

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

**VIRTUAL MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, January 31, 2023
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 p.m.**

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) will meet virtually via Zoom. You can listen to the meeting at the Board offices, located at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas 66612. Meeting information will be sent to participants via email, or you may contact arobinson@ksbor.org.

- I. Call to Order** Regent Kiblinger, Chair
 - A. Roll Call and Introductions
 - B. Approve minutes from January 18, 2023 p. 3

- II. Consent Agenda**
 - A. Credit by Exam Policy Revision Tara Lebar p. 5

- III. Other Matters**
 - A. Concurrent Enrollment Cost Model Presentation Heather Rinkenbaugh, Butler CC p. 7
 - B. Strategic Plan Pillar One Dashboard Update Regent Lane
 - C. Background on Program Review Sam Christy-Dangermond p. 13
 - D. Systemwide General Education Implementation Update Daniel Archer p. 16

- IV. Suggested Agenda Items for February 15th Meeting**
 - A. KU Request for an Exception to Baccalaureate Degree Policy Definition
 - B. Receive Apply KS Annual Report
 - C. Math Pathways Update
 - D. Act on Strategic Plan Pillar One Dashboard Foundational Indicators

- V. Adjournment**

BOARD ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

Four Regents serve on the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC), established in 2002. The Regents are appointed annually by the Chair and approved by the Board. BAASC meets virtually approximately two weeks prior to each Board meeting. The Committee also meets the morning of the first day of the monthly Board meeting. Membership includes:

Shelly Kiblinger, Chair

Cynthia Lane

Blake Benson

Diana Mendoza

**Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee
AY 2023 Meeting Schedule**

<i>BAASC Academic Year 2022- 2023 Meeting Dates</i>			
Meeting Dates	Location	Time	Agenda Materials Due
August 30, 2022	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	August 9, 2022
September 14, 2022	Topeka	10:30 a.m.	August 24, 2022
October 4, 2022	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	September 13, 2022
November 1, 2022	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	October 11, 2022
November 16, 2022	Kansas State University	11:00 a.m.	October 26, 2022
November 29, 2022	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	November 8, 2022
December 14, 2022	Topeka	10:30 a.m.	November 23, 2022
January 3, 2023	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	December 13, 2022
January 18, 2023	Topeka	11:00 a.m.	December 28, 2022
January 31, 2023	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	January 10, 2023
February 15, 2023	Topeka	11:00 a.m.	January 25, 2023
February 28, 2023	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	February 7, 2023
March 22, 2023	Topeka	11:00 a.m.	March 1, 2023
April 4, 2023	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	March 14, 2023
April 19, 2023	Pittsburg State University	11:00 a.m.	March 29, 2023
May 2, 2023	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	April 11, 2023
May 17, 2023	Topeka	11:00 a.m.	April 26, 2023
May 30, 2023	Virtual Meeting	9:00 a.m.	May 9, 2023
June 14, 2023	Topeka	11:00 a.m.	May 24, 2023

*Please note virtual meeting times are 9 a.m., and Board day meetings are 11 a.m. unless otherwise noted.

**Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee
MINUTES**

Wednesday, January 18, 2023

The January 18, 2023, meeting of the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Regent Kiblinger at 10:30 a.m. The meeting was held at the board office, with a virtual option through Zoom.

In Attendance:

Members:	Regent Kiblinger Regent Benson	Regent Mendoza	Regent Lane
Staff:	Daniel Archer Karla Wiscombe Charmine Chambers Gage Rohlf	Amy Robinson Tara Lebar Scott Smathers Judd McCormack	Sam Christy-Dangermond April Henry Cindy Farrier Marti Leisinger
Others:	Adam Borth, Fort Scott CC Clay Stoldt, WSU Elaine Simmons, Barton CC Howard Smith, PSU Jean Redeker, KU Jim Truelove, PSU Jay Henderson, WSU Karen Johnson, PSU Luke Dowell, SCCC Mike Walker, FHSU Rebecca Bilderback, Allen CC Ryan Stanley, FHSU Brad Bennett, SCCC Susan Castro, WSU	Andy Howe, K-State Aron Potter, Coffeyville CC Cherry Steffen, Washburn Heather Morgan, KACCT Jennifer Callis, SATC Jill Arensdorf, FSHU John Kirk, WSU Linnea GlenMaye, WSU Michelle Schoon, Cowley CC Marc Malone, Garden City CC Rick Ginsberg, KU Shirley Lefever, WSU Greg Nichols, SATC	Chuck Taber, K-State Ashlie Jack, WSU Cindy Hoss, Hutchinson CC Jason Sharp, Labette CC Jenn Roberts, KU Joan Brewer, ESU JoLanna Kord, ESU Laura Stevenson, Washburn Monette DePew, Pratt CC Paul Adams, FHSU Robert Klein, KUMC Tanya Gonzalez, K-State Taylor Crawshaw, Independence CC Jane Holwerda, Dodge City CC

Roll call was taken for members and presenters.

Approval of Minutes

Regent Benson moved to approve January 3, 2023, meeting minutes, and Regent Mendoza seconded the motion. With no corrections, the motion passed.

Discussion Agenda

- Scott Smathers, KBOR Vice President of Workforce Development, provided updates to the Off-Campus Delivery of Academic Courses and Programs policy. Board staff recommended in Chapter III. Section A.8.f.i that a reference to K.S.A. 74-32, 433 be added, and in Chapter III. Section A.8.f. ii (5) and (6) “no later than 30 days prior to the course(s) starting” be added. This will provide clarity and allow institutions and board staff to have sufficient time to react to outside-of-service area program requests.

The board policy manual can be found at https://www.kansasregents.org/about/policies-by-laws-missions/board_policy_manual_2.

Regent Lane moved to place the recommended changes on the Board discussion agenda for final approval, and Regent Benson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- Dr. Rick Ginsberg, Dean of the School of Education at KU, presented a final Educator Work Force Task Force report. Dr. Ginsberg discussed three areas of recommendations: 1) priorities for KBOR and Regents institutions to pursue to address workforce issues; 2) priority for addressing Kansas student performance; and 3) other teaching workforce recommendations such as collaborations, developing tiered-work force options for educators, and strengthening teacher base pay. With approval, the report will go to the full Board later in the same day.

Regent Lane moved to place the Educator Work Force Task Force final report on the Board discussion agenda for final approval and that they task President Flanders to help prioritize immediate implementation and assign KBOR staff. Regent Mendoza seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Systemwide General Education Update

Daniel Archer provided a Systemwide General Education Implementation update. A timeline has been created and will soon be sent out. Regent Kiblinger noted she would like BAASC to continue staying involved in the project with future updates.

Adjournment

The next BAASC meeting is scheduled for January 31, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.

Regent Benson moved to adjourn the meeting, and Regent Mendoza seconded. With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.

1. Act on Proposed Revisions to the Credit by Exam Policy

**Tara Lebar,
Associate Director,
Academic Affairs**

- *Affordability – On Time Graduation*

Summary and Staff Recommendation

The Board's policy on Credit by Examination requires state universities to adopt uniform cut scores for awarding credit to students for earning acceptable scores on standardized exams. Current policy includes Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Programs (CLEP) exams, and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams. The proposed policy revision seeks to include standardized cut scores for Cambridge International (CI) exams as well. Staff recommends approval.

Background

In December of 2016, the Board approved a policy requiring state universities to adopt standardized cut scores for awarding credit on AP and CLEP exams. The policy requires each state university to award credit for equivalent courses for all AP examination scores of three (3) and above and all CLEP examination scores of 50 and above. In 2019, the Board added International Baccalaureate (IB) exams to that policy by adopting a policy that awards credit at a standardized cut score of four (4) and above. The Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Task Force recommends the following policy addition: a standard cut score of E and above for Cambridge International (CI) Advanced Level (A Levels) exams or Advanced Subsidiary Level (AS Levels) exams when evaluated for the equivalent course or courses at their institution.

Membership on the CPL Task Force consists of representation from each university, as well as representation from the community college and technical college sectors. Their responsibility is delegated in Board policy to provide oversight of standardized recognition of credit for prior learning and to implement the Kansas Credit for Prior Learning Guidelines as approved by the Board.

Cambridge International Advanced Levels (A Levels) and Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Levels (AS Levels) are subject-based qualifications usually taken in the final two years of high school. Over 50 subjects are available with scores ranging from A* (highest) to U (lowest) on A Levels and a (highest) to u (lowest) on AS Levels. Cambridge International AS Level is typically a one-year program of study, while Cambridge International A Level typically takes two years. Assessment takes place at the end of each program, and schools have the freedom to offer a wide variety of subjects in almost any combination. The CPL Task Force conducted research regarding the interpretation of CI exam scores, practices and policies, and current practices for awarding credit for CI exams at their respective institutions. The Task Force concluded that consistent cut scores and transparency could attract international students and an increasing number of domestic students taking these exams to consider Kansas for higher education.

Staff Recommendation

The proposed policy change would require state universities to adopt standardized cut scores for awarding credit for Cambridge International A Level exam scores of E and above and Cambridge International AS Levels e and above when evaluated for equivalent courses. Staff recommends approval.

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE¹ – STATE UNIVERSITIES

A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (see Chapter III., Section A. for additional academic affairs policies applicable to

¹ See Chapter I., Section A.3. for definition of Governance.

state universities)

...

3. CREDIT BY EXAMINATION

- a. Credit awarded by any state university in conformity with this policy shall be accepted by all other state universities.
- b. Except for exams with alternative scores set under paragraph c, each state university shall award:
 - i. Credit for all Advanced Placement (AP) examination scores of three (3) or above for the equivalent course or courses at their institution.
 - ii. Credit for all College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) examination scores at or above the American Council of Education's (ACE) credit-granting recommended score of 50 for the equivalent course or courses at their institution.
 - iii. Credit for all International Baccalaureate (IB) examination scores of four (4) or above on Higher Level (HL) exams and Standard Level (SL) exams for the equivalent course or courses at their institutions.
 - iv. Credit for all Cambridge International (CI) examination scores of E or above on Advanced Levels (A Levels) exams and e or above on Advanced Subsidiary Level (AS Levels) exams when evaluated for the equivalent course or courses at their institution.
- c. Any academic discipline may establish a higher systemwide AP exam score above three (3), ~~and~~ IB exam scores above four (4), and scores above E and e for CI, using the process for establishing a higher systemwide score proposed by the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents and approved by the Council of Chief Academic Officers on May 18, 2016 and amended by the Council of Chief Academic Officers on February 20, 2019. Any academic discipline may review and change a higher systemwide AP exam score above (3), ~~and~~ a higher systemwide IB exam score above (4), and higher systemwide CI exam scores above E and e using the process for reviewing and changing system-wide scores proposed by the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents and approved by the Council of Chief Academic Officers on January 17, 2018 and amended by the Council of Chief Academic Officers on February 20, 2019.
- d. All other Kansas public postsecondary educational institutions are encouraged to adopt this state university policy.
- e. Institutions shall have discretion on awarding additional credit for scores above three (3) on AP exams, ~~and~~ above four (4) on Higher Level or Standard Level IB exams, above E and e on CI exams, and scores above the ACE credit-granting recommended score of 50 for CLEP exams.



CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT



BUTLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

www.butlercc.edu/highschool

HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

1,693

Students

18,575

Credit Hours

508

CEP Students

1,403

Dual Enrollment
Students

311

Excel in CTE
Students

AY22 KHEStats (KBOR)



BUTLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Butler enrolls over 1,500 students each semester through the H+ program. These students participate in classes at their high school, on our campuses, and online.

DUAL ENROLLMENT OPTIONS



BUTLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE



www.butlercc.edu/highschool

Creating **ACCESS**

Butler offers select courses tuition free to high school students who are residents of the state of Kansas.



GENERAL EDUCATION



EXCEL IN CTE

www.butlercc.edu/highschool

PARTNERSHIP SERVICES

Butler's high school teams work closely with our high school partners to create opportunities for high school students to get a jump start on their college education.

INFORMATION SESSIONS

PLACEMENT TESTING

ENROLLMENT SERVICES

STUDENT SUPPORT

TRAINING FOR PARTNERS

CREDENTIALLED FACULTY

Thank you
QUESTIONS?



hrintenb@butlercc.edu

www.butlercc.edu/highschool

Summary

Board policy requires that “In cooperation with the universities, the Board will maintain a program review cycle and a review process that will allow the universities to demonstrate that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission.” These reviews are “institutionally based and follow the departmental or unit structure of the institution.” (Policy and Procedures Manual, Chapter II Section A.5.a.) This paper provides an overview of the program review process as requested by the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee. Additionally, copies of individual campus reports submitted to the Board office last year are available at http://www.kansasregents.org/academic_affairs/618-program-review-reports. This paper also provides a brief background on the addition of Strategic Program Alignment to the program review policy and a history of the associated activities over the past few years.

January 31, 2023

I. Background

Per Board policy, Ch. II Section A.5.a.,

In cooperation with the state universities, the Board will maintain a regular program review cycle and process that will allow the universities to demonstrate on an ongoing basis that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall provide guidelines for Program Review and, as part of the review of institutional reports, will include consideration of the Board-approved minima tables.

Per the guidelines provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, each university must submit a Program Review report consisting of four major components: 1) an institutional overview of the academic program review process; 2) a summary assessment and recommendation for each program reviewed (including a summary table for quick reference); 3) a brief estimate of the fiscal implications of any recommended program changes; and 4) a follow-up summary on concerns raised in previous years. Further, institutions are required to submit information to the Kansas Higher Education Data System (KHEDS) as a part of program review. The four components vary in structure and content among the universities.

II. The Academic Program Review Process

State universities are required to review programs at least once every eight years, a frequency that was established by the Board in 1997. It is important to note universities are not required to review programs every year of the eight-year cycle, but the institutions must review all programs within that timeframe. As appropriate, universities establish their review schedules, and those have generally aligned with accreditation reporting requirements and site visits.

A. Criteria

Per the established guidelines, also dating back to 1997, state universities use the following criteria to review academic programs:

1. centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution;
2. quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty;
3. quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;
4. demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program;
5. service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and
6. cost-effectiveness.

Institutional reviews may include student learning assessment data, evaluations, recommendations from accrediting bodies, and various institutional data (e.g., data on student post-collegiate experiences, data gathered

from the core and institution-specific performance indicators, and/or information in national or disciplinary rankings of program quality). There are no system-defined metrics within the criteria, which results in a wide range of approaches and differing measurement standards. The institution may also provide additional information that relates to these criteria and add additional criteria that are meaningful and appropriate.

B. Data and Minima Tables

The Board has established minimum criteria appropriate to each degree level. Data collected on each academic program are critical to the program review process. Academic programs which fail to meet minimum criteria are identified as part of the review process. The nature of system-wide guidelines means that some disciplines may fail to meet a stated criterion, while, at the same time, maintaining exceptional quality and/or serving crucial roles within the university. Below are data minima for programs, which are based on five-year averages. *Though the number of faculty and average ACT score are included, the focus of recent reports has been on the number of majors and the number of graduates in each program.*

	Number of Majors	Number of Graduates	Number of Faculty FTE	Average ACT score
Bachelor’s	25	10	3	>=20
Master’s	20	5	6	-
Doctorate	5	2	8	-

C. Programs Requiring Additional Review

Based on the review of both qualitative reports and program review data institutions identify areas of possible concern and determine what, if any, steps should be taken to resolve problem areas. Academic programs which fail to meet any one of the minimum criteria above may be targeted for additional review (in addition to the regularly scheduled self-study.) Further, the university may designate any other program for additional review based on other information in KHEDS or other information sources. Finally, some programs may require temporary monitoring to assess progress in rectifying problems as identified in the regular program review.

Board staff monitors campus activities regarding programs identified for additional review through annual program review reports, or until issues are resolved. For programs that are discontinued, each university typically teaches out students in the program but does not accept new enrollments.

D. Final Report and Recommendations

In January of each year, each state university submits to Board staff an executive summary of its annual review (conducted the previous academic year) and recommendations for each program. Board staff develop the annual program review report based on the executive summaries provided by the institutions, analysis of data in the minima tables (with a focus on the numbers of majors and graduates in each program), and consultation with the institutions. A final Program Review Report, summarizing the information from all the universities, is typically reported to the Board in April of each year.

III. Strategic Program Alignment and Additional Analysis of Low-Enrollment Programs

In June 2018, the Board approved the addition of a Strategic Program Alignment process to the existing Program Review policy, whereby the Board may direct state universities to conduct a strategic program alignment review. Additionally, the policy indicates the Board may direct state universities to evaluate *select* academic programs *outside of the eight-year Program Review cycle*. This change to policy resulted in a two-part addition to “regular” program review: 1) strategic program alignment, in which the universities chose programs to further review; and 2) low-enrollment program evaluation, in which the Board directed the universities to further review undergraduate programs whose junior and senior enrollments did not meet the established minimum of 25 students.

A. Strategic Program Alignment

The University of Kansas and Wichita State University agreed to pilot the Strategic Program Alignment program. In December 2018, KU & WSU gave updates on the process, and in June 2019, they were approved to evaluate two programs each. At the same meeting, it was determined Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, and Kansas State University would also submit at least two programs for strategic program alignment at the January 2020 Board meeting for approval and present final recommendations to the Board in June 2020. Because Pittsburg State University was in the process of reviewing programs through its Strategic Visioning Process, they were approved to present the outcomes to the Board in the spring of 2020.

On January 15, 2020, the Board approved the degree programs that ESU, FHSU, and K-State requested to review under strategic program alignment. (It was during this discussion that the Board requested enrollment data on the current undergraduate academic programs offered by the six universities. These data were provided to the Board in February and March 2020 and resulted in a list of “low-enrollment programs.”)

In the spring of 2020, ESU, FHSU, KSU, KU, and WSU presented information on the programs they identified for strategic program alignment, which resulted in the discontinuance of eight programs, the placing of one program on hold for further analysis, the continued monitoring of two programs, and the addition of two new programs.

In May 2020, PSU presented its Strategic Visioning Process to the Board. The process resulted in the creation of a Program Review Council on campus which was charged with reviewing the University’s undergraduate and graduate anchor and core programs and the development of a net revenue model to determine the direct and indirect costs associated with each program. PSU also did a market analysis of its programs to determine program demand on campus and in the workforce. Provost Smith shared the next steps in the process for the University.

B. Low-Enrollment Program Review

At the Board’s request, in January, February, and March of 2021, the universities presented information and recommendations on their low-enrollment programs as a follow-up to the low-enrollment data presented to the Board the previous year. Out of a total of 69 programs evaluated, 11 programs were identified to merge and 14 were discontinued (some were already in the discontinuance process when they were identified as low-enrollment programs.) Several programs were identified for additional review.

IV. Summary

State universities review academic programs at least once every eight years using the six criteria listed on the first page of this paper. Departments at the universities conduct self-studies on academic programs and provide reports to a central university office. Those reports are summarized and provided to the Board Office along with additional information. Board Staff place each university’s detailed report on the website for reference, and further analyze and summarize the information to produce a final report for Board review.

Changes to Program Review Policy in 2018 gave the Board a mechanism to request additional review outside the “regular” program review cycle. This change to policy resulted in a two-part addition to “regular” program review: 1) strategic program alignment, in which the universities chose programs to further review and presented their findings in the spring of 2020; and 2) low-enrollment program evaluation, in which the Board directed the universities to further review and report on undergraduate programs in which enrollments fell below the minimum of 25 students (universities reported on these programs to the Board in Spring 2021.)

General Education (GE) Implementation

Phase One: Continue Planning and GE Implementation Check-Up Form					
Dec 2022	Jan 2023	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institution IDENTIFIES the GE courses offered on its campus that fall in each bucket in the seven-bucket systemwide GE framework. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. When doing this work, the institution works to identify any major in its degree inventory that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. It wishes to deviate from a GE bucket requirement based on programmatic accreditation or licensure requirements; and ii. Requires native students to complete a GE course in a specific GE bucket and the institution wishes to continue requiring – and not waive – such a GE course when a transfer student completed the systemwide GE or the applicable discipline bucket requirement through systemwide transfer coursework. 2. By April 1, 2023 the institution SUBMITS its GE Implementation Check-In Form. 3. By April 1, 2023, a coordinated institution that has determined that it will not participate in the systemwide GE PROVIDES written notice to the Board that it will opt out of the systemwide GE. 					

Phase Two: Master Course List and Exceptions			
June 2023	July 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By June 1, 2023, an institution SUBMITS a GE Master Course List of all the courses it plans to offer in each bucket.¹ 2. By July 15, 2023, the GE Council REVIEWS the master-course list to determine if it aligns with the seven-bucket systemwide GE framework. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. After the review, the campus representative (chief academic officer or his/her designee) who submitted the “master-course list” will receive correspondence noting that the GE Council: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has verified that the institution’s master-course list aligns with the seven-bucket systemwide GE framework; or ii. Identified a concern(s) with the master-course list and, in turn, was unable to verify that the institution’s master-course list aligns with the seven-bucket systemwide GE framework. b. If a concern is identified, the GE Council will work with the institution to resolve the concern(s) and involve the Board President and CEO and/or Board, as needed. 3. By July 30, 2023, the institution SUBMITS any (if applicable) request to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. deviate from a GE bucket requirement based on programmatic accreditation or licensure; and b. continue requiring – and not waive – a specific GE course for transfer students. 4. Institutions are encouraged to submit the requests noted in 3.a and b above before the July 30, 2023 deadline. 5. The goal will be to review and issue responses to the requests noted in 1.a and b above by September 30, 2023. Any correspondence regarding such a request will be issued to the individual who submitted it (the chief academic officer or his/her designee). 6. If applicable, a coordinated institution that provides written notice that it will opt out of the systemwide GE is DISCUSSED as a Board agenda item at the September 2023 Board meeting. 			

Phase Three: Formalizing the GE on Campus			
Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023	Jan 2024
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institution REVISES its catalog, degree sheets, degree maps, and degree audit coding to include the new systemwide GE requirements. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is understood that this work may also begin in previous stages, as determined by the institution. 			

¹ It is understood that some institutions may have expansive GE course inventories. In cases in which there are large inventories, in the first year, the goal will be to identify the high-enrollment courses that will be included in the buckets. It is understood that these inventories will grow after the first year.

Phase Four: Offering the New GE and Submitting Policy and Degree Maps					
Feb 2024	Mar 2024	Apr 2024	May 2024	Jun 2024	Jul 2024
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institution ADVISES students who enroll as first-time and transfer students in Fall 2024 classes in Feb 2024 and thereafter under the seven-bucket systemwide GE framework. 2. Fall 2024 course offerings PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES for students to complete GE courses in each bucket in the seven-bucket systemwide GE framework. 3. By July, 1, 2024, the institution SUBMITS a link to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. All its academic degree maps, which must meet basic standards, for students beginning in the 2024-2025 academic year; and b. Its policy detailing the requisite AP, CLEP, and IB scores and the corresponding GE credit that a student is eligible for. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cambridge International exams will likely be added to the Credit by Exam policy in spring 2023. Provided that these are approved as exams in the Credit by Exam policy, the institutional policies will also need to include these exam scores and the corresponding credit that the student is eligible for. 					