

PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSFER TO TRADITIONAL OPTIONS

Purpose:

This resource is designed to help institutional teams develop a redirection policy that is non-punitive. The table below includes potential situations that learners leaving a CBE program might experience and explains the pros and cons of different redirection policies.

Learner's Situation	Description of Policy Solution	Pros	Cons
<p>Learner demonstrated mastery for a competency that has a for-credit course equivalency of same size (i.e., 1 Competency = 1 Credit).</p>	<p>Learners automatically receive credit for the course equivalency and do not need to take any action.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes student burdens • Ideal alignment between CBE and for-credit courses • May be easier to track for financial aid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most courses aren't modularized in 1 credit segments making this a less likely situation • Could incentivize colleges to make decisions about the size of competencies based on their potential for credit equivalency rather than academic needs • Could require a lot of curriculum work to create aligned credit courses to single competencies

Learner's Situation	Description of Policy Solution	Pros	Cons
<p>Learner demonstrated mastery of a competency that is part but not all of a for-credit course equivalency</p> <p>(e.g., 1 Competency = .5 Credit).</p>	<p>For-credit courses are modularized so a learner can receive partial credit and only completes (and pays for) the modules not yet attempted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learner doesn't need to repeat course requirements and does not lose a learning opportunity • A larger population of students benefits from the flexibility of modularized courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May need to offer the option to complete modularized for-credit course to all learners per <i>California Code of Regulations, Title 5 regulations, § 58161 - Apportionment for Course Enrollment</i> • Resources would need to be allocated to support course modularization • Difficult when competencies are integrated into one learning cycle
<p>Learner demonstrated mastery of a competency that is part but not all of a for-credit course equivalency</p> <p>(e.g., 1 Competency = .5 Credit).</p>	<p>The college reviews progress against all of the competencies that equate to one course. The Learner earns an "A" for mastered competencies and an "F" for non-mastered competencies. If the sum of the whole exceeds the threshold for passing (C grade), then the learner passes the traditional course.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might be easier to explain to faculty and staff than other approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be unfair to students because this approach assumes would have failed the untaken portion and does not provide an alternative opportunity for them to show they could master that content • Institutions that utilize Mastery (B) and M+ (A) grades could have more challenges implementing

Learner's Situation	Description of Policy Solution	Pros	Cons
<p>Learner demonstrated mastery of a competency that is part but not all of a for-credit course equivalency (e.g., 1 Competency = .5 Credit).</p>	<p>The learner earns an “Incomplete” or “In Progress” grade in for-credit course equivalency and must work with faculty to complete the remainder of the for-credit course as independent study.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works within existing faculty models and aligns with traditional incomplete/in-progress policies • Faculty are able to provide individual support to students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would preclude student from enrolling in an actual course and could create issues with faculty compensation/load • Independent study and incompletes are often not completed • Require significant manual tracking at a granular level of the student's position in the learning