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ABSTRACT

Proposed revisions of the existing policies stated on pages 15-18 of the Undergraduate Academic Policies bulletin, 1975-76: ADVANCED PLACEMENT, PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS, CREDIT BY EXAMINATION:

Mandated by University Senate Policy

1. Advanced Placement Program
   P. 16, Revision
   Credit is awarded for scores of 3 or higher on the five-point scale established by the Advanced Placement program.

Recommendations for Faculty Senate Action

2. College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP)
   P. 16, Addition
   Regents External Degree Examinations (RED)
   Revision
   Grades of C or higher, Pass or a standard score of 45 or higher earned in a course taken through the College Proficiency Examination program will be accepted as passing grades.
   Addition
   Foreign Language Examination Standard Scores
   Battery A - Language Skills (writing, reading, listening, speaking):
   A minimum standard score of 45 on each subtest AND a total standard score of 200 or more for the four subtests combined is required for passing.
   Battery B - Minimum passing standard scores
   Applied Linguistics - 55
   Civilization and Culture - 55
   Professional Preparation - 60

Notes Regarding Advanced Placement, Proficiency Examinations, Credit by Examination
   P. 16, Delete item C
   Courses for which a student has been granted Advanced Placement Credit may not be used to fulfill the Liberal Arts Core requirement.
3. College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)

p. 16, Revision
The College accepts for advanced credit, scores at the twenty-fifth percentile or higher which have been earned in the CLEP General Examinations.

p. 17, Delete
To be eligible for credit under this program, the tests must be taken prior to matriculation at Brockport.

4. Departmental Administered Proficiency Examinations

p. 17, Delete Section 4

5. Notes Regarding Advanced Placement, Proficiency Examinations, and Credit by Examination

p. 18, Revision
No credit earned through the credit by examination process may be used to fulfill the senior residency requirement.
INTRODUCTION

The policy regarding Advanced Placement, proficiency examinations, and credit by examination which appears on pages 15-18 of the Undergraduate Academic Policies bulletin, 1975-76 was adopted by the Faculty Senate on December 4, 1972 and signed by Acting President Henderson on February 15, 1973. Since that time there have been a number of changes which bear on this policy so that certain revisions are now needed.

First, in February, 1975, the University Senate unanimously endorsed the report of the Credit by Evaluation Committee appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs and recommended that it be implemented. Chancellor Boyer also indicated his full agreement with the resolution and that implementation procedures would be initiated. The report of the Committee mandates the award of credit if specified minimum performance levels are met. The purpose in designating such guidelines was to standardize practices regarding credit by examination through the State University system. In preparing its report, the committee considered the trends in higher education regarding credit by evaluation, as well as the general philosophic issues raised and academic considerations concerned with the adoption of such a policy. Two of the proposed changes are mandated by this policy of State University.

Secondly, the expanded provisions of the College Entrance Examination Board's Advanced Placement (AP) program and the New York State Education Department's College Proficiency Examinations Program (CPETP) need to be acknowledged and incorporated into existing policy.

Lastly, the Departmental Credit by Examination program at Brockport has been growing since its adoption so that an all-college policy on departmentally-administered proficiency examinations has become obsolete.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM

Since its establishment in the 1950's the Advanced Placement Program has offered high school students the opportunity to take specific courses for which they might receive college credit or placement with successful scores. Presently Brockport awards credit for scores of 5 (extremely well qualified) and 4 (well qualified). At departmental discretion, credit or placement may be granted for scores of 3 (qualified). Under State University policy, students are guaranteed credit for published examinations provided the minimum performance levels are met. In the case of the Advanced Placement program, the minimum score at which credit is guaranteed is 3 (qualified). Thus, to bring college policy into compliance with the University Senate mandate, this policy would need to be revised to read:

Credit is awarded for scores of 3 or higher on the five-point scale established by the Advanced Placement program.

Rationale:
The intent of this policy is to establish uniform performance levels for the award of credit throughout the State University.
This is particularly important to transfer students who encounter differing policies within the State University units. Such policies can be applied to the AP examinations due to their documented validity and wide acceptance in the higher education community.

Initially, under the AP program credit was granted for the specific courses. In 1973, a program was begun under which the award of immediate sophomore standing is made to students gaining credit in three, or sometimes four, AP courses. More than 100 colleges and universities, including such institutions as American University, Boston University, Goddard College, Northwestern University, University of Maryland (Eastern Shore) and SUC at Old Westbury participate in this program. Further, studies at such universities as Harvard, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Stanford, Tulane, Virginia, and Yale have shown that qualified candidates take undergraduate programs of real strength and achieve records equal to those obtained by students whose basic college courses were taken at those institutions.

Because of this development in the Advanced Placement program and in order to well serve the needs of entering freshmen, it is proposed that the following be deleted from the policy governing AP credit.

Courses for which a student has been granted Advanced Placement credit may not be used to fulfill the Liberal Arts Core requirement.

Rationale:

Present policy allows 30 hours of undesignated credit toward meeting the Communication Arts Core and the Liberal Arts Core for students who score satisfactorily on the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) General Examination. These examinations are designed to cover subject matter that is the equivalent of a typical freshman-year program. As such, the examinations are recognized as lower-division, general-education subject matter. I would submit that the material covered in the Advanced Placement courses meet the same criteria; i.e., it is equivalent to subject matter contained in freshman year courses as substantiated by the recognition given AP credit by a number of institutions. Given this consideration and to be consistent in the award of credit for the general education requirements of the
College, Advanced Placement credit should also be allowed in the Communication Arts and Liberal Arts Core.

COLLEGE PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS AND REGENT’S INTERNAL DEGREE EXAMINATIONS

With the establishment of the Regent's External Degree Program, the proficiency examination program of the State Education Department has changed in two ways. First, the program has expanded to include both the College Proficiency Examination Program and the Regent's External Degree programs. Also, in addition to the use of letter grades, some examinations are using Pass/Fail Grades or Numerical Standard Scores.

Because of these programmatic changes, the following revisions in present policy are proposed:

College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP) and Regent's External Degree Program (REDP)

Grades of C or higher, or a Pass, or a standard score of 45 or higher earned in a course (except Foreign Language) taken through the College Proficiency Examination Program or the Regent's External Degree Program will be accepted as a passing grade.

In the Foreign Language Examination the following standard scores will be considered passing grades.

Battery A - Language Skills (writing, reading, listening, speaking)

A minimum standard score of 45 on each subtest AND a total standard score of 200 or more for the four subtests combined is required for passing.

Battery B - Minimum passing standard scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilization and Culture</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Preparation</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale:
Regardless of the type of grade used to report performance, the norming population for an examination consists of college students who have completed the college course(s) comparable in content and depth of knowledge to the content of the examination.
There are three types of examinations in which pass/fail grades are used. First, Pass/Fail grades are used when the purpose of the examination is to determine basic competence in a subject area; no attempt is made to differentiate among levels of competence. Examinations which cover subject matter typically taught in a series of college courses rather than in a single one or two semester course, are graded on a Pass/Fail basis. A grade of Pass on this type of examination indicates that the candidate's performance is better than that of 1/3 to 1/2 of the students in the norming group who have successfully completed the series of college courses.

Lastly, a Pass/Fail grading system is also used for examinations which test for knowledge associated with a specified level of achievement in a subject area, such as a major concentration. On this type of examination, a Pass grade indicates demonstrated competence in at least 60% of the content of the examination.

Numerical standard scores are used when the purpose of the examination is to differentiate among many levels of performance. The norming population consists only of those students who have passed the appropriate college course(s). The lowest reported standard score is 20 and the highest reported standard score is 90. The average standard score for the norming population is 50. The minimum passing standard score is 45.

**COLLEGE : LEVEL : EXAMINATION PROGRAM (CLEP)**

The State University Committee on Credits by Examination guarantees that credit be awarded for grades of C or higher received in published examinations, including CLEP Subject Examinations, College Proficiency Examinations, and the Advanced Placement Program. While the CLEP General Examinations are not specifically identified as part of this policy, it is clearly within the spirit and intent of the guidelines to award credit for scores which are at least equivalent to a grade of C.

Thus, to align College at Brockport policy with State University policy, the following revision would be needed.

The college accepts for advanced credit, scores at the twenty-fifth percentile or higher which have been earned in the CLEP General Examinations.

Rationale:
The Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience (CASE) of the American Council on Education recommends that credit be awarded for CLEP General Examination scores at or above the twenty-fifth percentile of the sophomore college-norming group. This group was derived from a representative sample of college sophomores at two-and-four-year colleges in the United States. The sophomores norms were
Further, it is proposed that the following restriction regarding the CLEP General Examinations be deleted.

To be eligible for credit under this program, the tests must be taken prior to matriculation at Brockport.

Rationale:
An exception to this policy has already been authorized for the Mature Adult Program (MAP) students. These students are allowed to take the examinations after matriculation at the college and actually beginning their studies. In the interest of equal opportunity, this option should also be available to all other students enrolled in the traditional four-year degree program.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTERED PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS

The adoption of the Departmental Credit by Examination program supersedes the policy of departmental administered proficiency examinations. Thus, it is recommended that it be deleted from the Undergraduate Academic Policies bulletin. This would in no way preclude the use of tests or auditions at the departmental level to determine appropriate placement in courses based on competency.

DEPARTMENTAL CREDIT BY EXAMINATION

It is recommended that, for clarification purpose, the phrase "only credit earned through" be deleted so that the statement would read:

No credit earned through the Credit by Examination process may be used to fulfill the Senior Residency requirement.
Proposed New Policy
concerning
Credit for non-traditional
educational programs
and
credit for prior experiential learning
Proposal for the award of credit for learning gained through non-traditional educational experiences.

I. Formal Military Training Programs

1. Credit for service training program will be granted in the categories of Technical-Associate Degree (including Lower-Division baccalaureate) and Upper-Division Baccalaureate Degree when such credit is appropriate to meeting degree requirements.

2. The amount of credit awarded will be determined by the recommendation of the Office of Educational Credit of the American Council of Education.

3. Credit for meeting the Communication Arts Core and the Liberal Arts Core and elective requirements will be awarded by the Advisement/Evaluation Office.

4. Major credit will be assigned only upon written approval of the department.

II. United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI)/Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES)

1. Credit will be awarded in appropriate subjects based on the American Council of Education recommendations for the following scores.
   a. USAFI Subject Standardized Tests - Percentile rating of 20 or higher (excludes CLEP Subject Exams)
   b. USAFI End-Of-Course Tests - Rating of either S (Satisfactory) or D (with distinction).
   c. USAFI Subject Examinations - Rating of S (Satisfactory)

2. Credit for meeting the Communication Arts Core and the Liberal Arts Core and elective requirements will be awarded by the Advisement Office based on departmental recommendations.

3. Major credit will be assigned only upon written approval of the department.

III. Educational Programs in Noncollegiate Organizations

1. Credit for educational programs in noncollegiate organizations will be granted based on the recommendation of the Office on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction of the New York State Education Department or American Council on Education credit recommendations.

2. Award of credit for general education and elective credit will be made by the Academic Advisement/Transcript Evaluation Office based on departmental recommendations.

3. Major credit will be assigned upon written approval of the department.

4. Programs for which there are no recommendations will be handled on a portfolio basis.
IV. Experiential Learning

1. Petition by a matriculated student in any undergraduate degree program may be made to receive credit for prior experiential learning.

2. A portfolio documenting the learning outcome(s) shall be submitted for each disciplinary area in which credit is requested. A non-refundable fee of $20 shall be required for each portfolio submitted for evaluation. The fee shall be payable at the time of submission of the portfolio for evaluation.

3. Exceptions to the above will be made for learnings that can be documented by standardized examinations and standardized evaluations such as A Guide to Educational Programs in Noncollegiate Organizations and The Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Forces.

4. Award of credit will be determined by the appropriate department.
The two basic acts of evaluation are description and judgment. Criteria for descriptive data are divided into three categories: antecedent data, transaction data, and outcome data. Antecedent data refers to any condition existing prior to teaching and learning which may relate to outcomes. The status of a student prior to his taking a course, e.g., his aptitude, previous education, and experience, is an important and complex antecedent. Other examples of antecedent conditions are facilities, equipment, and personnel necessary to the teaching of a course. Transaction data include the encounters of student with teacher, student with learning materials and resources, student with student, etc. - all the operations of events that constitute the process of education. Outcome data refer to those abilities, achievements, attitudes, and aspirations of a student resulting from an educational experience. How these three categories are inter-related, and whether the course accomplishes the purpose for which it was designed, are questions for expert judgment by the course evaluators.

**Semester Hour Standard**

Credit recommendations in the Guide are expressed in semester credit hours. In determining semester hour recommendations, American Council evaluators use the following guidelines:

1. One semester credit hour for each fifteen hours of classroom contact plus thirty hours of outside preparation or the equivalent; or

2. One semester credit hour for each thirty hours of laboratory work plus necessary outside preparation or its equivalent, normally expected to be fifteen hours; or

3. One semester credit hour for not less than forty-five hours of shop instruction (contact hours) or the equivalent.

Credit recommendations in the Guide are not derived by a simple arithmetic conversion. Evaluators exercise professional judgment and consider only those portions of a course that can be equated with civilian post-secondary curricula.

**Categories of Credit**

American Council evaluators utilize the following course category definitions in formulating credit recommendations:

1. Vocational-Certificate. - not applicable to this proposal.

2. Technical-Associate Degree (including lower division-baccalaureate). The associate degree category includes only collegiate coursework designed for an occupationally oriented associate degree curriculum but also introductory-level coursework in a university-parallel program transferable to a baccalaureate program.

3. Upper Division-Baccalaureate Degree. Upper division collegiate courses generally encompass specialization that is theoretical or analytical beyond the introductory level. Successful performance by students normally requires prior collegiate study in the area of specialization.

4. Graduate Degree - Not applicable to this proposal.

1. These criteria are based on a model developed by R.E. Stokes, "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation." Teachers College Record 68 (1967): 523-40.
Given the data and credit recommendations provided in the Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services, 1974 edition as the basis upon which further decisions are made concerning award of credit, the following proposal is made.

**Formal Military Training Programs**

1. Credit for service training programs will be granted in the categories of Technical-Associate Degree (including Lower-Division baccalaureate) and Upper-Division Baccalaureate Degree when such credit is appropriate to meeting degree requirements.

2. The amount of credit awarded will be determined by the recommendation of the Office of Educational Credit of the American Council of Education.

3. Credit for meeting the Communication Arts Core and the Liberal Arts Core and elective requirements will be awarded by the Advisement/Evaluation Office.

4. Major credit will be assigned only upon written approval of the department.

United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI)/Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES)

The United States Armed Forces Institute was established in April 1942 to provide opportunities for military personnel to continue their education while on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States. To this end, USAFI has supplied instructional materials, including courses for individual correspondence study and for group class work with examinations to measure student achievement.

In 1958, USAFI undertook an intensive study of its course examination program in cooperation with GHEE and the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Education). It was the purpose of this study to provide procedures to secure the best possible examination for measuring student achievement. As a result of this study, in July 1959 a new test construction program was undertaken at USAFI under procedures approved by the American Council on Education. These new tests were designated the USAFI Subject Standardized Tests (USST). A primary use of the USST is to measure learning acquired through the study of a USAFI college level course undertaken through correspondence, class instruction, or on a self-study basis. The tests also are used in an extensive credit-by-examination program.

USAFI Subject Standardized Tests are constructed through contract with institutions or agencies which have been approved by the American Council on Education. The educational objectives of each test are derived from the textbooks most commonly used in the respective subjects in schools and colleges throughout the country. These textbooks, usually four to six in number, have been selected on the basis of surveys regularly conducted by USAFI as a part of the textbook selection procedure. The final selection of tests for all courses is made with the advice of civilian educators who serve as consultants to USAFI. Instructional materials such as study guides are prepared for USAFI primarily through contracts with civilian educational institutions.
The Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE), now OEC of ACE, is the only agency authorised to recommend the amount of academic credit which may be granted for successful completion of USAFI courses and course tests. The credit recommendations of ACE are based on evaluations made by civilian educators who serve as consultants to the Commission. These recommendations and course outlines are contained in the USAFI Catalog, Sixteenth Edition published in 1972.

Since the disestablishment of the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) in May 1974, arrangements have been made for the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) to administer subject standardized tests to military personnel. During February 1975, the Office on Educational Credit asked subject-matter specialists to review subject standardized tests formerly offered by USAFI. The subject-matter specialists were asked to determine the validity on the tests and, as appropriate, make credit recommendations for use by colleges and universities. On April 1, 1975, credit was recommended for 14 of the subject standardized tests now offered by DANTES. These recommendations by credit category appear in the OEC Newsletter of May 1975. Additional subject standardized tests were scheduled for review in the summer of 1975. The results of these reviews are to be published in the next OEC Newsletter.

Based on this information it is proposed that the following be adopted as policy.

**United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI)/Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES)**

1. Credit will be awarded in appropriate subjects based on the American Council of Education recommendations for the following scores.
   a. USAFI Subject Standardized Tests - Percentile rating of 20 or higher (excludes CLEP Subject Exams)
   b. USAFI End-of-Course Tests - Rating of either S (Satisfactory) or D (with distinction)
   c. USAFI Subject Examinations - Rating of S (Satisfactory)

2. Credit for meeting the Communication Arts Core and the Liberal Arts Core and elective requirements will be awarded by the Advisement Office based on departmental recommendations.

3. Major credit will be assigned only upon written approval of the department.

**Educational Programs of Noncollegiate Institutions**

Many people have completed or are currently enrolled in formal learning activities conducted by business, industry, government, labor unions, police academies, and other agencies whose primary purpose is not education. A large number of these noncollegiate educational programs are of high quality and are comparable in content and level to college coursework. In an effort to relate these learning opportunities to traditional educational systems, the New York State Education Department and the American Council on Education have undertaken a project to develop a system for evaluating the educational programs of a number of these noncollegiate organizations. The purpose of the evaluation system is to establish college-level credit recommendations, where appropriate, for the programs and courses reviewed.
The New York State Education Department's Office of Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction administers the statewide evaluation of noncollegiate educational programs in New York State. Credit recommendations for programs in New York State are published in the Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Programs for Noncollegiate Organizations, December 1974. Some of the educational programs of the following participating organizations in New York State had been evaluated by March of 1975:

- American Institute of Banking - New York City Chapter
- Eastman Kodak
- Fellow Life Management Institute of the Life Office Management Association
- General Electric
- Literary Volunteers of America
- New York-New Jersey Port Authority
- New York City Police Academy
- New York State Police Academy
- New York Telephone Company
- Xerox Corporation

Since the evaluations are conducted on an ongoing basis, courses and educational programs at other organizations will be added continuously.

Each of the above organizations selected specific courses which it wanted to have evaluated. In some instances the courses make up part of an integrated educational program; in other instances they are individual offerings conducted by different units within an organization. In both cases, they are conducted for a specific period of time with a prescribed program of instruction, in a structured learning situation, under the direction of qualified instructors. Also, each course includes appropriate testing or measuring of student performance. All organizations supplied the following information for each specific course evaluated:

1. A syllabus describing objectives and content of the course.
2. Instructional materials used, such as textbooks, audiovisual materials, and case studies.
3. Procedures used for measuring the performance of students in the course, as well as samples of the evaluation instruments.
4. An explanation of criteria and procedures by which instructors were selected.
5. Duration of the course.
6. A description of the record-keeping system for students enrolled.

This material provided sufficient descriptive data to enable a team of consultant evaluators to judge each course in terms of its comparability to college-level programs and, on this basis, to make a credit recommendation.
The evaluators were selected from college and university faculties and from noncollegiate organizations on the basis of their knowledge of the subject matter and level of instruction of the courses to be reviewed. The State Education Department is now making these credit recommendations based on the professional judgment of these evaluators. The credit recommendations also have the endorsement of the Commission on Educational Credit of the American Council on Education.

Also, the American Council on Education is responsible for the evaluation of educational programs of noncollegiate organizations that are nationwide in scope or are located outside New York State. By February, 1975, ACE had evaluated some programs of the U.S. Postal Service and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and other courses will be evaluated in the months to come. Credit recommendations will be made available through the credit advisory service of the ACE's Office on Educational Credit.

Using the State Education Department's Guide to Educational Programs in Noncollegiate Organizations and the American Council of Education's credit recommendations for national programs and those programs located outside New York state as the basis for award of credit, the following is proposed for adoption as policy:

Educational Programs in Noncollegiate Organizations

1. Credit for educational programs in noncollegiate organizations will be granted based on the recommendation of the Office on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction of the New York State Education Department or American Council on Education credit recommendations.

2. Award of credit for general education and elective credit will be made by the Academic Advisement/Transcript Evaluation Office based on departmental recommendations.

3. Major credit will be assigned upon written approval of the department.

4. Programs for which there are no recommendations will be handled on a portfolio basis.
ABSTRACT

The Committee on Credit by Evaluation was created by Vice Chancellor
in 1974 to make recommendations for a consistent approach to the award
of credit by examination throughout the University. Following its delib-
erations during the early months of 1974, the Committee recommends policies
as stated in the following sections.

Educational Policies

Published Examinations. For purposes of providing minimum University-
wide guarantees to all SUNY students, students should be able to apply at
least 30 credit hours earned through published subject examinations, includ-
ing those offered as transfer credit, toward fulfillment of degree require-
ments at any SUNY campus in which they are enrolled. A given campus may
allow additional credit hours through these examinations up to the limit
specified by the residence provision described later in this document.
Campuses will not be expected to count credit hours toward fulfillment of
degree requirements in areas that would normally not receive credit during
an evaluation of transfer credits.

The preceding guarantee of credit for published examinations applies
to the following test series provided the specified minimum performance
levels are met.

A. College-Level Examination Program (Subject Examinations).
   Mean score obtained by persons from the standardization
group who had earned a grade of C in a formal course.

B. College Proficiency Examinations. Performance at a grade
   level of C.

C. Advanced Placement Program. A score of 3 or higher within
   the scale of 5 points used for this program.

Individual campuses may set lower cutoff scores for which local credit
may be awarded through published examinations; however, other SUNY units
will not be required to award transfer credit for scores lower than those
listed in the preceding specifications when published examinations are report-
ed. A campus may award credit for the General Examinations of the College-
level Examination Program but no transfer guarantees will be made to students
for these examinations.

Transfer Policies. All SUNY units must apply the same transfer pol-
ices to credit earned by evaluation that are used to evaluate transfer-
ability of credit earned through standard instructional methods, subject to
the standards for published examinations given previously.

a. No unit shall be required to give credit in subject
   matter that could not normally be transferred from
   other institutions.
b. Credit shall not be excluded from transfer because it was obtained through the evaluation method rather than formal course enrollment.

Residence Requirement. Credit hours earned through a demonstration of proficiency, either through published examinations or through examinations constructed and graded by a campus, may not be counted toward satisfaction of any existing residence requirements. Within this residence restriction, individual campuses may allow as many credits earned through the evaluation mechanism to be applied toward degree requirements as are deemed appropriate by that campus.

Content Restrictions. Where credit through Evaluation is awarded originally in content areas not offered by the campus, the evaluation test or mechanism must be reviewed and approved by an appropriate departmental committee, or in the absence of an appropriate department, by the appropriate campus committee, e.g., an Educational Policies Committee.

Evaluation Mechanisms. For credit earned through evaluation, exclusive of published examinations, the methods of evaluation shall be determined by the faculty assigned responsibility for awarding credit, or by outside consultants whose competences have been reviewed by procedures parallel to those employed by the campus for adjunct faculty.

Administrative Policies

Institutional Affiliation. Although the evaluation of a student's achievement may occur at any time, the student must have a record of progress toward an educational objective at the institution awarding credit prior to placement of credit on a transcript.

Campus Coordination and Information Services. A person or office on each campus shall be designated to coordinate credit by evaluation activities, either through the establishment of a separate examination center or through assignment of such duties to existing personnel. This individual or office shall:

a. insure that students, faculty, and staff are informed fully of the SUNY and campus practices concerning this option;
b. expedite scheduling of evaluation activities;
c. provide staff functions for campus groups concerned with credit by evaluation policies and procedures;
d. serve as an information channel between the campus and other units and agencies; and
e. insure that accurate records are maintained on use of the option.

Fiscal and Reporting Procedures. Reporting and budgetary procedures will be constructed to encourage development of the option at SUNY campuses. At the same time, standard policies are required to insure equal treatment of students within the system.

a. Credit by evaluation procedures are appropriate when students are not registered formally for the specific courses in question. When evaluation procedures have been devised by faculty at a given campus, students
will be assessed a fee according to guidelines developed by SUNY Central Administration. These guidelines will contain waiver provisions to avoid discrimination against the economically disadvantaged and will provide adequate controls to insure fiscal responsibility. Each campus may determine whether to follow one of the two procedures for its reporting and fiscal practices.

1. The campus may elect to operate on a system in which income derived from fees is used to pay costs associated with the program. Extra service payments to faculty members, who construct and evaluate unpublished examinations or participate in evaluation activities, will be made within those limitations provided by existing university guidelines on extra service. Under these conditions, the campus will receive no credit on enrollment reports or workload analyses for credit by evaluation activity.

2. Alternatively, a campus may elect to forfeit the income generated by fees, and report assigned credit hours through the official SUNY Enrollment Reports and the Course and Section Analysis Report. The credit hours attempted will be reported at .25 of the value to be entered on the student’s transcript, and will be counted as part of the campus FTE enrollment.

Following the selection of an initial option, the campus may change the basis for its administration of the credit by evaluation program only with the consent of the Office of Academic Programs of SUNY Central Administration.

b. The results of published examinations will be treated in the same administrative manner as transfer credit, i.e., no additional fees, other than those imposed by the examination publisher, will be charged to the student and no campus FTE credit will be reported.

c. These policies shall not preclude academic departments and faculty from providing additional examination or evaluation services to students already enrolled in courses in which such services appear appropriate. This latter process is regarded as a course challenge, as opposed to credit by evaluation, and will continue to be reported by the campus as formal course enrollment.
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

REPORT OF CREDIT BY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Committee Charge and Activities

The Committee on Credit by Evaluation was established by Vice Chancellor Deering in December, 1973 with the following objectives:

"The Committee is asked to work toward a consistent approach to the award of credit by examination which could be adopted as a policy throughout the University. The Committee should concern itself with all methods of credit by examination that come to its attention including College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) tests, College Proficiency Exams (CPE), Advanced Placement (AP) courses, and individually designed examinations for course challenge. The Committee is asked to review present policies and practices, identify issues of concern for the State University - including implications of credit by examination for the Trustees' transfer policy - and recommend policy alternatives to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs. The Committee report is requested by April 1, 1974."

After consideration of its charge, the Committee concluded that the terminology "credit by examination" should be changed to "credit by evaluation of prior learning." The latter terminology indicates that the type of credit under consideration can be assessed through a variety of methods, e.g., examinations, auditions, projects, or other demonstrations of proficiency. Throughout this paper, therefore, the phrase "credit by evaluation" is used to denote a range of activities broader than those implied by the original Committee charge.

The Committee has met in formal session on three occasions, and has conducted additional business through telephone conferences among its members. The Committee has had the benefit of consultation with additional resource persons, i.e., representatives from SUNY Central Administration and the College Entrance Examination Board.

The Committee has attempted to establish liaison with other interested parties within SUNY. The Chairman of the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Program Committee has assumed a liaison role with the Undergraduate Program Committee to avoid a duplication of effort between the two committees. Although the Student Assembly of the State University did not accept an invitation to select a student representative to the Committee, informal consultation has been obtained from students through various members of the Committee.

Background

Trends in Credit by Evaluation

Information available to the Committee indicates that the amount of credit obtained in this fashion in SUNY institutions, and across the country,
is relatively small at the present time. For example, at one SUNY University Center with a rather well-developed program, the credit hours awarded during 1972-73 comprised less than .5% of the total credit hours generated by the campus. On the other hand, one of the committee members conducted an inventory of his campus and found that credit hours in excess of 2% of reported campus credit hours had been awarded informally without being reported. On a national basis, the College-Level Examination Program administered by Educational Testing Service has shown a rise in participation from 6,575 subject examinations administered in 1971-72 to 31,073 for 1972-73.

The increased volume in credit by examination activity appears to be associated with a number of movements occurring in American higher education and can be expected to increase in the coming years. In the first place, many educational institutions are serving increased numbers of adults who are entering colleges and universities for continuing education, or who are initiating collegiate studies for the first time. Although Empire State College has created programs within the State University which attract a large number of such persons, nearly all SUNY institutions are observing increases in the number of mature students coming to college with proficiencies obtained outside the formal classroom situation. Additionally, the number of high school students with secondary school experiences which overlap introductory college courses has increased during the past few years. Beyond this, institutions with formal programs have discovered that students use the credit by examination option for a variety of reasons when made available to them. These include:

1. to reduce the time required for a baccalaureate degree to three or three and one-half years;
2. to regain advanced status following the loss of credits through transfer from another institution;
3. to lighten course loads while maintaining normal degree progress;
4. to advance through a major sequence when a required course has not been offered;
5. to graduate at the scheduled time following misunderstandings about completed requirements;
6. to take a semester away from campus without affecting degree progress;
7. to adapt a method of study to individual preferences;
8. to avoid a repetition of content already mastered.

Although the relative proportion of student credit hours earned through the evaluation process can be expected to remain small, there is some basis for assuming that use of the option will continue to increase in the coming years, and that its availability will be useful for a number of college students.

General Issues

The Committee discussed several issues related indirectly to academic practices. Since these issues tend to arise in the course of any
discussion of academic policies related to credit through evaluation, they are enumerated in this section prior to the presentation of academic concerns addressed by the Committee.

1. The extent to which SUNY institutions should assume a certification role in the absence of instruction was a recurrent topic in the Committee's deliberations. Ultimately, the Committee noted that, although the University's primary function should be the provision of instruction, certification of academic competence has been identified traditionally with organized faculties in American higher education. Consequently, the Committee assumed that the University would continue to play a major role in academic certification even when such certification occurred in the absence of instruction provided through the University.

2. The often conflicting concerns for campus autonomy and SUNY coordination were consistent themes underlying the Committee's deliberations. The recommendations in this report represent an attempt to maintain some balance between these concerns, providing SUNY-wide guarantees to students in some areas and campus options in others. Thus, the approach has been to establish minimum guarantees to students, and to encourage individual campuses to expand opportunities for credit obtained through the evaluation mechanism and to design practices related to specific campus needs.

3. The resource implications for the expanded use of the credit by evaluation method were considered in detail. The Committee has taken the position that the availability of this student option is contingent upon the University's ability to maintain viable educational institutions throughout the State. Therefore, administrative practices must be designed that will not have detrimental effects on the operating budgets of the State University or its individual institutions. Since the full-time equivalent student workload is used presently for budgetary deliberations, the Committee believes that workload created by this option must be equated to this measure and funded appropriately. At the same time, the Committee recognizes a possible salutary effect since provision of these opportunities may increase the demand for education among new student populations who might otherwise regard higher education as unaffordable. The Committee's recommendations are intended to encourage the expanded use of this option while insuring that appropriate budgetary support is maintained for institutions.

Academic Considerations

Although Committee members retain some concerns that the Credit by Evaluation option contains academic liabilities as well as assets, the Committee agreed unanimously that students should not be required to repeat instruction for material already mastered. Such repetition is considered uneconomical of student and faculty effort, and appears to be unsound pedagogically. Credit by Evaluation offers one alternative mechanism for avoiding such repetition.

Extensive use of the Credit by Evaluation option would result in some changes to the definition of undergraduate and graduate degrees as perceived in American higher education. For example, the baccalaureate degree presently signifies that the individual has not only attained mastery
In a somewhat prescribed distribution of courses; receipt of the degree also implies that the individual has spent nearly four years in formal educational experiences beyond the high school diploma. Unfortunately, no single statement would be adequate to describe the value of these structured experiences when contrasted with the value of other experiences which might lead to credit obtained through an alternative process. At one extreme, the Committee was unanimous in its opinion that a facile 19- or 20-year-old student should not be awarded a degree for being able to cram for a series of examinations. On the other hand, it is probably safe to assume that an individual who has gone through the process of mastering subject matter by using a variety of existing community resources has had a more relevant educational experience than the student who has attended a secession of lectures in a given subject. The Committee's recommendations ultimately assume that the Credit by Evaluation mechanism can reflect legitimate academic experiences when combined with instruction of a more traditional form. The Committee recognizes that there may be occasions in which a student is able to obtain credit with a superficial knowledge of the subject matter, but does not regard this risk to be any greater in a Credit by Evaluation context than in some standard instructional situations.

Related to the preceding discussion on the value of formal instructional experiences, the Committee recommendations use the mechanism of the residence requirement to define the upper limits to Credit by Evaluation that a given institution may honor. Within this approach, individual institutions would be able to impose additional restrictions on the number of credit hours allowed through this option provided such restrictions do not exceed some minimum established to provide SUNY-wide guarantees to its students.

The validity of the evaluation procedures frequently associated with Credit by Examination, e.g., multiple choice examinations, was the subject of considerable Committee discussion. Since multiple choice examinations are employed widely as the only means of evaluation in many college and university courses, and since a variety of evaluation procedures are possible in both standard and Credit by Evaluation contexts, the Committee formulated its recommendations without reference to the form of evaluation.

Additional Committee concern centered about the relative retention of learning through formal instruction and Credit by Evaluation. In the last analysis, it was felt that the question of retention, as well as that of which method constituted the better preparation for additional study, could be resolved only through empirical means. Consequently, the Committee's recommendations include a call for the introduction of evaluation and research activities associated with learning format.

A number of academic issues were considered to be matters that could be resolved appropriately only at the specific campuses. Among these is the question of whether or not a student should be allowed to attempt Credit by Evaluation following a prior failure in formal course enrollment. A related question about the number of times that the student might attempt to obtain credit for a given course was also considered a matter of individual campus determination. Due to the variety of grading systems in operation within the SUNY system, no recommendations are made in this report about the recording of letter grades obtained through proficiency demonstra-
tion. Beyond the specification of some minimum guarantee to students, the Committee also has not made recommendations concerning courses that a given campus may determine are to be excluded from this option. After considering the potential assets and liabilities of the Credit by Evaluation mechanism, the Committee encourages individual campuses to make every effort to create policies in which maximum utilization of the option is possible for its students.

Conclusions

After considering the various issues involved, the Committee has concluded that the Credit through Evaluation mechanism is of sufficient academic value, and of sufficient potential usefulness to students, that its availability should be expanded within the State University of New York.

At the same time that the Committee encourages expansion of Credit by Evaluation opportunities, the Committee believes that SUNY-wide policies will be necessary to protect students and to maintain the academic integrity of the State University of New York.

As in many areas of academic policy, the Committee believes that additional information must be available before any set of policies can be established with the confidence that such policies are consistent with the objectives of the University. Therefore, the following policy recommendations are accompanied by a call for additional research activity on the implications of increased utilization of the Credit by Evaluation option.

Recommendations

Educational Policies

Published Examinations. For purposes of providing minimum University-wide guarantees to all SUNY students, students should be able to apply at least 30 credit hours earned through published subject examinations, including those offered as transfer credit, toward fulfillment of degree requirements at any SUNY campus in which they are enrolled. A given campus may allow additional credit hours through these examinations up to the limit specified by the residence provision described later in this document. Campuses will not be expected to count credit hours toward fulfillment of degree requirements in areas that would normally not receive credit during an evaluation of transfer credits.

The preceding guarantee of credit for published examinations applies to the following test series provided the specified minimum performance levels are met:

A. College Level Examination Program (Subject Examinations). Mean score obtained by persons from the standardization group who had earned a grade of C in a formal course.

B. College Proficiency Examinations. Performance at a grade level of C.

C. Advanced Placement Program. A score of 3 or higher within the scale of 5 points used for this program.
Individual campuses may set lower cutoff scores for which local credit may be awarded through published examinations; however, other SUNY units will not be required to award transfer credit for scores lower than those listed in the preceding specifications when published examinations are reported. A campus may award credit for the College Level Examination Program but no transfer guarantees will be made to students for these examinations.

Rationale:

The purpose of the preceding policy is not to restrict the number of credit hours awarded through the Credit by Evaluation procedure. In fact, SUNY campuses are encouraged to allow more than the 30 hours of credit earned through published examinations to be applied toward fulfillment of degree requirements. The intent of this policy is to establish a guarantee to students on a SUNY-wide basis that a minimum of 30 credit hours earned through subject examinations will be honored by all campuses. The minimum performance levels specified tend to be employed frequently when such credits are honored by colleges. This guarantee may be important particularly for transfer students who presently encounter differing policies within the State University units. It is felt that such policies can be applied to the preceding examinations due to the fact that their uniformity allows a more systematic evaluation than is possible in the formal course enrollment context. This policy assumes that information concerning performance levels attained in credit by examination will be forwarded to schools to which students transfer.

Transfer Policies. All SUNY units must apply the same transfer policies to credit earned by evaluation that are used to evaluate transferability of credit earned through standard instructional methods, subject to the standards for published examinations given previously.

a. No unit shall be required to give credit in subject matter that could not normally be transferred from other institutions.

b. Credit shall not be excluded from transfer because it was obtained through the evaluation method rather than formal course enrollment.

Rationale:

The credit that a transfer student attempts to apply from a prior institution is evaluated with the understanding that the faculty of the prior institution has certified its educational value. Since this condition is also true in the Credit by Evaluation situation, such credit should be evaluated for transfer purposes in the same manner that credits are evaluated for formal course enrollment. However, under no circumstances should the campus evaluating transfer credit be required to honor credit obtained through evaluation in subject areas that would not be transferred for normal course enrollment.
Residence Requirement. Credit hours earned through a demonstration of proficiency, either through published examinations or through examinations constructed and graded by a campus, may not be counted toward satisfaction of any existing residence requirements. Within this residence restriction, individual campuses may allow as many credits earned through the evaluation mechanism to be applied toward degree requirements as are deemed appropriate by that campus.

Rationale:

This policy addresses the question of the maximum number of credit hours to be allowed for the credit by evaluation option. The residence requirement is used in most institutions to ensure that the student receiving a degree has participated in some minimum amount of formal instruction at the institution awarding the degree. Although the intent of these policies is to allow for a liberal use of credit by evaluation, the fulfillment of residence requirements in this manner would be clearly incongruous.

Within the restrictions implied for the maximum number of credits allowed and the minimum restrictions implied by the preceding 30-hour statement on published examinations, and by the transfer policy stated, SUNY campuses should be free to determine the number of credits to be allowed through the Credit by Evaluation mechanism.

Content Restrictions. Where credit through evaluation is awarded originally in content areas not offered by the campus, the evaluation test or mechanism must be reviewed and approved by an appropriate departmental committee, or in the absence of an appropriate department, by the appropriate campus committee, e.g., an Educational Policies Committee.

Rationale:

This policy is intended to apply to the institution in which the individual is initially granted credit, and is superseded by the prior statement on transfer when credit is applied following the transfer process. The intent is to follow the same procedures that are employed when nonstandard, or experimental, courses are approved for formal enrollment at a given campus. It is felt that a review mechanism involving an institution's faculty is required when credit is given in areas not formally approved on a continuing basis by the appropriate campus legislative body.

Evaluation Mechanisms. For credit earned through evaluation, exclusive of published examinations, the methods of evaluation shall be determined by the faculty assigned responsibility for awarding credit, or by outside consultants whose competences have been reviewed by procedures parallel to those employed by the campus for adjunct faculty.
Rationale:

A variety of evaluation methods may be appropriate beyond structured examinations, e.g., review of portfolios, term papers, auditions. The specific evaluation methods should be the prerogative of the instructor, or other person who assumes responsibility for certifying competence, just as the responsible faculty are given this prerogative for formal course enrollment. If outside persons are given this responsibility, their credentials should be reviewed in some systematic manner.

Administrative Policies

Institutional Affiliation. Although the evaluation of a student's achievement may occur at any time, the student must have a record of progress toward an educational objective at the institution awarding credit prior to placement of credit on a transcript.

Rationale:

The University should remain primarily an institution in which instruction is provided. Therefore, a transcript should be developed only for students participating in its instructional program. Any additional qualifications related to grade point average, etc., would appear to be appropriately within the domain of the individual campus.

Campus Coordination and Information Services. A person or office on each campus shall be designated to coordinate credit by evaluation activities, either through the establishment of a separate examination center or through assignment of such duties to existing personnel. This individual or office shall:

a. insure that students, faculty, and staff are informed fully of the SUNY and campus practices concerning this option;
b. expedite scheduling of evaluation activities;
c. provide staff functions for campus groups concerned with credit by evaluation policies and procedures;
d. serve as an information channel between the campus and other units and agencies; and
e. insure that accurate records are maintained on use of the option.

Rationale:

Experience on at least one SUNY campus has indicated that the establishment of routine procedures in a central campus office can provide stimulus to use of the option. Further, if careful study of the academic implications of this option are to be made, increased efforts must be devoted to maintaining accurate records. Considerable difficulty has been encountered in evaluating the option due to the fact that much credit by evaluation activity
occurs informally, and is not recorded even at a campus or academic department level.

Fiscal and Reporting Procedures. Reporting and budgetary procedures will be constructed to encourage development of the option at SUNY campuses. At the same time, standard policies are required to insure equal treatment of students within the system.

a. Credit by evaluation procedures are appropriate when students are not registered formally for the specific courses in question. When evaluation procedures have been devised by faculty at a given campus, students will be assessed a fee according to guidelines developed by SUNY Central Administration. These guidelines will contain waiver provisions to avoid discrimination against the economically disadvantaged and will provide adequate controls to insure fiscal responsibility. Each campus may determine whether to follow one of two procedures for its reporting and fiscal practices.

1. The campus may elect to operate on a system in which income derived from fees is used to pay costs associated with the program. Extra service payments to faculty members, who construct and evaluate nonpublished examinations or participate in evaluation activities, will be made within those limitations provided by existing university guidelines on extra service. Under these conditions, the campus will receive no credit on enrollment reports or workload analyses for credit by evaluation activity.

2. Alternatively, a campus may elect to forfeit the income generated by fees, and report assigned credit hours through the official SUNY Enrollment Reports and the Course and Section Analysis Report. The credit hours attempted will be reported at .25 of the value to be entered on the student's transcript, and will be counted as part of the campus FTE enrollment.

Following the selection of an initial option, the campus may change the basis for its administration of the credit by evaluation program only with the consent of the Office of Academic Programs of SUNY Central Administration.

b. The results of published examinations will be treated in the same administrative manner as transfer credit, i.e., no additional fees, other than those imposed by the examination publisher, will be charged to the student and no campus FTE credit will be reported.
c. These policies shall not preclude academic departments and faculty from providing additional examination or evaluation services to students already enrolled in courses in which such services appear appropriate. This latter process is regarded as a course challenge, as opposed to credit by evaluation, and will continue to be reported by the campus as formal course enrollment.

Rationale:

The alternative means of reporting and financing credit by evaluation activity have been devised to encourage the availability of the option at campuses with differing enrollment and financial circumstances. The FTE credit mechanism is considered important for some campuses in which the credit by evaluation option has the potential for understating the financial base of the institution. For those campuses experiencing enrollment pressures, however, the provision of FTE credit for evaluation activity would provide little incentive for its development. In any event, given standard fee guidelines, these policies provide equal treatment for students across the SUNY system.

SUNY Information Services. The SUNY Central Administration will publish at regular intervals a bulletin containing information obtained from campuses concerning the credit by evaluation policies and practices for each SUNY institution. The bulletin will provide students with information concerning the fee structures employed and financial aid practices of SUNY for the Credit by Evaluation option. This bulletin will also contain information concerning published examinations (1) not accepted for degree credit, (2) not appropriate for specialization requirements, or (3) not appropriate as prerequisites for advanced courses within a given campus program.

The Committee urges SUNY Central Administration to devise methods by which Credit by Evaluation activities can be reviewed and evaluated by its constituencies. Longitudinal information on later performance, potential demand for the option, and study of the fiscal implications for the University are considered of great importance.
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