for placement in the courses listed¹.

Placement into	ACCUPLACER Subtest	Score Range
Intermediate Algebra	Elementary Algebra	60-80
College Algebra	Elementary Algebra	81 or above
College Composition 1	Sentence Skills	69-120
College level reading	Reading Comprehension	69-120
College Composition 1	ESL5 ²	Under consideration

9. Institutions should use at least one other measure in addition to placement testing before placing students in remedial instruction³.
10. Students who do not demonstrate the academic skills (reading, writing, or math) for the degree/certificate sought should begin developmental courses in the first semester (if courses are available or during the first year if courses are not available) and continue in each subsequent semester of enrollment until all developmental requirements are completed.

Standardization of Placement Assessment Test Options

Nationally, 97% of two-year colleges use either ACCUPLACER or COMPASS for placement assessment. In April 2016, the Board entered a contract with College Board to allow public two-year colleges to take advantage of discounted pricing for ACCUPLACER exams. The contract was amended to allow the public universities to take advantage of this same pricing. As required by the terms of the contract, the Kansas Board of Regents recommends the use of ACCUPLACER as an institution’s primary basic skills assessment test. In Fall 2016, ACT took the COMPASS test off the market, leaving ACCUPLACER as the primary placement assessment exam available.

Discussion

Board staff discussed the policy recommendations and, presuming review and approval by SCOCAO and SCOPS, suggest they be adopted as guidelines similar to the Board’s [Kansas Credit for Prior Learning Guidelines](#), and be posted on the Board’s website.

¹ These scores will be reviewed by the Placement Assessment Policy Committee after at least two full years of implementation.

² ESL 5 refers to the combinations of four ESL sub-tests: Language Use, Listening, Reading Skills, and Sentence Meaning.

³ See attached list of Nationally Recognized Measures of Student Readiness.

Nationally Recognized Measures of Student Readiness

These measures are nationally recognized for placement in postsecondary coursework and should be used in addition to a single placement test score.

Skills Assessment Tools

ACCUPLACER sub-tests not named in the placement assessment policy, e.g., *Write Placer*,

Arithmetic, or *College-Level Math*

ACCUPLACER *Diagnostics*

Standardized tests used for college admissions, e.g., ACT or SAT

Locally developed tests that predict performance in college's curriculum

College grades from accredited institutions

High School GPA (Not more than three years old)

Grades in relevant high school courses (Not more than three years old)

Military records

Score of 165 or above on relevant GED® sub-test

Noncognitive Assessment Tools

ETS Success Navigator

ACT Engage

Smarter Measure

Wonderlic Admissions Risk Profile