



PROCEEDINGS REPORT:
THE 1ST ANNUAL
ARMY UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM,
DECEMBER 2015

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 4

Panel report: Creating Innovative Learning Environments..... 5
Moderator: Dr. Dave Quisenberry, Chief, Learning Science Innovations Division,
Center for Teaching and Learning
Excellence (CTLE), ArmyU

Panelist:
Dr. Jean Vettel, Army Research Laboratory
Dr. Doug Ward, University of Kansas
Dr. Marilyn Ault, University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning

Rapporteurs:
Dr. Charles D. Vance, Faculty & Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU
Ms. Lynn Fridell, Army Management Staff College, ArmyU

Panel report: Producing Relevant and Rigorous Curriculum..... 9
Moderator: Colonel Leonard L. Lira, Director, ArmyU’s CTLE

Panelists:
Mr. Keith Beurskens, Chief, Core Curriculum Development, CTLE, ArmyU;
Dr. Yong Zhao, Presidential Chair and Director of the Institute for Global and
Online Education, College of Education, University of Oregon
Dr. Karan Powell, Executive Vice President and Provost of American Public
University System.

Rapporteurs:
Dr. Barry Leslie, Army Management Staff College, ArmyU
Mr. Ken Riggins, Army Management Staff College, ArmyU

Panel report: Adopting Nationally Recognized Standards.....14
Moderator: Lieutenant Colonel Michael Myers

Panelists:
Ms. Lisa Lutz, Army COOL
Dr. Vinjay Krishna
Mr. Kent Ervin, Chief, Policy Governance Division, Army University
Dr. Christopher Reynolds, Vice President, Academic Communications &
Outreach at American Public University System

Rapporteurs:
Dr. Charles D. Vance, Faculty & Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU
Dr. John M. Persyn, Faculty and Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU

Panel report: Developing World Class Faculty.....19
Co-Moderators:

Dr. Harold L. Laurence, Faculty & Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU
Dr. Wesley Smith, Faculty & Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU

Panelist:

Dr. Casey Blaine, Chief of Staff and Faculty, Fires Center of Excellence, Ft. Sill,
OK
Dr. Stephen Brookfield, University of St. Thomas
Dr. Cheryl J. Polson, Kansas State University College of Education

Rapporteurs:

Lieutenant Colonel Steven Hill
Mr. Brian Blew

Panel report: Exploring Collaborative Opportunities.....22

Moderator: Brigadier General John S. Kem

Panelist:

Mr. Trong Nguyen, Cooperative Degree Programs, ECU/CP32,
Dr. Steven Schmidt, East Carolina University (ECU)
Dr. Peter Harms, University of Alabama

Rapporteurs:

Ms. Lynn Fridell, Army Management Staff College, ArmyU
Mr. Ken Riggins, Army Management Staff College, ArmyU

Conclusion.....25

Appendices

Appendix A: Web Addresses for Full Panel Videos.....27

Appendix B: After Action Report28

Appendix C: After Action Review Notes30

Introduction

The Army University Provost executed the Army University's 1st Annual Education Symposium in accordance with the HQDA EXORD 214-15 from 2-3 December 2015 at Fort Leavenworth, KS. The purpose of the symposium was to introduce ArmyU to civilian academic institutions and to announce the Army University as the new Army education enterprise focal point. Additionally, the symposium provided a forum for professional dialogue between military leaders and academic professionals about the Army's proposed approach to educating Army professionals for both the current and future operational environments.

Over 250 members representing 82 civilian higher education institutions and 31 professional military education institutions attended the symposium's panels. Keynote speakers included the Combined Arms Center Commander/Executive Vice Chancellor, LTG Robert B. Brown and the first ArmyU Provost, BG John S. Kem. Together their opening comments provided the context and framework for the establishment of the Army University. Five panel discussions followed: Creating an Innovative Learning Environment, Producing Relevant Curriculum, Adopting Nationally Recognized Standards, Developing World Class Faculty, and Collaborative Exchange Opportunities. Panel topics, drawn from the strategic initiatives of Army University, included creating innovative learning environments, producing professional curriculum, developing world-class faculty, adopting nationally/regionally recognized standards, and building collaborative opportunities and networks. Panel members consisted of renowned subject matter experts from the civilian and military adult education community.

One immediate and positive result from the symposium was the expansion of critical network connections made between the Army PME institutes and several civilian academic institutions not previously established. Additionally, current education networks were solidified as traditional partners offered lessons learned and new ideas to expand their partnerships. This result will further support the foundation of new institutional educational programs that the Army PME enterprise needs in order to prepare Army Professionals for the current and future conflict environments. The work accomplished during the ArmyU Educational Symposium represents the beginning of the hard work required ahead that will directly improve the fundamental processes used to develop leaders for the complex and uncertain 21st Century security environment.

Panel Report: Creating Innovative Learning Environments

Panel

Moderator: Dr. Dave Quisenberry, Chief, Learning Science Innovations Division, Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE), ArmyU

Panelist: Dr. Jean Vettel, Army Research Laboratory, Dr. Doug Ward, University Of Kansas, Dr. Marilyn Ault, University Of Kansas Center for Research on Learning

Introduction

The goal for this panel discussion was to share how the US Army might best cultivate an innovative and engaging learning culture both inside and outside the classroom for the entirety of a professional career. Army University also sought to discover how best to lead this effort, or alternatively empower the creative educational approaches of others?

The focus of this topic was to share best practices in the learning sciences that support a positive learning culture that is adaptable to the diverse needs of the Officer, Warrant Officer, Non-Commissioned Officer and Army Civilian cohorts.

Dr. David Quisenberry began the discussion by promoting the importance of education innovation to the Army's strategy to "win in a complex world." Providing an image of what successful learning environment could be is a prerequisite to making new choices. Whether for reasons of mission accomplishment, advancing strategy, or return on taxpayer investment, there is little argument over the need for significant improvement in Army educational outcomes. While part of the process is to identify the best educators, classrooms and curriculums that outperform the status quo and redefine define excellence, innovation must also "scale." Army University must identify and reproduce processes and systems on a large scale to maximize learning for the hundreds of thousands of Army professionals.

Presentations and Discussions

Dr. Marilyn Ault, University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning, presented work supporting learning designs that combine knowledge, skills, attitudes, and self-efficacy. She praised the Army Learning Concept 2015, as in agreement with the most current thought on adult learning, with the exception that the importance of social learning should be explicitly included. She supported this view with graphic data depicting **significantly higher results when course designs included social learning and a broad variety of student-centric methodologies.**

Her second major point concerned how classroom technology might hijack higher order thinking. We must carefully design what we ask the learner to do. **Learners increasingly demand that their learning include technology tools. However, designers must be wary not to allow these tools that make learning easier to make thinking easier as well.** Technology does not replace classic course design principles.

Third, is Todd Rose's "Myth of Average." Briefly, it is the belief that educators can use statistical averages to understand students. Scientists have come to realize that it is a myth, and over the last decade strategies have evolved from averages to individuals, (e.g. personalized medicine, diets, fitness plans, work environments). Unfortunately, education has not quite realized the myth yet and it hurts both our challenged students and gifted students. Most of us are challenged in some areas and gifted in others; so the harm extends to every student.

Designers should (1) "Ban the Average" (2) Project Learner Variability.

Dr. Doug Ward, University of Kansas, shared metaphors to make his points about helping students learn how to learn. He asks the audience to contrast learning from a speaker on a mountaintop to that of friends engaged in a campfire conversation, and then to the conversation among strangers at the watercooler. Finally, he asked us to contrast the first three with the self-learning of a person in a cave remote from social interaction, but the timing of learning and the methodology is exactly as they choose. Echoing Dr. Ault, he recommends **designing social learning into our course and incorporate a broad variety of student-centric methodologies**

Then he described a community barn raising as a dynamic learning environment whereby all of the aforementioned metaphors could coexist in a self-directed entrepreneurial manner. It is an engaged social group of experts and learners, teams and individuals, all working toward shared goals of increased learning, better relationships, and the accomplishment of shared goals.

Learning should not be driven by the lesson timeline, but instead be self-directed and entrepreneurial.

Dr. Jean Vettel, Army Research Laboratory, anticipated a future soldier more burdened by cognitive load than physical burden. She echoed Dr. Ward's call for self-directed learning, but also asserted that this could be also be accomplished subconsciously. The possibility now exists that we could monitor brain activity and capture our cognitive load; moreover, this data might initiate devices and technology that helps us in degraded states. **Learning should be self-directed, even subconsciously self-directed.**

If we extend this capability to the classroom or any learning environment, we truly begin to create a persistent personal profile of every learner. Projecting Variability is an enabling course design. **The emerging new technology of the individual provides the data to create an individualized environment that discriminates individuals, and nurtures individual potential.**

Primary Theme One – Student Directed Learning. Learning should be more student directed and less Army directed. We need to move past the assumption that the organization must tell the students what they must learn. What we need to do as educators is lay out the requirements, provide a way forward, and enable to students to be involved in determining what they want or need to learn and when. Physiological measures provide learner and instructor precise real-time performance data.

A collaborative effort between the student and teachers is the best form of assessment data. They share responsibility for progress toward the essential outcomes. Students show what they

are doing, and describe why they are doing it. Formative assessments, in and of themselves, are a tool to practice critical thinking skills.

Primary Theme Two – Everything is a Schoolhouse. More team-based learning, in the operating environment, with evolving and negotiated roles. More facilitated short- or long-term projects for educational credit. More “just-in-time learning,” as determined by either the team or the individual—neither has a clear vision of that is should be until the need presents itself. Students need to be able to drill down on a particular topic, using whatever information or research technology is available to them, to develop skills for learning on the spot when required. More augmented reality (as opposed to virtual reality), especially for unique deficiencies. Augmented reality has a lot of potential to *add* to the learning environment, as opposed to replacing it (virtual reality).

Primary Theme Three – Redefined Classroom. The classroom is a flexible learning environment, even an online environment. It is better to have an “active learning” classroom. Instructors need the flexibility to provide multiple modes of presentation in addition to multiple teaching and learning techniques. Students need the control to ask for more or less help/time/methodologies. The classroom should be socially mobile, meaning that students should easily have an opportunity to seek out assistance from other students of their choosing, to socialize with other students, and facilitate cooperative learning.

Implications for Army University

Generally, the dominant themes strongly supported the existing Army Learning Concept, the Enterprise Classroom Program, and the Army Distributed Learning Program. The Army is the rare education institution that is both the supplier and consumer of student competencies.

- Efforts to align course designs with the Army Learning Concept must continue to receive high support and resources.
- The Army Learning Concept should more explicitly include social learning.
- Definitions of the Enterprise Classroom and Distributed Learning should more explicitly incorporate the perspective of the entrepreneurial learner.
- Competency assessment should more explicitly incorporate the perspective of work teams, peers, and the consumers of graduates (e.g. FORSCOM, ASCCs, universities, civilian workplace)

Panel discussion repeatedly poached/overlapped with the topics of curriculum development and faculty development.

- This overlap supports the current organizational design of CTLE (e.g. Faculty Development, Curriculum Development, Learning Science and Innovation).
- Changing culture and the mental models of faculty are the largest obstacles to innovation.
- Increase collaboration between the faculty and lesson designers of ArmyU Centers, Schools and Colleges.

- Increase collaboration with Army and civilian innovation suppliers and innovation consumers.

Panel Report: Producing Relevant and Rigorous Curriculum

Panel

Moderator: Colonel Leonard L. Lira, Director, Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE), ArmyU.

Panelists: Mr. Keith Beurskens, Chief, Core Curriculum Development, CTLE, ArmyU; Dr. Yong Zhao, Presidential Chair and Director of the Institute for Global and Online Education, College of Education, University of Oregon, Dr. Karan Powell, Executive Vice President and Provost of American Public University System.

The stated focus and goal of this panel was to discuss how to create rigorous and relevant curriculum in a way to achieve general learning outcomes that the Army Asa profession has identified as necessary to its workforce. To solve the problem of the complex security environment, the Army's assumption is that the solution to this is to develop leaders who can innovate, improve, and thrive in the uncertainty and chaos seen in modern day conflict.

This is clearly an important topic not just for the Army, but for higher education as well, as evidenced by a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Learner that highlighted the results from the National Survey of Student Engagement that indicated that expectations about academic rigor are far from universal.

Presentations and Discussions

The first presenter was Mr. Keith Beurskens who works at ArmyU as a Division Chief of the Core Curriculum Development Division of the CTLE. Mr. Beurskens discussed the four main objectives that his division is working on to help the Army professional military education institutions develop relevant and rigorous curriculum. The second presenter, Dr. Yong Zhao, Presidential Chair and Director of the Institute for Global and Online Education in the College of Education at the University of Oregon, discussed how student autonomy increases engagement and rigor and how technology creates more opportunities for transferring the responsibility of learning to students. The third panelist, Dr. Powell, who is Executive Vice President and Provost of American Public University System, focused her comments on identifying, developing, and evaluating relevant curriculum through industry advisory councils, adoption of a systematized learning outcomes assessment methodology and approach, and implementing a rigorous program review process. The panel presentation and pursuant discussions elicited three primary themes: the need to reframe credentialing, the potential of entrepreneurial learning, and how to incorporate pragmatic training and education.

Primary Theme One – Reframe Credentialing. Dr. Zhao captured this theme by commenting on the changes occurring in higher education. He cited specifically how the monopoly on learning opportunities has been broken, but that the monopoly on granting credit for that learning is still centrally owned and managed. Dr. Zhao explained this by describing how student learning comes from many venues, but that higher education institutions own the granting of credits and

diploma credentials. This results in the imposition of old ideas about how to measure and credential leaning on new learning opportunities.

Credentialing accounts for specialized knowledge, broad knowledge, intellectual skills, perspectives, applied and collaborative learning, civic and global learning. These factors are mapped to curriculum, faculty actions, and student engagement in such a way that promotes rigor, highlights learner growth, and provides students with opportunities.

Panel discussion and questions from the audience explored the importance of a common credentialing lexicon that promotes shared understanding among stakeholders. One recommendation that came from this discussion was the idea of reframing how training and higher education institutions grant credit hours. Old accreditation frameworks did not account for the personalized learning eco-systems – a term used by Dr. Zhao to describe emergence of the entrepreneurial learning environment. This type of learner centric environment give individual learners a larger stake in how their learning is developed and credentialed. For example, the development of general learning outcomes, and the curriculum to achieve them, should account for various student-learning venues. This type of rigorous learning outcomes focus will implications for student engagement, retention, and learning transfer.

Student engagement and retention was another discussion strand associated with reframing credentialing. In a pragmatic sense, engagement was tied to the relevance of the training and education. The panel discussion highlighted the point that various stakeholders expected learning outcomes to translate into benefits for employers, students, and the Army. Students expected training and education to result in enhanced career potential, pay increase, improved job performance and a progressive / sequential certification of proficiency. Some audience comments suggested that students moved away from programs that lacked rigor and, more importantly, employers avoided hiring individuals who lacked proficiency or could not perform, hence the importance of credentialing that accounts for various learning venues while ensuring student learning meets standards.

Primary Theme Two - Entrepreneurial Learning. Multiple individuals engaged in the discussion about entrepreneurial learners. The entrepreneurial mindset requires that institutions provide a classroom environment that converges relevant curriculum, skilled faculty, technology, and a freedom to fail. Without the freedom to fail, individual creativity and innovation will be obstructed. This topic was tied to discussions about education and training frameworks that imposed outdated paradigms in the classroom. Based on this, Dr. Zhao championed the idea of personalized learning eco-systems that incorporate cutting edge technology. He went on to point out that graduates chase current jobs where as future employment would require them to redefine existing workplace requirements in new ways – possibly invent new jobs where none existed.

Based on these themes, the panel concluded that developing ‘world class learners’ requires the setting aside of traditionally imposed content and knowledge in favor of highlighting creativity and the entrepreneurial mindset. This new paradigm focuses more on learning and less on teaching. The idea is that students should be liberated to develop their own personalized learning eco-system. This will prove challenging in the Army PME environment characterized by adherence to doctrine, rules, and a culture of conformity.

To support the concept of a personalized learning eco-system, a single student university concept needs to be considered. Such a concept would imply that micro units of learning are combined to create credit hours for an authentic product predicated by reframed learning

outcomes. This would account for cognitive and non-cognitive factors contributing to success or failure.

Based on the discussion this idea generated, an entrepreneurial learning environment seemed to resonate with members of the Army community present in the audience. Several military audience members made comments that connected the idea of entrepreneurial learners to supporting the Army Operational Concept of 2040. It was noted that should the Army invests in developing new paradigms that create opportunities and allows for student innovation, then the flexibility and adaptability of entrepreneurial classrooms would promote a relevant classroom and lead to students able to address real world problems. However, establishing entrepreneurial classroom environments requires that students also reframe their expectations. Most students lack familiarity with classroom environments in which they are expected to drive their learning. Traditional classroom power structures are ingrained in most student learning experiences, thus the institution must address expectations of both the learner and faculty for this type of classroom to succeed.

Additionally, discussion elicited the observation that technology plays an important role in the entrepreneurial classroom. From this idea two points were developed. Some participants viewed technology as a delivery mechanism for knowledge, but not education. At the other end of this spectrum, others insisted that students should develop themselves through media venues, thus reducing reliance on faculty interaction. Other participants suggested that the classroom must maintain a balance among multiple factors: student engagement, faculty facilitation, and technology.

Primary Theme 3 - Pragmatic Training and Education. Dr. Karan Powell's discussion brought this last theme out by asking two questions. What does producing relevant curriculum mean and who should define it? The thread of this discussion indicated that relevance is inextricably tied to the pragmatic aspects of training and education. This is particularly, true if programs of study are to provide authentic, real-world challenges that promote an entrepreneurial mindset capable of meeting the complex demands of the 21st century. Dr. Powell noted that pragmatic, relevant training and education opportunities involve multiple factors, some of which were described in the previous themes.

The first factor is credentialing. As stated in previously, credentialing must have rigorous standards to ensure students are proficient in the skills or the education they have acquired. Credentialing is more effective when a common lexicon is shared among stakeholders. A common lexicon promotes the granting or transfer of credits for student learning acquired through multiple venues. Filtering learning acquired through multiple venues and vetted through rigorous standards embedded in curriculum, faculty actions, program review and evaluation, student engagement and articulated by a common lexicon will enhance stakeholder confidence.

The second factor is Learning Outcomes. General learning outcomes must account for cognitive and non-cognitive learning. Examples of non-cognitive learning includes creativity, global competency, and human dimension factors. Learning outcomes are closely tied to the credentialing discussion. A strand of this discussion focused on 'micro-unit' learning that, when compiled, achieves learning outcomes. When micro-unit learning that students acquire from multiple sources (personalized learning eco-systems) are credentialed, students remain engaged and stakeholders benefit.

The third factor is Faculty Development. This strand of discussion highlighted multiple challenges that affect the learning rigor and successful achievement of learning outcomes.

Faculty skills are more than ‘teaching’. Relevant curriculum requires delivery by agile and adaptive faculty that facilitate the entrepreneurial learning environment. However, the Army does not reward these skills and it certainly does not recruit or assign PME faculty and staff based on these criteria. In most training venues, the instructors have little or no exposure to facilitation. They rely on old paradigms that reinforce traditional classroom power structures. In other words, they model instruction that they received.

- Entrepreneurial Learning. Discussion of relevant, pragmatic training and education recognized that educational institutions must be agile and adaptive. Entrepreneurial learning, as already discussed, requires new paradigms for credentialing, curriculum development including general learning outcomes, faculty development, and management of student expectations. Relevant, pragmatic curriculum must challenge students and help them acquire the capability to pose and predict problems.

Implications for Army University

Army University should develop a clearer vision of the mix of education delivery methods, on-line, brick and mortar, blended etc. Curriculum should include real world problems that students will solve in the classroom. Army University should take on the challenge to develop personalized education for its student population. Given ArmyU’s structure and mission it is best placed to affect these innovative changes. Developing relevant curriculum is not an isolated function within one institution. It is affected by multiple factors such as credentialing, faculty development, learning outcomes, and classroom environment at each of the COEs/ schools across the Army learning enterprise. ArmyU has the opportunity to align these disparate efforts into a coherent implementation of the learning strategy. Based on this, four implications for ArmyU were observed from this panel discussion:

1. *Academic Credentialing Paradigm Revision.* Current Army academic credentialing is fragmented and misunderstood. Revision of the current credentialing paradigm end state:

- Fosters shared understanding among the Army’s internal and external stakeholders
- Accounts for ‘micro-units’ of learning
- Translates real-world experiences into industry and workforce development roadmaps
- Promotes and values the entrepreneurial mindset,
- Accounts for cognitive and non-cognitive (creativity, innovation, human dimension) factors
- Credentialing that is understood by stake-holders, accumulates ‘micro-learning’ experiences, accounts for individual lived experiences, and produces capability to thrive in complex environments will benefit the Army throughout the individual’s human resource life-cycle.

2. *Faculty and Staff Development Paradigm Revision.* Current Army faculty & staff development efforts currently do not support the entrepreneurial, innovative, creative mindsets necessary for agile and adaptive facilitation of classroom experiences. Faculty development paradigm end state:

- Aligns Army training and education venues with Army Learning Methodology and Army Operating Concept.
- Reduces or eliminates perceptions of the ‘substitute teacher’ and the traditional power structures in the classroom.
- Strengthens the relevance and realism of classroom experiences that, in turn, affect learning transfer into the Army formations.
- Provides faculty with 21st Century competencies (e.g. critical thinking, problem prediction, ability, adaptability) that enhance Army cohorts upon reassignment or transfer.
- Transforms the mindset of individuals managing Army Human Resource functions to view faculty assignments as valuable – eliminates the stigma of serving in faculty training and education positions.
- Rewards individuals who serve in faculty positions; elevates faculty training and education positions as an honor and of vital importance to successfully achieving the Army’s Operating Concept.

3. *General Learning Outcomes.* The recent Army Learning Coordination Council (ALCC) Learning Continuum-Soldier Competencies Sub-Committee workshop from 7 – 11 December 2015 developed and recommended General Learning Outcomes and a framework that unifies efforts across Army cohorts. The learning outcome end state:

- Incorporates a common lexicon that connects to credentialing efforts and promotes shared understanding among internal and external stakeholders.
- Accounts for the various individual learning experiences (e.g. micro-units, personalized learning eco-system).
- Provides for rigor to ensure individuals meet standards, certifications, performance thresholds.
- Incorporates industry input into development of learning outcomes.

4. *Entrepreneurial Classroom Environments.* The pragmatic considerations of learning underscored the importance of relevant, realistic training and education. The entrepreneurial classroom environments end state:

- Enable the Army to achieve its learning management methodology in support of the Army Operating Concept.
- Promotes student engagement while managing student expectations – they will be a partner in their training and education resulting in easily transferable and commonly understood experiences.
- Develops critical skills and reduces barriers for creativity, innovation, problem posing, critical thinking, and human dimension considerations.
- Sharpens faculty skills (noted above) that are plowed back into the Army cohorts.

Panel Report: Adopting Nationally Recognized Standards

Panel

Moderator: Lieutenant Colonel Michael Myers, Army University

Panelists: Ms. Lisa Lutz, Army COOL, Dr. Vinjay Krishna, Mr. Kent Ervin, Chief, Policy Governance Division, Army University, Dr. Christopher Reynolds, Vice President, Academic Communications & Outreach at American Public University System

The goal of this panel was to learn how to blend the proven models of the United States finest universities with the best practices in our military education and training programs in order to develop the future Soldiers and leaders our profession requires.

The focus of this topic is to share strategies for identifying the standards, and developing the processes and partnerships that enable Soldiers and Army Civilians to be awarded appropriate credit for military academic and credentialing education and experience at accredited universities, colleges, and vocational schools.

Presentations and Discussions

The first presenter was Ms. Lisa Lutz. She noted that in the 90s, a commission was established by Senator Dole to examine potential credentials for veterans. A task force was formed to shed light on how to facilitate credentialing. Over 70% of military personnel had some potential to receive credentials. The Department of Labor, the VA, and other agencies began to get involved with reviewing credentialing. Initially, the view of the Army was not supportive. They asked, “Why would we want to give someone a ticket out of the Army?” In 2000, the Army increased its emphasis on credentialing. The “GI to Jobs” working group was formed in 2000 to help incentivize military service. The Army established a Credentialing Opportunities Online (COOL) program as an online source for credentialing information, to provide occupation-specific info for all MOSs, and begin to develop requirements for credentialing. Almost every MOS has some potential for credentialing, but many of the Army MOSs and specialties do not meet the civilian credentialing standards. The types of requirements for certification / credentialing drive what the soldier is required to pursue in terms of education and experience, typically including an exam. Training and education requirements are really the key to credentialing.

The lack of information about how to get credentials has been a big problem, a barrier to the overall credential efforts. Many credentials result from additional duties, rather than from a soldier’s MOS. The types of requirements vary, but are key to getting credentials. Credentials in hands of soldiers is evidence that they have the skills for certain jobs. Education and training requirements also pose a big challenge. There are legitimate gaps between military training and civilian credentialing requirements; the key is to get credit for what soldiers have learned.

From 2010 to 2015, 4000 soldiers have been professionally credentialed. The Navy was the first to develop a COOL program similar to the Army's; the Air Force and Marine Corps soon followed.

At present, we have identified fee requirements for credentialing, most of which are paid for by the services. In FY 15 Congress required that the military pay for certification and credentialing fees. However, barriers still remain with respect to recognizing military experience and giving soldiers credit for it. It always comes down to the educational component.

The Army University is an excellent forum to review these issues. ACE reviews Army training and recommends credit; however, civilian institutions have been reluctant to grant credit. The National Governors Association piloted a program in 6 states intended to establish "bridge" programs that provide training for the gaps not included in military training.

There is no consistent quality in credentialing programs. Accreditation of credentialing and certification programs is a new concept. "Diploma mill" issues exist in these programs, particularly in the absence of national standards or oversight, as they do in other higher education programs. The COOL program helps identify whether a program is accredited by one of the 3 accrediting bodies. It also identifies if program is authorized to receive government funds. Programs also must self-assess if they meet standards. As stakeholders, we should grab the reins to influence the direction of these efforts.

There are three methods to ensure quality—

- "caveat emptor," in which all available information is provided to the soldiers and they are left to make their own decisions about obtaining credentials;
- whether the program for which an individual is seeking credentials is approved by under the GI Bill; this is a "quick screen" process, but helps weed out bogus programs that won't result in credentialing;
- a credential checklist, which is not a precise or detailed process, but helps contribute to ensuring quality.

Dr. Vinjay Krishna, as a member of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), shared that ANSI was originally established to provide standards for products. A new area that has evolved is in the area of competence for people. There are a lot of standards, but not national standards for many occupations and professions. In many cases, certificate indicate competence, but not always. They have developed national standards based on learning principles. There is now more focus on standards for performance and competence of people.

A big challenge is how to verify the competence of people to assure standards when there are over 4000 certification bodies. **Less than 10% of certification programs meet any kind of national standards.** For example, security certification must be according to national standards. However, nationally recognized is not the same as having national standards. Certification is about competence, not education, and not training. A lot of training is based solely, or primarily, on seat time. Emphasis now is on establishing good course objectives and learning outcomes,

including adult learning principles that contribute to effective learning of these competencies. A new focus is on how to assess the competence of people providing the certification training.

Mr. Kent Ervin, emphasized that certification and credentialing systems, programs, and processes are a wide-ranging challenge. There are many schools that follow TRADOC guidance but don't answer to TRADOC: JAG, MEDCOM, Chaplains, etc. Many schools outside of TRADOC follow TRADOC policies and procedures for training and education programs. AMSC is now under the TRADOC umbrella. Soldiers also attend joint schools and other service schools, but Army standards still drive the assessment of what these soldiers learn. Army University absorbed the training function. It is important to sort through who our students are and who our customers are. Over 71% of American population of service age are not fit to serve in the military for various reasons.

There is great diversity in student demographics, particularly military students versus civilian students. Many of the challenges we face are in the areas of ethics and standards of behavior. The biggest challenge is to educate and train to perform in one of 213 jobs in 10 different categories—to provide soldiers capable of fighting and winning our nation's wars.

There are a lot of TRADOC schools and centers, at least one in every state; many of them are Reserve Component schools, either US Army Reserve or National Guard.

Dr. Christopher Reynolds, started by stating the focus has been on providing opportunity to service members leaving the service. The challenge has been determining what military certifications cross over into the civilian world. For example, Army medics may be certified as EMTs, but require certain training and education while on active duty. Troops to teachers was one success story. Walmart's emphasis on hiring veterans is another. The union laborer template is helpful, but insufficient, and doesn't translate well to education certification. We need to determine what the certifications (credentials) are that soldiers bring with them when they leave the service and what do they or might they need to make a successful transition. There may be a need to relook Bloom's taxonomy with respect to military certification and credentialing.

Primary Theme One - Many Army competencies align with civilian occupations

We must ensure service members get credit for training that they complete. **The Army is the gold standard when it comes to training facilities.** The key is to raise awareness of the quality of this training so credentialing bodies can get the full picture. A couple of good examples are the medical board certification and board certification of emergency management personnel. Developing a military transcript that civilian institutions understand is key. There is a big push to develop a digital transcript that will follow a person from job to job. The AG school is working on developing a human resource certification. They would like to partner with someone who has a compatible HR program in order to be able to grant certification beyond the military training in this area.

SUSCoE created a military academia/consortium. They conduct staff rides, share technology, conduct tours of facilities, and so forth, all with a view to strengthen the partnerships. They

established a credentialing office for welders and truck drivers. They have worked with TRADOC in this effort to establish closer partnerships and develop joint credentialing. Would be happy to share what we achieved and how we did it.

Primary Theme Two - Credentialing, certification and licensing is complex and multifarious.

We need to find ways to differentiate between different certification programs and determine the value of each of them, conduct a comparison of the quality of these programs. There have been some efforts to create a registry of programs to consolidate knowledge about credentialing programs. With over 4000 certifications, there are issues of the magnitude of the task. Lumina is a company that provides a credential transparency registry.

Most of the certifications are housed in the professional organizations and associations. As a result, they become the “gatekeepers.” There is also a language barrier between military terminology and commercial terminology for certifications. Improving dialogue throughout the whole village of stakeholders is necessary to standardize requirements for and definitions associated with certifications. Users need to know what the differences in cost, quality, and transportability really mean to those seeking certification.

The questions are always how to you determine learning objectives and how do you know when they’ve been achieved? Terminology in military learning is different than in civilian learning. Gap analysis is another difference that shows the significance of differences in terminology between military and civilian institutions. **The military must learn to communicate better with civilian institutions.** The school commandants establish learning objectives for their Army schools—and it is hard work.

A central question is, if the Army does the gap analysis, will civilian institutions accept it? The best approach would be for national organizations to lead the effort with respect to gap analysis. The requirement to share POIs with credentialing agencies is a nightmare.

Central Texas College has a “college credit for heroes” program. It provides a service to all institutions in the state of Texas, in particular making recommendations on awarding credits. CTC provides equivalency documentation to everyone in the state. They emphasize Army school POIs, because without them it can take 2 years to complete the determination. The biggest problem is not getting access to changes. It’s hard to keep up with changes in MOSs.

Army University can help speed up the process. **An ACE review takes 18 months just to get on the docket.** Some institutions won’t play ball; not all universities will grant credit unless it is from *their* institution. There’s a problem with reciprocity when moving from state to state (not everything is recognized by all states, there’s no national standard).

A material-based approach to training and education worked pretty well in the past. However, with the new conflicts, that model doesn’t work as well. Now individuals and ideologies are more significant. The purpose of ArmyU is to improve Army education to meet the greater challenges of a more complex world.

Implication for Army University

This panel highlighted several key considerations associated with credentialing and certification for military members. Panel members' overviews provided deeper understanding of the overlap and gaps between military and civilian credentialing perspectives and practices. Specifically, they emphasized that credentialing "standards" vary widely across civilian occupations and that professional organizations and associations act as "gatekeepers" regarding certification and credentialing in their professions. They also noted that the lack of a common language between military and civilian occupations, as well as the sometimes unique requirements for military occupations, make the direct translation of military to civilian skills and competencies difficult. Overall, panelists and members of the audience agreed that it is important to ensure that military members are appropriately recognized for their skills and competencies, not only while they are serving, but also as they prepare to leave the service and enter the civilian workforce. They also expressed that The Army University can positively contribute to this goal by collaborating with other key stakeholders.

Key actions for Army University toward Adopting Nationally Recognized Standards include the following:

- Identify Army MOSs for which civilian credentialing standards are currently being met but credentials are not being awarded.
- Identify gaps in credentialing for Army MOSs that do not currently meet civilian standards; identify additional education and experience requirements and defining a path toward fulfilling credentialing requirements.
- Develop a military career-span digital transcript that provides a compilation of an individual's training, education, and work experience. The transcript should link military skills to credentialing requirements in language that civilian institutions understand.
- Provide access to Army school POIs supporting credentialing to streamline ACE credit review.
- Promote the quality of credentialing programs used by the military. Support accreditation of credentialing and certification programs.
- Ensure and assess the competence of those individuals who provide certification training. Specifically, within the Army, this relates to the quality and competence of Army instructors to teach the skills required for certification and credentialing. More broadly, this supports the Army University initiative to "Develop World Class Faculty."

To support these efforts, Army University must actively participate in the dialogue among stakeholders to ensure certification and credentialing programs reflect nationally recognized standards of all members of the various professions—military and civilian.

Panel Report: Developing World Class Faculty

Panel

Moderators: Dr. Harold T. Laurence, Faculty & Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU, Dr. Wesley Smith, Faculty & Staff Development Division, CTLE, ArmyU

Panelists: Dr. Casey Blaine, Chief of Staff and Faculty, Fires Center of Excellence, Ft. Sill, OK, Dr. Stephen Brookfield, University of St. Thomas, Dr. Cheryl J. Polson, Kansas State University College of Education

Introduction

The goal of the “Developing World Class Faculty” panel discussion was to share and discuss overarching strategies, policies, and innovative practices to identify, recruit, develop and retain world class faculty. The panel included faculty development and adult learning experts from Army University and civilian institutions of higher education. The panel moderator began the discussion by sharing the importance of developing world class faculty as it relates to the impacts on student learning, institutional agility, and ultimately the success of the institution in reaching its goals. Faculty members are critical drivers to change within any university, college or school and leaders at these institutions have a profound responsibility to establish the framework that supports and facilitates faculty development. The panel moderator also shared some current trends in faculty development across both military and civilian institutions – institutions are establishing an office or center for faculty development; focusing on learner-centered teaching and learning strategies; integrating the development of 21st century skills within the content areas; focusing on educational technology integration; and developing tiered development programs for faculty. These trends in faculty development are aligned with current efforts at Army University as its leaders have made faculty and staff development a top priority.

Presentations and Discussions

Dr. Casey Blaine, Chief, Staff and Faculty Development Office, Fires Center of Excellence (Fires CoE), Army University presented three important components of the faculty development program at the Fires CoE. He stressed the importance of developing a **vision** for the faculty development program that is focused on outcomes or outputs of the program and that is widely accepted by leadership, faculty developers, and faculty members. The Fires CoE has established “Produce the best Fires Soldier in the world” as its vision. According to Dr. Blaine, this vision is inculcated in the faculty members through faculty orientation, faculty development courses and sessions, and ongoing certification processes. Dr. Blaine then discussed the importance of having a **methodology** or model that underpins a faculty development program. The Fires CoE, along with the greater Army University, has the “Army Learning Model” that outlines and describes the principles of adult learning, the learner-centered learning environment, the 21st Century Soldier Competencies, and the importance of the instructor as a facilitator. Having this conceptual framework or model is critical to developing a program that is well thought out and evidenced based. Finally, he discussed the importance of **assessment** or **evaluation** of instructors and provided the Kirkpatrick Four-level Evaluation Model as an example of what

they use at the Fires CoE. At the Fires CoE, they focus on the importance of instructor passion and facilitation skills, along with implementation of a learner-centered instructional environment. He mentioned that instructor candidates are assessed in several ways during instructor training by both faculty developers and peers. Instructors are also assessed during their tour of duty using instructor evaluations by supervisors and end-of-course evaluations that are completed by their students.

Dr. Cheryl J. Polson, Associate Dean, Kansas State University (KSU), College of Education posited several points regarding world class faculty from a practitioner's perspective. First, she shared several illustrations to reveal the importance of using a participative approach with adult learners. She stressed the importance of avoiding the **authoritarian approach** with adult learners. By allowing adult learners to participate and share their prior knowledge and personal experiences, faculty members are implementing a more learner-centered environment. Second, she talked presented the importance of understanding **who your students are** through telling a story about her first interaction with military adult learners. In this story, she assigned a role playing activity to a group of Army officers. In the end, due to the duty positions within the Army structure, one group did not reenact the role play activity due to the possibility of embarrassment in front of other subordinate officers in the class. Dr. Polson reminded the audience that as civilian faculty members and instructors we must make sure we **understand the military environment** when designing learning activities. Finally, she stated that "World Class Faculty" members **do not sacrifice quality** in the process of delivering a program. In some instances, faculty members have pioneered programs, which gave significant credit hours in a short time period, while allowing no **time for reflection**. There is an imperative to ensure quality learning.

Dr. Polson also shared responses to the question, "What constitutes World Class Faculty?" from some of her former KSU students. These students reported the following: World Class Faculty – 1) understand barriers to learning; 2) have a rationale for learning requirements; 3) establish trust with students; 4) assist learners in taking responsibility for learning; 5) provide relevancy; 6) get students to accept risk; and 7) engage learners.

Dr. Stephen Brookfield, John Ireland Endowed Chair, University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota spoke about the process of getting buy-in for faculty development programs. He sometimes experiences hostile or passive-aggressive behaviors from faculty members during professional development sessions. He presented four key points for dealing with "outright resistance" to faculty development programs. First, he emphasized the importance of **building a case** for the program by linking it to a needs analysis to identify gaps in faculty skills or knowledge. Next, faculty trainers and leaders must **model their commitment** to the change in current practices by being engaged in the learning and implementation. His next point related to **establishing early credibility** with the faculty. Faculty trainers must be prepared to capture faculty members' attention early in the process and keep them engaged during the training session(s). Faculty members are keen to the credibility of trainers. Some may ask themselves, "What do they have to offer me?" The final point was the need to **monitor and address resistance**, and **surface it**. Faculty members should be allowed to vent and share their frustrations with development programs. Resistance from faculty should be considered part of the process of changing current teaching and learning practices.

Implications for Army University

As Army University strives to implement an overarching strategy, policies, and innovative practices to identify, recruit, develop and retain World Class Faculty members across the learning enterprise, it will be important to consider many of the points brought by this distinguished panel. Army University leaders and faculty developers will have to complete the analyses to identify the competencies required for World Class Faculty members, determine the gaps in faculty skills and knowledge, create a vision for change, be prepared for resistance and welcome it, understand who their faculty members are, implement an effective model for teaching and learning, establish credibility, develop an instructor evaluation program, and maintain quality in all faculty development programs.

Panel Report: Exploring Collaborative Opportunities

Panel

Moderator: Brigadier General John S. Kem

Panelist:

Mr. Trong Nguyen, Cooperative Degree Programs, ECU/CP32,
Dr. Steven Schmidt, East Carolina University (ECU)
Dr. Peter Harms, University of Alabama

Presentations and Discussions

The first presenter, Dr. Peter Harms emphasized the opportunity for Army University is to get a handle on what is taking place throughout the institution and avoid redundancies in order to avoid overburdening and stay focused on the vision.

Outside institutions should focus on the following:

1. Have to respond quickly, succinctly, and have elevator pitch ready. Be aware of the consequences of the project. Communicate what the value and benefit of the project is to the Army.
2. Be willing to start small. Be humble and work way up. You must execute and deliver, be on time, adhere to timelines.
3. Once build reputation, rewards start to flow as trust is built. Be prepared for something to be shut down, must be adaptable and flexible. Be accountable for how you spend the money.
4. Never compromise on the rigor of the project. Working with non-scientists, so don't give in to less rigor. Army wants good value for the money.
5. Visualize the data. May see something new in the data and be able to communicate it from another viewpoint.
6. Don't screw up because the research affects policy and decisions that ultimately affects the lives of people. Must verify the data, don't assume it is the 'field' not getting things done.
7. Responsiveness. Army expects you to respond. Leads to credibility.

When working with outside organizations the Army should remember:

1. University and Army bureaucracies breed an ugly child.
2. Universities have to learn how to deal with the Army – so Army must be able to mentor civilian universities in the processes.
3. If research is important for Army University – then they must engage the academic community.
4. Sometimes, research does not move fast. Adjust the number of updates accordingly.

5. Research is not a recipe; it is a search. Adjust the trajectory of plans accordingly.

The second presenter Mr. Trong Nguyen shared. The CP 32 workforce description is 90% veterans, 61% military retirees, and 12% have masters or doctorates. Development and careers of all army civilians. He highlighted two programs on accreditation that is recognized outside the Army. He then listed the key elements for program success.

Precisely identify the competencies of the work force. In order to develop a competent workforce identify and close the gaps. He called this the design model. Closing the gaps is more than going through ADDIE model. He emphasized the importance of establishing relationships outside the walls of the Army. Everything must be a collaborative and mutually beneficial effort with outside accrediting agencies.

His example was East Carolina University, which had an established distant learning program, especially in adult education. They were willing to modify existing courses (8 classes with 875 students). There was a high application rate and high competition rate across the workforce.

Dr. Steven Schmidt, was Mr. Nguyen's partner at Eastern Carolina University. He supported the example and shared his perspective. He noted the importance of course rotation. An online program is not a degree program but it is a continuing education program with options to enroll in master's program. At ECU students use as CPE and some use for the master's program. Courses are practical in nature. There is a focus on real-world application and skill-building focus versus theory. Students choose material based upon personal goals and needs. Tasks are collaborative and require peer assessment.

Universities who wish to develop similar programs should invest in their understanding of military culture and veterans issues. Be very selective about instructors who teach distance learning and select candidates more on their skills in this domain than academic credentials.

Set clear expectations up front is important to maximize enrolment and reduce attrition. The erroneous perception is that online education is easy.

Keep accurate records. The Army wants to know about drop outs. Students sign waivers so ECU can talk directly to a student's organization. .

Primary Theme One – Personalize Learning for Every Student. Learning is dynamic, social, multi-dimensional, event. Technology has come a long ways in promoting – more than a chat session – programs allow face-to-face interaction and continues to improve. Learning styles understanding unique for each student is important in order to incorporate technology and methods for all students. Typical university students are working an average of 30 hours per week. This is certainly true of the Army Student.

Primary Theme Two – Army University Serves Many Audiences. Education and training has a wide umbrella from research to policy to teaching to simulation to the battlefield. We have

some unique requirements – e.g. ammunition research, but in most cases we can learn from and share resources with other top organizations. We must demand the best faculty, staff, recruiting, and content. Focus on credit – yes! We will collaborate with civilian institutions in order to avoid redundancy and avoid overhead burdens, but Army still reserves right to do some of the degree granting and certification when necessary. Army University can assist with reducing barriers.

Implications for Army University

- Army University sees one of its primary missions is to get a handle on the redundant human factors research that is being conducted across the Army.
- On line learning technology has improved to the point that on line learners feel a personal attachment to learning and a sense of community. This offers Army University the opportunity to develop robust on line curriculum.
- The current generation of learners is comfortable with on line learning. It is the Army's current leadership (baby boomers) that have challenges with on line learning.
- Non-Army institutions and individuals want a single point of entry for access into Army research venues.
- There is apprehension among the Army's current education and research partners as to what shape and roles Army University will take in the future. Recommend that Army University take an aggressive marketing strategy to allay the fears of its current stakeholders.
- In its current state Army University has to be prudent as to what missions it accepts at current manning levels. Simply stated Army University cannot be all things to all its current and future constituents.

Conclusion

This proceedings report provides a full account of the Symposium results; however, below are some general take-aways summarized from a synthesis of the panel discussions.

1. Collaboration between the great national university system and the Army Professional Military Education (PME) enterprise currently occurs by happenstance. Several participants noted that both the Army PME enterprise and civilian academic institutions could benefit from increasing public-private partnerships, but the mechanism to formalize this process is lacking. ArmyU's creation offers opportunity to remedy this, but those mechanisms still need to be developed and implemented.
2. The participating Army COE/Schools recognized the role ArmyU will play in better managing the rate of innovation within the Army's PME enterprise. ArmyU will need to help them re-purpose and re-organize their organizations to match the ArmyU institution framework. Army University is all of TRADOC, to include all of its COES/Schools.
3. Participation by several civilian academic institutions lacking traditional relationships, because they are not in close proximity to Army installations, provides the opportunity to expand the impact of the One Army School System to the Reserve and National Guard components in each of the fifty states.
4. Development of education and training programs are subject to the changing demographics of the population that the Army recruits from to meet the conflict exigencies that the Nation faces today and for the foreseeable future. Training and education are important, and faculty and staff development are key to great training and education. However, the must focus must be on the learner; the T&E effort must support learners by adapting to technological changes and an increasing global interconnectivity.
5. The increase of online technology, such as the capacity for video interface and peer-to-peer online dialogue, is drastically changing the way online training and education can be delivered. ArmyU needs to re-think the way the Army PME enterprise incorporate distance learning programs and how to better expand those programs through the One Army School System and across cohorts. The opportunity exists for multi-component and multi-cohort online education opportunities.
6. This event provided a forum for civilian and military PME institutions to develop a better understanding of the full implications of what ArmyU represents. ArmyU must develop a strategic messaging campaign that helps both external and internal stakeholders and communities of interest come to a complete understanding of the reason behind and benefits of the ArmyU.
7. ArmyU needs to move forward in an expeditiously deliberate manner. ArmyU must develop new programs, initiatives, and opportunities, and some regulations and policies will have to adapt to catch up, but ArmyU needs to do this deliberately to account for the risk those policies were emplaced to guard against.

8. ArmyU and civilian industry/academia face challenges in defining credentialing “national standards” that meet the workforce requirements of both the Army and national industries that rely on a credentialed workforce.

9. The private sector is wrestling with credentialing challenges and will be a tremendous partner as the Army moves forward with its credentialing programs. For example, American National Standards Institute (ANSI), promotes and facilitates voluntary consensus standards and conformity assessments. Their work ties directly to the Credential Transparency Initiative (national credential registry fostering “validation” of credentials akin to academic accreditation) as well as the credentialing efforts underway within ArmyU and across the Army Learning Enterprise. On-going private sector work will help to speed the maturation of the Army’s credentialing efforts.

Appendix A: Web Addresses for Full Panel Videos

LTG Brown's Welcome and Opening Remarks (34:50):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yAh7IBy32nE>

BG Kem's Welcome and Opening Remarks (27:02):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tbics-wXHQI>

Innovative Learning Environment Panel (1:31:46):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SMgm9jV-u68>

Nationally Recognized Standards Panel - Part 1 (56:20):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1-qMtRQkyYY>

Nationally Recognized Standards Panel - Part 2 (43:13):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j61SxBVS1iE>

Producing Relevant Curriculum (1:46:10):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gIcTit11j4o>

Develop World Class Faculty Panel (1:21:13):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7Oj0-CpBQk>

Building a Collaborative Exchange (2:11:23):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fS7aiFD5ZGY>

Closing Remarks (27:21)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kyGCsL6A6wE>

Appendix B: After Action Review



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

THE ARMY UNIVERSITY
201 AUGUR AVENUE
FORT LEAVENWORTH KS 66027

ATZL-LS
2016

15 January

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: AFTER ACTION REVIEW for CAC AU Education Symposium - Educating Agile, Adaptive, and Innovative Leaders and Institutions, 01-03 December 2015

An after action review (AAR) is a critical and required step in the process of hosting a conference. An AAR is required for every Army-hosted conference where costs are

\$50,000 or more. The information may influence future decisions about whether to host the conference again. The AAR must be staffed through the command, organization, or activity conference manager, who will provide a copy to the approval authority and OAA via the Army Conference Reporting and Tracking Tool (ACRTT) no later than 25 days after the conference end date. For conferences the Secretary of the Army or the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army approved, a Tier 2 or Tier 3 official will endorse the AAR prior to submission to Office of the Administrative Assistant via ACRTT.

1. Basic Conference Information

Conference Name: Army University Education Symposium - Educating Agile, Adaptive, and Innovative Leaders and Institutions

Dates: 01-03 December 2015

Location: Frontier Conference Center, Fort Leavenworth, KS Hosting Organization: CAC

Name of Approving Authority: Tier-3 Date of Approval: 9/24/2015

2. Benefits and Cost-Benefit Analysis

What was the purpose for holding the conference? Specifically, how did the conference advance the Army's mission?

The purpose of the symposium was to introduce the Academic Community to Army University, host a frank discussion regarding topics which will help shape Army University in the future, develop partnerships and relationships with academic experts, and to set the conditions for the next education symposium in 2016. The symposium advanced the Army's mission by engaging key leaders throughout

academia who can offer alternative perspectives which will enable Army University key leaders to achieve growth and structural goals and milestones.

Did the conference meet that purpose and provide tangible deliverables?

Yes. See the Army University Education Symposium Proceeding Report for further information.

Summarize the outcomes of the conference; provide specific quantifiable results when possible.

Approximately 250 military and non-military attended the symposium in person, and 94 more participated via webcast. Participants represented over 100 different colleges and universities.

The conference was viewed favorably by a majority of the participants (80% viewed as positive via feedback surveys). The symposium came in under budget by nearly \$30,000. Approximately 250 personnel participated in the symposium, approximately 80% of whom were civilian.

Are the benefits of the conference worth the expenditure to host the conference again? Explain why or why not.

Yes. The benefits of the symposium are worth the expenditures to host it again. The opportunity to engage civilian academia from across the United States, at one location was a terrific opportunity to glean a plethora of information on all 5 panels as outlined the after action report.

List tentative dates and location(s) of future proposed conferences, if known.

The second Army University Education Symposium is tentatively planned for late summer 2016 in Kansas City, MO.

3. Follow-On Tasks and Requirements

Did the approval memorandum include any tasker(s), requirement(s), or contingencies that needed to be mitigated? If so, provide the status.

Yes. There was a tasker to complete an after action report. The task is complete.

4. Reporting of Updated Cost and Attendance

Update your previously reported conference information to report estimated actual cost and attendance numbers using ACRTT. If you exceeded the approved estimated cost or attendance numbers by 10 percent or more, you must provide a detailed explanation and proposed method to avoid overages in the future.

5. Certification

I attest that the information in this AAR is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

JOHN S KEM
BG, USA
Provost

Appendix C: After Action Review Notes

Army University Education Symposium (AAR) Notes

Agenda

- Facilitator Introductions: COL Lira
- Opening Remarks: BG Kem / CSM Clowser
- Restated Symposium Task and Purpose: Dr. Quisenberry
- Coordination Topics (Issues/Discussion/Recommendation Format): Vice Chancellor/Provost Staff
- Summary of Outcomes by Panel: Moderators/Rapporteurs
- Discussion about the next symposium: COL Lira, COL Delvaux
- Alibis
- Closing Remarks: VPLS, VPAA, CAC G3, Provost CSM, Provost

AAR Notes:

What follows is a rough transcript of a free flowing AAR discussion which took place on 18 December 2015.

Section I – Administrative and General Comments

1. Develop a database to collect solicitations, contact information and institutional interest items from symposium attendees, uniting it with ArmyU lines of efforts. The medium used to retain this information could be Excel, Microsoft Word, and/or other domain. There are limitations and operational constraints to database collection is the protection of personal identifiable information (PII). Permissions through OMD is a 15-month process to collect public information. Perception of the government collecting information on its citizens is a serious concern.
2. CAC-T conference section intends to develop a symposium/conference standing operating procedure (SOP) to drive all future requirements. CAC requests the symposium closure report and AAR NLT one month from completion of AAR. Symposium closure suspense to CAC o/a 31 January 2015 (winter break alibi).
3. The projected symposium budget was \$89,000, actual costs came to approximately \$67,000. This practice of establishing a ceiling with a margin for overages should carry into future symposiums. Executive service ratios and planning factors provided the foundation and legal review for symposium with O12 funds. Future symposiums should plan to build the O12 dollars into the symposium packet, better facilitating leader engagements and potential socials at the General Officer quarters. ArmyU must establish a policy for honorariums/gifts for panel members for future symposiums.
4. The Army Press' Innovative Learning book was popular among attendees, facilitating discussion between civilian and military educators throughout the symposium.
5. Future events should welcome civilian media outlets, allowing the ArmyU message to reach a greater audience. Local media should receive invitation no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of a future event.

*Invitations and outreach for possible 3QTRFY16 / 4QTRFY16 ArmyU Academic Conference must begin now. Early action could provide greater chance of more attendees from diverse military (Joint Staff, Congressional Fellows, etc.) and educational institutions.

6. The ArmyU lost an opportunity to capitalize on the accolades of our own “World Class Faculty.” Telling the story of our PhDs and professionals did not fall within the scope of the ArmyU problem set during mission analysis. The tour of the Lewis and Clark building, however, demonstrated to the symposium attendees ArmyU’s commitment to education.

7. The overuse of Army vernacular (acronyms and institutional jargon) acted as an obstacle to civilian educators fully comprehending ArmyU’s message. In future events, soldiers must commit to translating language to academia while participating in discussion panels.

8. Communications resources should align with goals. Identify how to operationalize Twitter, Facebook, Webcasts, and live streaming to assist in panels with desired end-state...more information provided early always helps process.

a. Webcasts should continue to be operationally requested vs. locally sourced.
(local sourcing is \$150K /yr)

b. Does the Frontier Conference Center and/or Lewis and Clark require modification in order to facilitate future symposiums? [MAJ Barber provide feedback to K1 o/a 01 February 2015]

9. The professional expertise of the personnel running the symposium should be sustained. MAJ Barber being able to facilitate the last minute Skype call on behalf of Dr. Brookfield was paramount to the panel discussion. Skype could provide the means to garner higher caliber professionals to participate in future symposiums.

10. Future symposium planning should include Garrison representatives to enable educational institutions access to the Installation. Invited visitors should not have to submit MOU/MOAs for events. The installation access list was not forwarded to gate security, and attendees were directed back to the visitor center on the second day.

a. There is a need to identify requirements for International invitees to include timeline for foreign visitor request?

11. The symposium feedback forms were 80% positive, recommend refinement of future survey questions to reduce confusion. Further, online and hard copy surveys should be submitted anonymously, reducing the risk of unauthorized PII dissemination.

12. Online RSVP registration should close a week prior to the symposium. An accurate list is vital to facilitate name tags generation, reservations, and installation access. Future symposium registration should also include a laptop w/ printer in order to facilitate updates over the course of the symposium (i.e. print new name tags). All attendees appreciated welcome packets which included pen, paper, registration, dinner, timeline, and welcome letters.

Section II – Panel Recommendations / Discussion

1. Panel 1 (Innovative Learning Environment): Facilitator should not be afraid to deviate from the script and solicit feedback from the audience. Panel sparked great discussion, though the audience felt there were no new ideas identified. A recommendation was to ask the audience to pass questions to event personnel, who then forward questions to the moderator for answers. A second or concurrent option would be to operationalize Twitter to field questions from the audience. (Twitter was not displayed in order to screen negative comments.)

a. Future Symposium topic recommendations generated by Panel 1 are: What is next for classroom standardization and modernization? How do schools and COEs seek innovation in their classrooms? What is our call for papers criteria? Who is the audience?

b. The intent of future symposiums should not be to solve TRADOC and academia problems at the same time, but should instead focus on one question group. The conference could take “two tracks simultaneously” and break-out panel sessions that appeal to just academics and military (more requirements and resource intensive).

2. Panel 2 (Curriculum Development): Identified that civilian institutions struggle with the same issues regarding building relevant curriculum with general learning outcomes.

3. Panel 3 (Adopting National Standards): Most credentialing opportunities online are not validated and provide no perspective to project readiness. Statistically, 4,000 credentials and certifications are available to Soldiers, 20% having real significance. Stovepipes and shortfalls to credentialing stem from lack of congressional funding due to national regulatory requirements.

a. Credentialing and certification satisfies an industry institutional requirement, which did not meet the interest of academics in attendance.

b. The credentialing process was identified as a great opportunity for transitioning Soldiers. Finally, dialogue between institutions and stakeholders helped to identify quality credentialing institutions.

c. Academics attending panel discussions were concerned about the Army issuing degrees and certification. Universities are concerned with ArmyU's potential to take business away (i.e. Tuition assistance). Messaging should be a balancing act as we move forward in order to promote partnerships and not drive away academia.

4. Panel 4 (World Class Faculty): Establishing a clear faculty model with evaluation is paramount in any successful faculty. Faculty development competencies must have a clear vision, expect resistance, encourage faculty for self-reflection, and continual reevaluation. The Kirk Patrick model may not be a winning model for NCO & Soldier cohorts.

a. Academia is impressed with the military's ease in adjusting standards, governance, and relaying guidance.

b. All institutions should improve messaging when referencing faculty development, recognition, and selection programs.

- c. The panel was seen as too military - lost sight of the intended academic focus.
5. Panel 5 (Collaborative Exchange): Panel morphed into a wrap up. The research panel member was identified as the wrong person for the panel. He was more of an analyst versus researcher which highlighted problems with research partnerships versus promoting research opportunities.

Section III – Closing comments

1. The current system of partnering with civilian institutions was identified as generally working well. Learning institution with access to on-post services do not wish to see changes that would cause them to lose their access.
 - a. There appeared to be a strategic messaging fear from the audience. The collaborative exchange panel created the most requests for information.
2. The ArmyU identity is different depending on the institution's perspective. We need to identify what tackle next...internal reflection? How do we makes things better? Who do we need to bring in for working groups? What is the impact on internal and external audience?
3. Who is doing research? Identify the means to find research information. Which ideas will help create the connective tissue?
4. The symposium was successful in leveraging the full capability of the ArmyU organization. Cross-ArmyU organization collaborative exchange will be crucial as we move forward.