



MHEC/MCMC Lumina Funding State Reports

November 11, 2017

Prepared by: Sara Appel

Table of Contents

Lumina Metrics.....	1
Illinois.....	3
Indiana.....	6
Iowa.....	8
Kansas.....	11
Kentucky.....	15
Michigan.....	20
Minnesota*.....	25
Missouri.....	27
Nebraska.....	29
North Dakota.....	32
Ohio.....	37
South Dakota.....	42
Wisconsin.....	47

*The Excel spreadsheet for Minnesota was purposely omitted from this document due to its length.

Lumina MCMC Metrics for Grants

November 11, 2017

LUMINA GRANT METRICS

November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

The purpose of this project is to advance the work of the Multi-State Collaborative on Military Credit (MCMC), a voluntary association of 13 states that seeks to improve the timely completion of postsecondary credentials by military servicemembers, veterans, and their families through addressing barriers to access, participation, and completion. This will be accomplished through a comprehensive review and advancement of effective policy and practice within and among institutions, states, federal agencies, and key not-for-profit organizations. Specifically, the MCMC seeks to: maximize ways for servicemembers and their family members to transition to college; create models for consistent, transparent, and effective awarding of credit for military training and experience that can be scaled regionally and nationally; establish strong partnerships with institutions and organizations for the purpose of promoting their shared interest in military servicemember success; and generate a system for documenting and tracking academic progression of military servicemembers at the state level.

Metric	Status
1. At the conclusion of year one activities, MCMC has fully informed the other three regional compacts about progress made to date and invited the compacts to consider options for partnering in some way with MCMC.	Completed
2. A majority of states (7) have developed a mechanism by which the persistence and graduation rate of servicemembers can be tracked over time. Twelve states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, South Dakota, North Dakota, Ohio and Wisconsin have developed a mechanism by which the persistence and graduation rate of servicemembers can be tracked over time.	Exceeded 
3. *A majority of states (7) have increased the number of servicemembers who graduate with an associate degree by a percent to be determined.	Not achievable at this date due to what we've learned about institutional and state data collection.
4. *A majority of states (7) have increased the number of service members who graduate with a baccalaureate degree by a percent to be determined.	Not achievable at this date due to what we've learned about institutional and state data collection.
5. At least four states have three or more state licensing boards that are willing to accept military training and experience as a way to accelerate progress toward earning a licensure or certificate in accordance with the NGA pilot project or a related federal initiative. Five states: Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin have three or more state licensing boards that are willing to accept military training and experience as a way to accelerate progress toward earning a licensure or certificate thus leading to a smooth transition into the civilian workforce	Exceeded 

Lumina MCMC Metrics for Grants

November 11, 2017

<p>6. Institutions produce and submit analytics that indicate the number of Servicemembers and Veterans who have enrolled in bridge/ accelerated programs or received credit for prior learning. This includes how many credits were accepted and time and money was saved due to these methods of PLA. (Note: Due to data collection submission dates, this information may not be available until January 2018.)</p>	<p>In Progress</p>
<p>7. A majority of states (7) have 2-year and or 4-year institutions that have bridge or accelerated programs for Servicemembers and Veterans which can be accessed via the MCMC Bridge Program Inventory. Eleven states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio and South Dakota have programs in place.</p>	<p>Exceeded</p> 
<p>8. **A majority of states (7) have implemented new or revised postsecondary web sites that contain the consensus core information useful to service members and links to collectively developed tools and resources. Eight states have met this metric: Illinois (http://www.ibhe.org/Veteran/List.asp), Indiana (http://www.learnmoreindiana.org/military/), Ohio (https://www.ohiohighered.org/veterans), Kansas (https://www.kansasregents.org/students/military), South Dakota (https://www.sdbor.edu/student-information/Pages/NG-and-Vet-campus-contacts.aspx), North Dakota (https://www.ndus.edu/students/military-veterans-families/), Michigan (https://micmve.org/), and Minnesota (http://www.minnstate.edu/military/index.html, https://linkvet.custhelp.com/app/home/session/L3RpbWUvMTQ5NDQyMzIxNy9zaWQvTzNtc3FkaW4%3D).</p>	<p>Exceeded</p> 

*Institutions and states have different definitions for “veteran” which significantly skew the data. The Data, Technology and Systems Work Group has reached out to Common Education Data Standards to create a set of commonly agreed upon names, definitions, option sets, and technical specifications for a given selection of data elements. The Association for Institutional Research has also been contacted to help with this issue as well as Student Veterans of America.

**While this metric is marked completed, the Communications and Outreach Work Group is updating their core information which may change some of these websites and add additional ones.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: 11/6/17

State: Illinois

Report submitted by: Amanda Winters

Title: Assistant Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education

Email: winters@ibhe.org

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$ \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$9,651.30

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.
The Illinois state plan has included plans to accumulate three years' worth of state funds from eth project in order to make a substantial contribution to credit articulation projects in one large effort. The first two years of the project were spent in connecting with other state agencies (Illinois Department of Veteran's Affairs, Illinois Community College Board) along with Illinois veterans groups (CAEL veteran efforts, Illinois Joining Forces, Discharged Servicemember Taskforce, Military Prior Learning Assessment Taskforce) to assess the needs around the state and to review student data.
2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.
The state has moved towards a stepped approach based on the data around returning servicemembers in Illinois. The highest need area is law enforcement and criminal justice.
3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.
The project has facilitated better connections between state agencies around veterans issues (Illinois Department of Veteran's Affairs, Illinois Community College Board, Illinois Board of Higher Education, Illinois Student Assistance Commission) along with Illinois veterans groups (CAEL veteran efforts, Illinois Joining Forces, Discharged Servicemember Taskforce). The initiative also led to the development of a statewide taskforce focused on [Military Prior Learning Assessment](#).
4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?
Efforts to focus on this project were sidetracked when the state went through a two year budget impasse. This pressure has been alleviated with the passage of a state budget, but the contraction of institutional resources were severely limited during the impasse. So, while Illinois institutions are committed to better serving veteran populations, they could not commit significant staff time until a budget was passed.
5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?
The current ongoing work is focused on the articulation of military training in the area of criminal justice/law enforcement at three institutions (1 four year university and 2 community colleges). If funding were to continue, we would focus on sharing these articulations across other public

institutions and private college partners. After that point, we would take the process, rubrics, and articulations agreements and apply them to other high priority areas (Human Resources and Transportation/Distribution and Logistics)

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.
The state has coordinated a state Military Prior Learning Assessment taskforce. Pursuant to PA 99-395, the Illinois Board of Higher Education created a Military Prior Learning Assessment (MPLA) Task Force. According to 110 ILCS 205/9.34, the purpose of the Task Force was “to study and make recommendations on how to best effectuate the recognition of military learning for academic credit, industry-recognized credentials, and college degrees through the use of the Prior Learning Assessment.” Results/reports from the Taskforce can be found [here](#). Several institutions are also undergoing a policy audit to insure that their policies are truly veteran friendly.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?
These grant funds provided an opportunity for engagement of a consultant to bring training and policy review to partnering institutions. The funds also provided support for state agency staff to travel to veteran meetings around the state and coordinate with ongoing veteran efforts. Finally, the remainder of the monies will be utilized for faculty stipends at the participating institutions. Faculty will be working directly with military training documents and creating direct articulations.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?
Continued financial support of these efforts would assist in moving articulation forward.
2. How else could we have helped you?
More information around the nuts and bolts work (rubrics, assessment framework, sample articulations etc.) would have been helpful.

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
July 2017	CRJ- articulation planning, kick-off meeting	Springfield, IL	To coordinate with institutional reps from several institutions and create an action plan for CRJ articulations	\$250
Sept 2017	Institutional meeting re: CRJ articulation and policy audit	Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL	JST training, Policy audit/review, review of POI documents and available resources.	Included in Consultant fee
Sept 2017	Institutional meeting re: CRJ articulation and policy audit	Kankakee Community College, Kankakee IL	JST training, Policy audit/review, review of POI documents and available resources.	Included in Consultant fee
October 2017	Institutional meeting re: CRJ	Kaskaskia College, Centralia, IL	JST training, Policy audit/review, review of	Included in

	articulation and policy audit		POI documents and available resources.	Consultant fee
--	-------------------------------	--	--	----------------

Notes: The remaining funds are in the process of being dispersed to the three participating institutions for faculty stipends to support the direct articulation work in the area of criminal justice/law enforcement.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: 10/16/2017

State: Indiana

Report submitted by: Ken Sauer

Title: Senior Associate Commissioner and Chief Academic Officer Email: ksauer@che.in.gov

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000 Amount spent to date: \$17,254.05

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.
 - Many of the objectives in the state plan were met.
2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.
 - Evaluating ACE Military Credit Recommendations Meeting: This meeting accommodated around 75 people in person and through WebEx to learn how to use ACE credit recommendations and see what Kansas, as well as institutions in Indiana are doing to create military bridge programs.
 - Credential Engine: A lot of our focus has gone into entering credentials (including military) into the Credential Engine Registry.
 - Trip to Medical Education Training Campus (METC) in San Antonio, TX.
3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.
 - Indiana MCMC State Leadership Team: Consists of Indiana colleges and universities, National Guard, State Approving Agency, Indiana Board of Nursing, Bowen Center, and state representatives.
 - Connie Beene from Kansas: Attended our ACE Military Credit Recommendations meeting
 - Katie Giardello from Michigan: Partnered together to host session at NISTS about MCMC.
4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?
 - It was difficult to get a lot of representatives to respond to communications and attend in-person meetings. Establishing bridge programs has also been difficult.
5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

- Credential Engine
- ACE Military Credit Recommendations Meeting
- Relationships with other states
- Creation of Military Bridge Programs
- Trip to METC
- Establishment of Indiana MCMC Leadership Team
- Development of LearnMoreIndiana Veterans website

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

- The grant money allowed us to travel for military-related conferences, MCMC meetings, bring staff to Indiana, travel to surrounding states, and host meetings.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

2. How else could we have helped you?

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
Oct 18-20, 2017	Trip to METC	Ken Sauer, Jillian Scholten		
Sept 11, 2017	ACE Military Recommendations Meeting	Indiana MCMC State Leadership Team & others across Indiana	Demonstrate how to use ACE Military Credit tool.	
Mar 6-9, 2017	CCME Conference	Jillian Scholten		
Feb 15-17, 2017	NISTS Conference	Jillian Scholten	Presentation about MCMC	
July 27, 2016	Indiana MCMC Leadership Team Meeting	Indiana MCMC State Leadership Team		

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: October 30, 2017

State: Iowa

Report submitted by: Rachel Boon

Title: Chief Academic Officer

Email: rachel.boon@iowaregents.edu

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$4,468.66

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.
2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.
3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

Partnerships in the state of Iowa MCMC efforts have expanded in the past year beyond the group of community college, Regent university and private college partners in our initial group. We've now added the Education Services Officer of the Iowa National Guard, the Program Director for a state program for veterans called Home Base Iowa and an Iowa Workforce Development staff member who works directly on veteran re-employment efforts. Our hope is that this increases capacity to understand the educational needs of active and separating veterans as well as improve alignment with the job market in the state.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

We continue to run into barriers both internal the colleges and external. Externally, licensing requirements in nursing continue to lack sufficient connection to military training. The state has committed no resources to this work and has reduced resources for colleges and universities overall, so capacity to invest in this work is severely limited.

Internally, faculty resistance to recognizing occupational specialty training (i.e. not what is represented on the JST) is ongoing. Connecting to general education courses has been limited due to college concerns that key theoretical concepts are learned in military training. Statewide solutions are limited due to the varying general education requirements across the state, which has hampered a community college driven initiative to have a Medic-to-LPN bridge program statewide.

Also, some courses are instructional divided differently than the military training, so partial credit may be warranted, but doesn't help a student who will still need to complete the full course. Bridge

courses are the best solution, but not general viable in terms of enrollment numbers. This has been a really hard nut to crack.

5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

Our biggest need is for someone who can devote more time to the work and lead sessions and meetings directly with faculty.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

We have progress on individual campuses and when that gets shared with our cross-institutional group, it sometimes inspires movement in other institutions. It's a slower approach to progress, but one that is organic and perhaps has the best chance of sticking.

When we did use resources to bring together healthcare and criminal justice faculty in spring 2017, the biggest success was spurring conversations that have continued after that initial meeting. The Criminal Justice faculty, for example, realized that individual colleges may have a course here or there that articulates well to MP training, but the most consistent articulation is for major-required internship credits (ranging from 3-6). While many were disappointed that this was the only consistent outcome, it is somewhat encouraging that the faculty continue to meet to align learning outcomes across colleges in core courses and this may eventually lead to additional statewide course articulations.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

Through the grant we've initiated conversations that led to efforts to create or initiate the following:

- statewide community college Medic-to-LPN bridge program
- a private college Medic-to-Paramedic bridge that is being expanded to LPN this year
- Regent universities approving veterans who had deployments with completion of the internationalization graduation requirement
- Multiple colleges awarding communications or leadership credit (graduation requirements in most instances) based on military training or rank
- Use of military occupation and training as required internship credits

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

Based on what we've learned about common veteran career and educational interests at the point of separation, we are proceeding with programs that align to those and existing workforce needs in the future. Primary focus will be on computer science/IT and on supply chain/logistics in the coming year. We believe that alignment with workforce needs with help with making the case to faculty.

A major benefit of the grant work has been access to the work of people and institutions in other states. The members of the steering committee and working groups have been incredibly helpful and often spurred ideas to help us get past some barriers or delays we were experiencing. Without the network of support, this would all make much less progress.

2. How else could we have helped you?

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
11/16/16	Iowa Exec Meeting	Cross-sector leaders, Marshalltown, Iowa	Exec Meeting; planning for spring articulation conf.	\$116.44
1/20/17	Iowa Exec Meeting	Cross-sector leaders, Marshalltown, Iowa	Exec Meeting; planning for spring articulation conf.	\$96
3/6/17	CCME conference	Rachel Boon, Atlanta, GA	Participate in national meeting of military educators, gain best practice information	\$1,768.05
3/10/17	Statewide articulation conf.	University, comm coll, private coll faculty, national experts	Advance military articulations in healthcare fields and criminal justice	\$2,728.89
4/21/17	Iowa Exec Meeting	Cross-sector leaders, Marshalltown, Iowa	Review articulation outcomes; plan for next year	\$220.57

Notes:

Plans for the coming year include expending remaining funds, and carryover funds from prior year in the form of faculty stipends to accelerate the evaluation of equivalencies. There is a broad goal to have some statewide consistency in as many areas as possible. Initial focus for this year will be computer science/IT and supply chain/logistics.

It is also important to note that we had turnover in our statewide leadership of this work in late spring, so there has been a re-set in some approaches, and some shifts in strategy. We anticipate leadership consistency moving forward and hope to create a sustainable process.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: *November 1, 2017*

State: *Kansas*

Report submitted by: *Connie Beene*

Title: *Sr. Director, Adult & Career Technical Education*

Email: *cbeene@ksbor.org*

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: *\$30,000*

Amount spent to date: *\$29,981.02*

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.

When we created the state plan, we didn't have a solid direction or completely formed outcome in mind. The flexibility of MHEC/MCMC staff in working with our state has allowed us to exceed expectations. The biggest challenge is that we don't have staff specifically working just this project.

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

The grant funds leveraged opportunities to convene our military partners with our colleges/universities to advance our work in the creation of bridge programs.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

This grant was (and is) a fantastic vehicle to form new relationships and partnerships, both in and out of our state. Specifically, partners involved in the MCMC-funded military articulation initiative:

- ★ *Kansas Board of Regents*
- ★ *Governor's Military Council*
- ★ *Army University*
- ★ *Kansas Department of Commerce*
- ★ *U.S. Army*
- ★ *Kansas National Guard*
- ★ *Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs Office*
- ★ *Office of The Adjutant General*
- ★ *Ft. Riley, Soldiers for Life Program*

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

- *Sharing of information on our website*
 - *Database should be ready in the spring of 2018*
- *No staff specifically dedicated to this initiative – impedes progress*
 - *Putting more onus on the institutions to begin the process of determining articulation. KBOR then can assist with statewide sharing/convening.*

5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

Not at this time.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

- *The #1 success of this project is the creation of over 75 bridge programs which accelerate a servicemember or veteran's progress to a degree*

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

We have yet to collect data and are just beginning our advertising campaign, but we expect the numbers of military connected students accessing college credit opportunities will greatly increase.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

Just a thank you for all of your work on this project, and support.

2. How else could we have helped you?

MHEC/MCMC has done a super job of supporting the Kansas initiatives!

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
1/29/16	Diesel/auto Tech Articulation	35 faculty, 5 Army & National Guard experts	Determine how outcomes from military training align with program outcomes, and begin the process of building a bridge program	\$4,042.52
4/8/16	Military Police Articulation	40 faculty, 6 Army & National Guard experts	Determine how outcomes from military training align	2,972.44

			with program outcomes, and begin the process of building a bridge program	
5/9/16	KS Collaborative on Military Credit	15 members	Review progress and make recommendations for next steps	\$394.16
5/10/16	MCMC Annual Meeting	2 KBOR staff	Travel to annual meeting	\$251.34
5/16/16	Human Resource Articulation	37 faculty, 4 Army & National Guard experts	Determine how outcomes from military training align with program outcomes, and begin the process of building a bridge program	\$1,361.44
6/20/16	Basic Training Articulation	30 faculty, 4 Army experts, 2 from adjutant general office	Determine how outcomes from military training align with program outcomes, and begin the process of building a bridge program	\$1,510.39
11/29/16	METC Visit	15 healthcare faculty & 3 KBOR staff	Develop a better understanding of the level of training that occurs at METC	\$1,971.68
3/3/17	ACE Military Workshop	100 faculty, ACE staff, faculty reviewers & KBOR staff	Develop a better understand of the process used in making an ACE recommendation	\$28.20 Majority of expenses pd for with Perkins funds
4/11, 5/2, 5/5, 6/20/17	Staff travel to institutions	3 KBOR staff	Assist with articulation creating	\$242.15
9/29/17	Review of 91E	50 faculty, 8 Army & National Guard experts	Determine how outcomes from military training align with program outcomes, and begin the process of building a bridge program	\$0

10/15/17	Advertising		Advertising campaign to direct service members & veterans to website	\$5975/remainder pd for with Perkins funds.
----------	-------------	--	--	---

Notes: Utilized Carl Perkins funds so as to focus MCMC grant funds on expenses other than travel reimbursement.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: November 6, 2017

State: Kentucky

Report submitted by: Melissa Bell

Title: Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs

Email: melissa.bell@ky.gov

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$5,262.16

Lessons Learned

- 1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.**

The original state plan was quite ambitious in terms of both short- and long-term objectives, as well as action steps. The short-term action plan included the following.

Articulation of Academic Credit Work Group

This group will identify promising practices that can facilitate the translation of military training and experience into academic credit leading toward the completion of a certificate or degree program. Specifically, they will:

- Explore ways to increase the use of ACE recommendations.
- Determine how CAEL can assist our campuses in the evaluation of training and experiences.
- Explore the expanded use of DANTES and CLEP.
- Work with campus groups of faculty/staff to develop consistent and transparent equivalencies.
- Collaborate with institutions to maximize the use of the Joint Services Transcript (JST).
- Work with CollegeSource to determine how information available for Transferology can be used with the KnowHow2Transfer.org website to establish and make public equivalencies established between military occupational specialties and academic credit.

Results: Progress was made on all of these goals, although there is still much work to be done. Most of the progress has come in terms of conversations and increasing awareness on our campuses of the importance of credit for prior learning obtained in the military.

The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) hired a recently retired Army major in February 2017 to work full-time on this initiative for a few months. He has visited both community and technical college campuses as well as university campuses to discuss the use of ACE military credit recommendations.

CPE worked with MCMC points of contact at the public institutions to create Guiding Principles for Awarding Military Credit, which was presented to the Council at its November 18, 2016 meeting. These principles serve as the main point of conversation as CPE staff visit the campuses to discuss the use of military credit and other issues related to the transition from the military to postsecondary education.

CPE staff created a template for military credit articulation and worked with the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) to identify course equivalencies to include in the database. KCTCS is currently working with various faculty groups to approve these credit equivalencies.

CPE staff has also requested database entries from the public universities. The plan is for all of these equivalencies to be aggregated and included in a statewide database of credit equivalencies for military credit.

The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has created several new groups of public institution faculty and administrators who will continue to work on articulation of credit issues. Military credit will be a standing agenda item for the General Education Work Group, which consists of chairs of general education committees; the Academic Quality Assurance Work Group, which consists of assessment directors; the Teaching and Learning Group, which consists of teaching and learning center directors; and the Committee on Undergraduate Education, which consists of associate provosts.

Licensure and Certification Work Group

This work group will focus on identifying and establishing accelerated pathways for service members to obtain certification and/or licensure. Specifically, they will:

- Extend the results of the existing national efforts to Kentucky.
- Identify other professional or occupational areas in which service members can translate their military training and experience either directly into a license or third-party industry certification or indirectly by earning credit that will accelerate completion of a one-year or longer certificate or degree program that will lead to a license or industry certification.
- Work with licensing boards and industry associations to realize pathways in the new professional or occupational areas identified.
- Work with institutions on identifying what curricular gaps remain in these pathways and how these gaps might be bridged.

Results: CPE staff attends the monthly Kentucky Veteran's Resource Council in order to assist in the planning and execution of two great ventures for our military community, accelerated licensing and the Bridge program. The accelerated licensing workgroup has completed the analysis of the state's workforce needs which best match the job descriptions of the separating military members. These include: Law Enforcement, Emergency Medical, Nursing, Social Work, HVAC, Plumbers, Physical Therapist, veterinarian technician, tractor trailer driver, and respiratory therapist. Currently, other members of the subcommittee are researching with the appropriate licensing boards on the specific requirements for making accelerated licensing possible. The aim is to complete the research and analysis and present recommendations for regulations/legislation in early 2018. The CPE also reviewed and provided feedback on the initial business plan for the Bridge program, which is a facility planned to be located near Ft Campbell, postured to serve as a one-stop transition facility to fully meet all the needs of every transitioning military member. The Bridge program will also have a unique partnership between Tennessee and Kentucky.

Communications and Outreach Work Group

This group will work to identify policies and procedures that can enhance the ways in which information can be communicated to service members about how their military training and experience can result in progress toward earning a postsecondary certificate, degree, or professional license or certification. Specifically, they will:

- Collaborate with organizations like ACE, AAC&U, NASPA, NAVPA, and the MCMC Communications and Outreach Work Group to ensure that all available information is transmitted in the most efficient way to the service members in Kentucky.
- Work to develop a website to disseminate information to service members. Integrate the work of the MCMC Communication and Outreach Work Group on interactive web-based modules for service members into the Kentucky website.

Results: CPE has created a plan for a statewide postsecondary education website for military students. Funding for this website will be included in CPE's upcoming capital budget request, and funding for permanent staff to lead the initiative will be including in the upcoming operating budget proposal.

Bob King, CPE's president, gave an update to the state congressional Interim Joint Committee on Veterans, Military Affairs, and Public Protection on September 14, 2017, which outlined the CPE's goals to help the military community through by promoting the guiding principles which promotes the use of ACE credit recommendations; highlighting the MOS-course equivalency crosswalk for the KCTCS system, and demonstrating the capabilities of the potential statewide website for military students.

The CPE conducted outreach events to share our desire to assist the military community with the Louisville VA Hospital on September November 3, 2017.

Assessment Work Group

This work group will monitor the progress of the initiative, the service member students of Kentucky, and will help develop the technical infrastructure to accomplish the goals. Specifically, they will:

- Establish the most effective way of determining who the current and former servicemembers are on our campuses.
- Develop the metrics and data processes by which the academic success of our servicemember students will be measured. (e.g. persistence/graduation rates, persistence/graduation rates vs. the general student population, etc.)
- Develop and implement a system assessment scorecard to measure institutional and statewide progress.

Results: All of these goals were accomplished by the inclusion of military active, military veteran, and military connected students (all with common statewide definitions) in the statewide postsecondary Comprehensive Database. Data collection began in summer 2017, and success metrics can be calculated in upcoming semesters.

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

The articulation of military credit conversations has opened up more general conversations about the use of credit for prior learning. This has led CPE to create a goal of a statewide credit for prior learning policy by 2018.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

This grant, and the work that it has initiated, has been helpful in the development of a partnership with the Kentucky Education and Workforce Development and its activities related to helping veterans find employment. It has also helped us form a partnership with the Kentucky Commission on Military Affairs, which is focused on helping the military community achieve their educational goals and ease the transition to life after the military.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

Personnel time and the timing of this project's activities have been the biggest barriers. Kentucky has made a great deal of progress on our military-related initiatives, but we were hampered for much of the initiative because there was no dedicated staff member on this project. Most staff members at CPE work on several major projects at one time. In February 2017, CPE redirected other funding to hire someone to work full-time on a time-limited basis. This helped move the project forward.

CPE would like to conduct a workshop on the use of ACE credit recommendations, but several other statewide workshops had already been planned for the fall. We did not want to overwhelm campus personnel with multiple workshops within a limited amount of time, so we decided not to pursue the military credit workshop this fall.

In short, we plan to continue campus visits, information workshops, and implementation of the guiding principles. But these activities could not be accomplished fully during the time frame of this grant.

5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

Funding for travel is helpful, but there are also other types of expenses related to implementing the action steps. Personnel and technology costs (related to the development of the statewide military credit database and website) are the biggest expenses and grant funding could be helpful in offsetting these types of expenses.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

The Guiding Principles for Awarding Military Credit have been useful as a point of reference for all our conversations with institutions. Campuses have been asked to reference this document, do a self analysis of how closely they follow each guiding principle, and determine what steps need to be taken to fully comply with all principles.

Statewide definitions were created for the following:

- Military active student – student currently serves in the U.S. National Guard, is in the Reserve unit of any branch of the U.S. military, or is on Active Duty in any branch of the U.S. military.
- Military veteran student – student formerly served in the U.S. National Guard, in the Reserve unit of any branch of the U.S. military, or on Active Duty in any branch of the U.S. military and was released under conditions other than dishonorable.
- Military connected student – student’s spouse, parent or guardian serves in the U.S. National Guard, is in the Reserve unit of any branch of the U.S. military, is on Active Duty in any branch of the U.S. military or student is otherwise eligible for any military education benefits via the spouse, parent or guardian.

These definitions were included in the 2017-18 Comprehensive Database Reporting Guidelines for State-Supported Institutions, which means that these students will be identified at each public campus and included in the CPE unit-level database.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

This grant allowed us to focus attention on military students. Although we have had statewide efforts related to adult learners, this grant put a focus specifically on military students that helped institutions focus efforts on a particular subgroup of adults. This made the efforts much more manageable and less overwhelming than looking at the larger population of adult learners.

In addition, the MCMC activities helped CPE participate more fully in statewide conversations led by other state agencies related to accelerated licensure activities. In short, it helped us be a better partner.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

We have discovered, through other initiatives as well as the MCMC, that campus representatives are less likely to prefer face-to-face meetings than they had in the past. They seem to prefer one or two face-to-face meetings, but they appreciate the flexibility of Zoom meetings and phone calls, which eliminates travel time.

In addition, the original committee, comprised mostly of veteran services coordinators, were not necessarily the best points of contact for some of the issues. For instance, articulation of credit is an academic issue, so CPE decided to work with the statewide group of chief academic officers to finalize the guiding principles. Instead of a military-specific assessment group, CPE staff worked with institutional researchers at their annual statewide meeting to operationalize the definitions of military active, military veteran, and military related students, and CPE data staff have been working with campus IR staff to implement the collection of these new data elements on each campus.

2. How else could we have helped you?

This has been a very well-organized and well-managed initiative. Conference calls of the various work groups have been followed up promptly with meeting notes. Relevant national information has been passed on to state leads. The webinars have been very helpful resources at both the state and institutional levels. The only suggestion for any potential funding in the future would be increased flexibility in the use of funds so that states and institutions can use the money to best fit their needs and priorities.

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
May 2016	MCMC Annual Meeting	Incidental travel costs for CPE staff to travel to Chicago, IL on 5/11-5/13	Participate in annual meeting	30.00
February 2017	METC Visit	Travel for two University of Louisville and two community college reps to visit METC (note: one participant never submitted paperwork to be reimbursed so this cost if for three people)	Better understand METC academic offerings and help educate others in KY on articulation of credit issues as well as the possible development of bridge programming	3,037.32
April 2017	KY Student Success Summit	Four military students served on a panel to explain the needs of military students to a group of more than 300 faculty, staff, and administrators	Help institutions understand the unique needs of military students	339.20
June 2017	Michigan Military Credit Conference	CPE staff member attended the conference hosted by Michigan colleagues and discussed findings with KY campus leaders	Help institutions understand the logistics of articulation of military credit	639.67
July 2017	In-state travel to Lexington	CPE staff member travelled to Lexington for an academic affairs planning meeting; represented military student initiative in the planning efforts	Better educate other staff members on military issues and incorporate needs of military students in internal planning efforts	18.80
July 2017	In-state travel Morehead	CPE staff travel for campus visit to Morehead State University to meet with deans, provost, transfer coordinator, admissions staff, registrar, and veteran's coordinator	Moderate military students panel at KY Student Success Summit/Discuss guiding principles, statewide definitions, and other topics related to military students at Morehead State University	85.60
September 2017	In-state travel to Louisville	CPE staff travel to biennial conference of all public university board of regents/trustees	Discuss military student issues with board members	70.40

Notes: The dates are for when the travel occurred, not when it was posted to accounting records. There were several other campus visits (two to Western Kentucky University, one to the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, Northern Kentucky University, and Eastern Kentucky University) that were not charges to this grant. Also note that CPE staff will conduct a campus visit to Murray State University in November.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: November 6, 2017

State: Michigan

Report submitted by: Katherine Giardello

Title: Director, Veteran & Transfer Initiatives

Email: kgiardello@mcca.org

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$30,000

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.

It is important to note that a separate Kresge Foundation grant award to the [Consortium of Michigan Veterans Educators \(CMVE\)](#) spanning 2015-2018 presented many similar objectives to the MCMC project and additional fund support for execution of all Consortia activities in this time period, including dedicated staffing to work toward the objectives of both grant projects.

The original short- and long-term goals set in Michigan's initial state plan for its involvement with the Multi-State Collaborative on Military Credit (MCMC) project have been met. Outcomes for initial stated goals are presented below:

- Michigan will be learning and sharing best or guiding practices on how to help student Veterans be successful in college and beyond.
 - *This objective was met through regular networking between members of the Consortium of Michigan Veterans Educators (CMVE), participation in national dialogues on student veteran success, digital communication sharing, webinars highlighting a variety of success-oriented topics throughout the year, spring regional workshops on student veteran success strategies, and an annual professional development conference. In this grant period, CMVE's listserv expanded from 118 members in Fall 2015 to 198 in October 2017 and, in total, there were approximately 957 (duplicated) participants at 12 virtual and 14 in-person events between 2014-2017.*
- Michigan will work on recruiting of military members to Michigan for college.
 - *CMVE has developed an outreach kit with materials for veterans pursuing postsecondary education in Michigan, continues to enhance its website resources, and strengthened partnerships with strategic collaborators, including the Michigan Veterans Affairs Agency (MVAA) and Michigan Economic Development Corporation's (MEDC) Veteran Talent Attraction Team activities. Through this partnership, CMVE was able to travel with a multi-*

faceted “WhyMichigan?” team to separation events for enlisted service members and officers.

- Michigan will be providing professional development training on articulation of academic credit; data tracking; student Veteran transitions; student Veterans and careers by way of an annual conference and webinars.
 - *These topics were all covered in activities held, both virtually and in-person throughout the duration of this grant period. See below for more specific detail on activities held related to CMVE’s MI-litary Equivalency Project.*
- Michigan will be providing professional development training to institutional staff, faculty and administrators.
 - *In addition to expanding the CMVE network to include educators from a variety of veteran-facing roles becoming active with CMVE-sponsored activities described above, CMVE members have provided training on military-connected student themes, including credit for military experience at a variety of partner organizations events, including the Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (MACRA), Michigan College Access Network (MCAN), Michigan Center for Student Success, and in a variety of on-campus meetings and activities.*
- Michigan will be collecting state level data on student Veterans and providing data reports on specific outcomes.
 - *Michigan’s Center on Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) has been collecting data on military-connected students on an optional basis as part of all public institution’s required state data reporting processes. Discussions are underway to consider moving these data to required fields so the state can evaluate and assess aggregated data on persistence and completion for military-connected students. CMVE also continues to work with the Michigan Veterans Affairs Agency (MVAA) to review data submitted annually by participating institutions as part of their Veteran-Friendly Schools rankings process.*
- Michigan will have easier processes to obtain licensure and certification at the state level, and will have more fast-track programs in place.
 - *Michigan has legislation for veterans from certain military specialties to obtain accelerated licenses for commercial drivers licenses (CDL), emergency medical services personnel, law enforcement, and firefighting. In addition, through CMVE’s MI-litary Equivalency Project many campuses have benefited from hearing more about METC and its emphasis on credentialing as part of military medical training. Campuses are moving forward to become METC degree completion partners, supplying general education courses, often online, to supplement METC’s clinical training. Campuses are also considering execution of collaborative accelerated veterans programming in ongoing dialogue and exploration of other states practices in this area. The program area with the most momentum is nursing and Michigan’s Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA) department has expressed support for this work.*

Additional goals specific to institutional capacity building for military credit awards were created when CMVE's MI-litary Equivalency Project (MEP) launched in October 2016 and all stated goals for that project have been met or continue to be in progress toward completion as presented here:

- Assist institutions in utilizing information available on the Joint Services Transcript (JST) to more directly map American Council on Education (ACE) credit recommendations to their catalogs and develop direct transfer equivalencies.
 - *This was a major thrust of the statewide activities planned for the MI-litary Equivalency Project further described later in this document.*
- Articulate military experience to general education requirements and build equivalencies for Military Occupational Specialties (MOSs)
 - *This work is happening at the campus-level at a number of institutions throughout Michigan and future progress is expected. Progress has primarily been made in healthcare programs, although addition work in business, occupational areas, and criminal justice continues on several campuses.*
- *Showcase developed equivalencies in transfer equivalency databases.*
 - *The final phase of the MEP focuses on campus-level support, including opportunities to include newly developed military credit equivalencies in institutional transfer databases and to consider including these equivalencies in statewide transfer databases currently under development in partnership with the Michigan Veterans Affairs Agency and the state-supported MTN Replacement Project.*

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

The most salient benefits have been increased visibility of the topic of alternative credit, globally, and specifically related to military training and education, particularly as documented on the Joint Services Transcript (JST). There has been tremendous value in bringing educators in a variety of roles related to military credit awards together, both in Michigan and throughout the MHEC region, to compare practices and collectively overcome barriers to awarding direct credit for military experience. It was especially nice to bring some of our institutional representatives to MCMC meetings and activities using MCMC-funded travel stipends.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

MCMC has provided great networking and capacity-building opportunities for both project leaders as well as the institutional participants in both MCMC and MEP programming. Through MCMC connections, CMVE has benefitted from strengthened relationships with Student Veterans of America (SVA), National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), American Council on Education (ACE), the American Legion, Council on Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL), and leaders in this area, both at the state and institutional level and within and outside of the MHEC region. These partnerships have resulted in presentations to the statewide CMVE audience and opportunities for CMVE institutions to engage with these partners to improve service to their military-connected students.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

Without a statewide policy lever, Michigan institutions enjoy considerable autonomy over their local policies and whether or not they will participate in state-level projects. In the case of this project, many institutions willingly came to the table to learn and review promising practices in order to

build capacity but collective progress has been variable and measured against individual institutional priorities making it difficult to provide much detail in outcomes as measured by new military credit awards created as a result of this project.

5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?
Our priorities in this work moving forward are to continue providing professional development and technical assistance support at the institutional-level. To keep the momentum going in Michigan, funding for dedicated staffing and operational costs for convenings and marketing new fast track programs for veterans will be critical.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.
 - a. *Multiple campuses have increased their offering of direct transfer equivalencies for military training experiences, either by awarding direct credit for ACE recommendations or using other forms of PLA to illustrate competencies gained in the military and link these to competencies gained in similar academic programs.*
 - b. *Many campuses are working toward coding ACE credit recommendations commonly found on JST into their transfer credit databases to improve transparency for service members.*
 - c. *Campuses have begun to discuss allowing for credit reciprocity if veterans plan to transfer between institutions.*
 - d. *The following MI-litary Equivalency Project programs supported by this grant provided institutional capacity-building opportunities and have been archived on the [MEP website](#) to make digital resources continuously available as-needed by educators:*
 - i. *10.11.16 @10:30AM-12PM, MI-litary Equivalency Project Kickoff (webinar)*
 - ii. *11.9.16 @ 3-4PM, Building Campus Strategy for the MI-litary Equivalency Project (webinar)*
 - iii. *11.29.16 @1:30-3PM, Talking PLA and Transferability, presented by the Council on Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) (webinar)*
 - iv. *1.26.17 @ 1PM, The ACE Review Process- Insights from MI Faculty (webinar)*
 - v. *4.21.17 @ 10-11AM – Exploring Campus Workflows Around Awarding Direct Credit for JST, featuring Community College of Baltimore County and the University of West Georgia (webinar)*
 - vi. *5.25.17 @ 10-10:30AM – A Closer Look at DSST Exams (webinar)*
 - vii. *6.2.17 @ Jackson College – MI-litary Equivalency Project Campus Planning Seminar, featuring Dr. Patricia Brewer, Midwest Regional Liaison, Center for Education Attainment and Innovation, American Council on Education*
 - viii. *9.26.17 Pre-Conference Program: Military Credit Mapping Summit, featuring staff from American Council on Education (ACE) Translation Exercise and the Defense Health Agency's Medical Education and Training Campus (METC)*
 - e. *In addition to the programs referenced above that were supported by this grant, a [digital resource repository](#) has been developed, largely using materials shared throughout the MCMC network, to provide opportunities for institutions to streamline military credit mapping processes.*

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?
 - a. *While we do not have data to for evidence-based evaluation of outcomes, institutions have shared a number of examples of new credit awards developed as a result of their involvement with CMVE's MI-litary Equivalency Project. The hope, then, is that more student veterans are receiving more direct transfer credit for military training and the continuing*

efforts on-campus to align military competencies with academic programs will result in more transparency and more interest in higher education from military-connected populations.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?
 - a. *We are grateful for the funding and leadership support this project has afforded us in Michigan!*

2. How else could we have helped you?
 - a. *This seems well situated to pursue leadership for big solutions with national partners that could be leveraged by multiple states agreeing to participate, such as a consistent database for military credits awarded from all institutions, either in our region or nationally.*

Specific to 2016-2017 (Grant period: 11/1/16-10/31/17)

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Income: \$10,000 + 2015-2016 Carryforward \$12,442.74 = **\$22,442.74** starting balance for final grant period

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
01/2017	ACE Faculty Reviewer Webinar	Virtual; 60 participants	ACE Staff and ACE Faculty Reviewers from MI Demonstrated Faculty Review Process and Introduced Credit Mapping Concepts	\$1,650.00
02/2017	METC Trip Stipends	METC, Fort Sam Houston, TX; 2 attendees from Michigan	Educator Tour of METC Training Facilities & Curricular Materials	\$800.00
06/1/2017	MEP Campus Planning Seminar	Jackson, MI; 40 participants from 22 institutions	Military Credit Campus Planning Seminar, with ACE facilitation	\$5,057.98
09/26/2017	Military Credit Mapping Summit & 5 th Annual Conference Activities	Lansing, MI; 60 educators from 20+institutions	Military Credit Mapping Summit, with ACE and METC facilitation; networking and professional development conference proceedings	\$11,599.68
Multiple Dates	Travel	Statewide, National travel for project coordinator and invited guest speakers	Ongoing professional development and training opportunities for staff, including bringing subject matter experts to participate in Michigan events	\$3,335.08
			Total Expenditures:	\$22,442.74

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: 11/3/2017

State: Minnesota

Report submitted by: Gina Sobania

Title: Director of Military, Veteran, and Adult Learner Services Email: gina.sobania@minnstate.edu

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$30,242 (includes interest earned from the grant money)

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.
 - a. Most of our objectives in our original state plan were met. We haven't yet been able to determine which factors are creating positive impacts on persistence and graduation rates for military-connected students.
2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.
 - a. Minnesota State was able to have conversations with staff under the Obama Administration. Most recently, Minnesota State had dialogue with the Department of Defense and DANTES regarding access to the ACE database.
3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.
 - a. Minnesota had developed many partnerships prior to the MCMC grant. Those partnership continue and have been enhanced in the past 3 years. Minnesota State is now invited to all Minnesota National Guard's Recruiting and Retention Battalion Recruit Sustainment Programs (RSP) sites. Minnesota State provides college literacy briefs to these new recruits within the Minnesota National Guard.
4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?
 - a. Barriers were access to the ACE database. We have been making progress within the last 2-3 months regarding this issue.
5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?
 - a. N/A.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.
 - a. The grant funds helped Minnesota State to host a Statewide Veterans Conference in October 2016. It had been 10 years since such a conference was held statewide.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?
 - a. These grants made an impact by being able to work with faculty to award credit for military courses and occupations.
 - b. Minnesota State has been able to offer technical assistance and training to other states/systems within and outside MCMC.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

2. How else could we have helped you?

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

SEE ATTACHED EXCEL DOCUMENT.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost

Notes:

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: 11/02/2017

State: Missouri

Report submitted by: James Bonanno

Title: Research Associate, Academic Affairs, Missouri Department of Higher Education

Email: James.Bonanno@dhe.mo.gov

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$20,000

Amount spent to date: \$ 10,000

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed. We have gradually met our objectives or are in progress to do so. Data collection is ongoing. We have allocated funds to institutions that have requested assistance to support programs for veterans, including transition support and degree completion efforts. More military service members today are entering into postsecondary education institutions in Missouri and earning the credentials necessary to be successful and competitive in the workforce.
2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.
We have had success in identifying and expanding common course equivalencies to facilitate transfer and articulation of academic credit, and established key partnerships throughout the state to further military credit initiatives.
3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant. We have developed a positive collaborative relationship with the University of Missouri, in particular its department of military and veterans program, and are in the process of fostering collaborative partnerships with other institutional leaders in our state. Among other benefits, these partnerships help to raise awareness for student-veterans and the challenges they face on Missouri college campuses.
4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them? No significant barriers to-date except that our department was short staffed for several months and now, once again, has a representative to MCMC on the Articulation & Academic Credit taskforce, so that we can continue to collaborate on these important issues.
5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding? We are hopeful that Lumina

continues its generosity in partnership with MCMC. We would recommend that additional sources of grant-funding be identified and pursued to ensure that these successful collaborative efforts continue.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

We have developed key working relationships with institutions in our state to advance the goals established together with MCMC based on its recommendations. In particular, we have helped four key institutions in Missouri develop their veterans and military credit programs: St. Charles Community College; the University of Missouri-Kansas City; Ozarks Technical Community College; State Fair Community College. These funds have been awarded to help military service members entering into postsecondary education institutions earn the credentials necessary to be successful and competitive in the workforce, in many cases, utilizing the skills acquired while in military service.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

The institutions listed below expressed interest in outreach and development of programs for veterans to assist in their transition from military to academic life. Veteran-students often face challenges with the transition to academic life and fall through the cracks. These institutions are able to increase programs and services to prevent this from happening by providing programs to benefit military veterans in our state.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

The recipients of these grants would like to express their gratitude to MCMC for helping to improve the educational experience of military veterans at Missouri institutions of higher learning.

2. How else could we have helped you?

Please continue to keep the Missouri department of Higher Education informed on all the latest developments relating to military credit initiatives. Thank you.

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
06/2017	Veterans Programs	St. Charles Community College	Veterans Outreach initiatives	\$2,500.00
06/2017	Veterans Programs	University of Missouri-KC	Veterans Outreach initiatives	\$2,500.00
06/2017	Veterans Programs	Ozarks Technical College	Veterans Outreach initiatives	\$2,500.00
06/2017	Veterans Programs	State Fair Community College	Veterans Outreach initiatives	\$2,500.00

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: November 6, 2017

State: Nebraska

Report submitted by: Kathleen L. Fimple

Title: Academic Programs Officer

Email: Kathleen.fimple@nebraska.gov

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$20,000

Amount spent to date: \$2,342.06

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.

The objectives were only partially met. Some of the objectives were too ambitious for a state with no staff assigned to MCMC except as an add-on to other duties and with colleges with veterans support offices spread over 75,000 square miles (larger than all of New England). This situation was also influenced by a state mind-set of local control—institutions want the best for veterans but they all have their own way of going about it (albeit some better than others) and are reluctant to change.

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

We have the basis for establishing a state-wide database for information regarding enrollments, completions, etc. for veterans. Since this office has lost 25% of its staff in the last year due to budget cuts, we have been unable to actually create the database.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

This has been a huge learning experience for many of us in the state. I discovered that people in charge of veteran support offices in one institution didn't know about other directors or even were unaware of some of the other offices. Nebraska has several institutions that have been recognized as the #1 institution in the U.S. for military and veterans. The office directors at these institutions have been very supportive, especially Travis Karr at Central Community College.

State Senator Sue Crawford and her office staff were advocates for military support before MCMC and continued to work on advancing that agenda.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

There were many people with good ideas but they were unwilling or unable to take on the implementation of the project ideas. Had the state had a person dedicated to MCMC, even part-time, some of these very good ideas might have become reality.

- Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

There are good ideas with potential on the table that could be initiated with adequate staffing. There is nothing in-progress that would be lost due to the end of the grant.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

- Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

We have raised awareness of veterans’ needs and the supports available. Veterans support office directors have become more connected to others in the state. We have started to compile state-level data that was never before assembled in a single document. We’ve identified bridge programs available in the state.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

- How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

While we were hoping for a more coordinated state-wide effort to improve experiences for military connected students, individual institutions, particularly office directors, have taken the initiative on their own campuses to improve the situations that they felt needed attention and that could reasonably be addressed. (Note: one overly-ambitious objective was to be the catalyst for state-level policy change. Fortunately, individuals took up the challenge to change what they could.)

Other Comments

- Is there anything else you would like to share with us?
Completed several of the metrics identified for the Lumina grant.
- How else could we have helped you?

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
7-18-16	Bridge programs meeting	State capitol; Sen. Crawford and representatives from nine institutions	Identify existing programs and any in development. Educate institutions about programs and benefits and encourage development.	---
3-8-17	Sent survey to determine data collected by each institution and format	Sent by Coordinating Commission to all identified veterans support offices	Determine ability to create database	---

Notes:

Activity costs covered by state in routine staffing budget. Mileage made available to July participants but all declined.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: November 6, 2017

State: North Dakota

Report submitted by: Lisa A. Johnson

Title: Director of Academic Affairs

Email: Lisa A. Johnson

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$26,873.85

Remaining \$3,126.15 will be spent no later than 06-30-2018

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.

The following is the list of North Dakota's original objectives associated with the MCMC:

- a. Active participation in the Articulation of Academic Credit workgroup to consult with the American Council on Education (ACE), the Council of College and Military Educators (CCME), DANTES and College Source to better understand resources for educational institutions and to share that information with ND constituents.
- b. Work with ND admissions staff, records office staff, and education certifying officials to ensure both staff and students are not only aware of resources like the *ACE Military Guide to the Evaluation of Education Experiences* in the Armed Services but also apply credit for military experience(s) when credit is appropriate.
- c. Continued participation in the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) and their work in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA).
- d. Review the top ten Military Occupational Specialty Qualifications (MOSQs) of military members and veterans and mapping military skills and occupations to commonly numbered coursework using the *ACE Guide* and other resources.

Objectives "a" through "c" were met as described above and continue to be addressed in the state. To varying degrees, campuses have begun to examine some of the top MOSQs at their institution and/or emerging programs that are well aligned with the skills and proficiencies of exiting service members. Nearly every institution has added new programs that will be of interest to exiting service members. Recent examples include cybersecurity, data analytics, unmanned aerial systems, and aviation technology management.

Campuses continue to arrange their own training to better utilize the *ACE Military Guide to the Evaluation of Education Experiences* in the Armed Services or contract with individuals

from other North Dakota colleges or universities to conduct similar training at the departmental level.

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

As evidenced in some of the recent applications for campus specific, small grant opportunities, campuses have begun to think about how to support the transition of veterans, service members and their families to civilian and/or campus life. For example, one campus is coordinating opportunities for veterans and service members to network with both military and non-military members in the campus community for the purpose of extending access to childcare outside of formal, scheduled day care hours. Another campus is working with a local equine therapeutic riding program to develop a toolkit to extend therapeutic and transition services to veterans, service members, and their families. Several other equine therapy programs in the state have requested access to the toolkit when it is available.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

Campuses in the state are noticeably more comfortable contacting one another when seeking assistance in locating staff to conduct training that is specific to better serving veterans and service members. At the urging of external stakeholders, legislators, and the State Board of Higher Education, other campuses with significantly smaller military and veteran populations have considered moving to a model of shared services in order to provide greater consistency and improved services to veterans, service members, and their families in light of reduced campus staffing.

The Chancellor of the North Dakota University System included elements of better serving veterans, service members and their families in each campus president's goals. Again, there were noticeable efforts on many campuses as a result of the Chancellor's written inclusion of these expectations at the highest levels of leadership on campus. The MCMC not only prompted this discussion but also served as a means of achieving this expectation with every campus leading and/or participating in statewide funding opportunities, training events, and other activities.

Additionally, the North Dakota University System did utilize a recommendation from a MCMC state that suggested the name of Joe Rasmussen, Veterans Services Coordinator, UW-Madison—who uses the Veterans Educational Benefits Module in PeopleSoft. Joe Rasmussen was an excellent resource to our state. Additionally, Joe has been involved in providing feedback to federal reporting changes. He was able to assure ND MCMC participants that the PeopleSoft module was compatible with pending reporting changes at the federal level and that campuses would be well-positioned when that change occurs.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

Significant Reductions in Staffing

The North Dakota University System has experienced a reduction in force of more than 400 faculty and staff in fiscal year 2016. Another reduction of nearly 400 faculty and staff is expected in the next biennium. This is probably a common scenario across colleges and

universities throughout the U.S. The remaining faculty and staff are noticeably impacted and tasked with assuming the responsibilities of those who are no longer on staff. Aside from promoting efficiencies gained through technological means, it has been difficult to find individuals willing to champion campus level initiatives surrounding increased award of college credit for military training and experience. For now, we are concentrating on the technological improvements and associated training to improve overall efficiency.

Pending Solutions – Support from VISTA Staff

The North Dakota Department of Veterans Affairs was recently granted funds to employ several VISTA staff. The NDUS has been able to utilize the services of at least one VISTA staff to advance common goals between the ND Department of Veterans Affairs and the North Dakota University System (MCMC).

5. *Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?*

The ability of the state to award small grants or mini grants to colleges and universities to facilitate campus specific initiatives has been the most impactful practice to date. This flexibility associated with the MCMC funding enabled the state to move away from large statewide events and to tailor activities to the specific needs of the campus.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.
Previously listed above.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

North Dakota is grateful for the MCMC funds that were able to stimulate campus specific initiatives to better serve veterans, service members, and their families. The funds have been successfully used to raise awareness, conduct training and professional development, and implement a system-wide educational benefits software module to better serve students.

A visit to a Minnesota Veterans Conference in 2016 was particularly helpful to better understand Yellow Ribbon Communities and Organizations. For reference, a good contact was Annette Brechon Kuyper, Director of Military Outreach for the MN Department of Military Affairs. The North Dakota University System would like to see each college/university within the system to become a Yellow Ribbon Organization to complement an established state, regional, and national referral system.

2. How else could we have helped you?

MHEC staff assigned to and working with the MCMC project have all been very responsive to questions and concerns raised by the state.

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
Oct 2017	Campus specific training to implement and refine more advanced features of the PeopleSoft Benefits module	University of North Dakota staff who work with educational benefits	Implementation of the PeopleSoft module	\$2,000
Oct 2017	Partnership with a local equine therapy program to develop a toolkit to serve veterans and service members at NDSU	North Dakota State University staff who work with veterans, NDSU students who are veterans or service members, and the NDSU equine program.	Development of a toolkit to enable existing programs to expand this service to veterans and service members.	\$1,600
Oct 2017	Creation of campus community based network to extend access to child care for NDSU veterans and service members outside of formal day care hours.	North Dakota State University Wellness Center	Organization of at least two networking opportunities.	\$3,500
Oct 2017	Campus specific training for student affairs staff and others to support enrollment, retention, and completion	Mayville State University student affairs staff – open invitation to others to participate.	Evaluation of training will be conducted.	\$1,500

	efforts of the university.			
Oct 2017	Campus specific training to implement and refine more advanced features of the PeopleSoft Benefits module	North Dakota State University staff who work with educational benefits. Open invitation to NDUS staff who work with education certifying officials and business office staff who work with VA benefits.	Implementation of the PeopleSoft module	\$2,350
Oct 2017	Collaborative partnership with a university writing center to encourage veterans and service members to develop personal non-fiction narratives that can be read for the public by the veterans who wrote them.	North Dakota State University and the Red River Valley Writing Project	One or more public event; other campuses have expressed interest in replicating this activity. Demonstrated success in previous years.	\$2,350

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: 6 November 2017

State: OHIO

Report submitted by: Jared Shank

Title: Director of Military & Apprenticeship Initiatives & Special Projects
Jshank@highered.ohio.gov

Email:

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: \$30,000

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.

All but one of the short-term goals were met. The only one that wasn't fully achieved was the potential creation of a "faculty champions" group. However, faculty members have participated in our many trainings and we tap veteran faculty members who are on our statewide faculty panels to help with alignment work regarding MTAGS, so although an official group was created, we still have some faculty champions.

All goals listed in the long-term objectives for 2016 were met and completed. The 2017 goals are all completed, however, the tracking mechanisms, strategies for SAP, and the evaluation matrix are "living" goals. They are regularly being improved and updated.

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

The Ohio HB488 designated single point of contact have established themselves as a new state higher education group. They have been having a couple main meetings each year to discuss issues and then form sub-committees to address those issues. This group has been beneficial in veteran advocacy, not only with academic credit, but with all veteran on campus issues.

I also think our work to better track and identify military/veteran students and track their credit awards has started many other conversations and projects about better data tracking and identification for the general population. The better data tracking has also now been used by some institutions to assist in advocating for a veterans center or lounge on campus.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

The grant helped to strengthen relationships with ACE. We utilized ACE for our regional trainings and again got assistance from them for our train the trainer program. Their work in explaining the ACE faculty review process to our faculty members was extremely important in the overall credit awarding process.

Another major relationship that came out of the grant was all of our work with nursing programs. We have no statewide faculty panels in nursing so all of the work to evaluate military credit really had to start from scratch. The grants funds helped us to identify strong individuals to send to METC and then come back and help facilitate conversations with all of the public institutions that have nursing programs. We have now created nursing working groups to continuing looking at military

training and those members have drafted a position statement recommending that certain nursing program entrance requirements should be waived for military medics. The Ohio Council of ADN education administrators (OCADNEA) has recently approved the position statement language. Next, the Council of Deans for the BSN programs will vote to approve the same language. Once this is done, the document will go out for statewide endorsement. This success and framework for how the nursing work was achieved will likely be utilized again in other broad areas such as leadership and criminal justice. An additional relationship that has been strengthened is our (ODHE) work with the Ohio Department of Veteran Services (ODVS). The best example of this is that many institutions invite the Chancellor of ODHE and the Director of ODVS to come to their campus and have roundtable type discussions with student veterans. These discussions yield great information in regards to what is happening at the ground level and give guidance to other areas where additional work should be pursued. Lastly, our (ODHE) Military Strategic Implementation Team (MSIT) has been reinvigorated because of the MCMC work. The MSIT was formed to help with the implementation of Ohio HB488. However, once that was achieved the group could have disappeared, but that group instead helped to craft our state plan for MCMC and is now our group of champions when it comes to implementing our plan and continually looking for way to assist veterans in higher education.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

The most common barrier encountered on a regular and somewhat ongoing basis is the lack of readily available information regarding military training. The ACE recommendations are not typically questioned by our faculty anymore (was once a barrier, but no longer), however, they often ask for additional information regarding certain outcomes, equipment used, or assessment. Sometimes ACE is able to assist in this area, but not always. Also, the CCAF is worse about this issue because although they have an easy to reference online course catalog, a one or two sentence description of a course is simply not enough to do alignment work with the majority of courses they offer. We have utilized many methods to try to get information with little success. We will continue to try new strategies to get information that is needed.

5. Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

One concern that is starting to get some remedy in some of the workgroups is the lack of information sharing or participation in general. Some workgroup discussion have many people on a call, but very few actually participating. I believe featuring a state or a couple states for updates in each group has been helping this issue.

As for future recommendations, we support the recently drafted document that was pitched to Lumina for the continuation of funding. Essentially, we support anything that continues the mission of MCMC and encourages collaboration among our participating states. An example of this would be to secure funding to continue to have our annual MCMC meeting. Specifically, perhaps there could be funding to support joint initiatives between states.

We have also been encouraged by our work with **nursing programs** in assisting veterans with medical backgrounds. Any potential funding to target broad meta-major type areas such as **leadership, or criminal justice** we feel would also yield valuable progress.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

They directly assisted with being able to host many **training events** regarding military credit. These events were with faculty and staff. Our faculty panels can now review military coursework in a manner as simple as they review coursework from other Ohio institutions. If no statewide guarantee can be agreed on, they have had training to be able to do their own institutional alignment work.

The **train the trainer program** that was created and still used by institutions was a direct result of the grant funding and although it is geared toward Ohio, any state or institution could use our train the trainer program.

The work I mentioned above with our **Nursing programs** is truly only because of the grant. It would have been extremely difficult to coordinate everything that has been done without the financial assistance that the grant has given us.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

There are many successes already listed in our state plan and our state updates. However, the single largest success is the overall creation and acceptance of the **Military Transfer Assurance Guide (MTAG)** course here in Ohio. Due to Ohio HB488 and this grant project, we now have a way that military training can be mapped and attached to other statewide transfer credit guarantees. We also have an electronic system that allows for tracking of that information and for the display of that information for faculty, staff, and students. Once an MTAG is mapped to a statewide guarantee, it is transferable to any of the 36 public institutions in Ohio. This prevents the unnecessary re-evaluation of training and levels the playing field for all of our public institutions.

Also, the position of MCMC manager held by Sara Appel is extremely important to keep funded. Sara has been an amazing resource in helping all of our states, let alone Ohio. It is critical to have an individual who can coordinate the functions of MCMC amongst all the states and Sara excels at that position. Without her and that role, the overall collaborative would likely not be as successful.

2. How else could we have helped you?

Just some suggestions – videotape/film/stream the speakers and the entire MCMC annual meetings. It’s too late now, but the original presentation about Army University would have been a great asset to record, as well as the student panel. This ability (much like the recorded webinars) would be very useful to share around our states and to keep a good record of events and progress.

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost
12/9/2016	ODHE – Military strategic Implementation Team Meeting	Columbus, OH	Discuss SAP, Licensure/certification, and Pathway options that exist in Ohio. Also discussed future pre-deployment GE credit project.	\$215.86
2/8-11/2017	NASPA	Jared Shank /Washington D.C. (presented with Sara Appel and MCMC and presented with Katie Giardello about Ohio and Michigan)	Outreach and Awareness and listening to presentations from around the country regarding military topics in higher education that could potentially be replicated in Ohio.	\$1652.50

4/14-16/2017	CAEL/MCMC Gathering @ METC	Sherrill Smith, Patricia Allen , Houston TX	Learn about military medic programs taught at METC and use their curriculum information to further the credit evaluation process	\$2684.76
4/17/2017	ODHE – Military strategic Implementation Team Meeting	Columbus, OH	Discussed METC trip & plans for nursing gathering, Pre-deployment training, outreach campaign for May, and the results of NVEST report.	\$133.46
5/4-5/2017	MCMC Annual Meeting	Hideo Tsuchida, Jared Shank / Chicago Ill	Give state updates and share knowledge and information	\$935.93
5/19/2017	Nursing Gathering on Military Credit	Held at the Ohio Department of Higher Education Columbus, OH	Explain METC training to nursing programs and provide them with curriculum plans. Then discuss how to move forward.	\$551.53
7-10 /2017	Aligning Medic training to nursing programs	Sherrill Smith, Patricia Allen	Based on May19th meeting, develop strategies for the next meeting (9-21-17) to keep moving forward. Agree to help facilitate the meeting as well as breakout group sessions.	\$2325.96
9/21/2017	Nursing Gathering on Military Credit - 2 nd Meeting	Sherrill Smith, Patricia Allen, Jared Shank, Paula Compton	Created working groups for LPN, AND, & BSN as well as a position statement document	\$0 (embedded in above item)
10/26/2017	Social Media outreach	Jared Shank – Facebook outreach	Use a graphic via social media (Facebook) to encourage service members and veterans to turn in their military transcripts to get college credit. (this will hopefully spur more evaluation across the state)	\$1500 *(see note below)

Notes: *- We have a receipt from Facebook for this charge, but the charge hasn't hit the Pcard, so technically this has yet to be paid. However, it has been scheduled to start "airing" this week through Veterans Day and has been set to exhaust the \$1500.

MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: November 3, 2017

State: South Dakota

Report submitted by: Jay Perry

Title: Assistant VP for Academic Affairs, SD Board of Regents (SD MCMC Coordinator)

Email: jay.perry@sdbor.edu

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000

Amount spent to date: less than \$200

Lessons Learned

1. Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed.

South Dakota initially had four primary goals:

1. Review and revise existing veteran services and credit policies at Regental universities to ensure alignment with national best practices.
2. Review and update institutional websites and Board of Regents website to ensure they provide readily accessible and relevant information to veteran students.
3. Establish metrics and processes for tracking persistence and graduation of service members at South Dakota public universities to better inform future decisions.
4. Identify best practices and strategies for communicating veteran services and credit options to future and current veteran students.

Each of these goals has been met. Additional work continues, including review of prior learning assessment strategies by national experts (goal 1) and the pending launch of communications campaign to better inform students of military credit options at our institutions (goal 4).

As work with the MCMC progressed, an additional goal of creating bridge programs targeted to veterans developed. The resulting programs included articulation agreements with the NSA and Dakota State University (a related agreement with the Army is pending) as well as a military science track within the general studies degree program at the University of South Dakota. The latter degree is intended for veteran students who need an academic credential but are undecided on a specific major.

2. Describe any additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.

During the initial stages of South Dakota's MCMC work we engaged the registrars at each of our six institutions in discussions about prior learning assessment (PLA) as it applied to veteran students.

We initially hoped to find improved processes for PLA to ensure veteran students received all available university credit for competencies established during the students' time in the military. This process led to a more comprehensive review of our PLA policies and practices for all students, not just military students. Improving PLA options for all students has emerged as a system priority due to the initial review conducted with veteran students in mind.

A second additional benefit of our participation in the MCMC is a continually growing interest in improving our services for veteran students. At the outset of our work there was little understanding of the education provided in the military. Now, there is considerable awareness of the military's education pathways and greater support for finding ways to translate that education into college credit. This awareness and understanding has occurred with registrars, provosts, administrators, and faculty.

3. How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity? List any institutions/organizations or people that were active partners with your grant.

Within the South Dakota higher education system, informal partnerships developed between our six institutions on issues related to veteran enrollment and credit transfer. These partnerships included our registrars, veteran service personnel, and faculty. The primary partnership gained internally was increased attention to veteran issues by our Academic Affairs Council (the chief academic officers at our six institutions), the key leaders for implementing meaningful change and policies related to military credit transfer.

Outside of our system, work on the grant fostered additional positive relationships and work on veterans issues. The work on the MCMC allowed our system to engage in additional discussions with state legislators. Legislators were eager to learn about the MCMC which sparked additional conversations and partnerships related to access to education for veterans, including discussions about potential legislation making education in our state more cost effective for veteran students. In addition, South Dakota has a newly created Board of Technical Education that oversees the state's four technical institutes. The work with the MCMC has provided opportunities to share what we have learned with the technical institutes, laying groundwork for future partnerships on veteran and other issues.

Perhaps the greatest benefit in terms of relationships and partnerships has been the interactions between states partnering in the MCMC. A network of colleagues with specialized expertise has emerged, providing options for seeking out assistance from others who have engaged in similar processes. This network is of tremendous value for long-term capacity for change – the work of the MCMC will continue in future years based on these relationship whether or not the organization exists as a formal entity.

4. What were some barriers that you encountered during the project? How did you get over them?

One barrier South Dakota faced was the relative small size of the state. South Dakota was very interested in creating bridge programs that aided veterans transitioning from the military to specific academic programs related to the veteran's military occupation. However, with a 2017 estimated population 865,000 and a higher education system of 36,000 estimated headcount, the volume of veterans in the system is relatively small compared to other MCMC partners. Targeted academic programs must meet established minimums in order to be cost effective. Therefore, creating numerous transition bridge programs did not make sense for South Dakota. Instead, South Dakota focused on programs that could have the broadest impact, including a military sciences track within a bachelor's of general studies program and articulation/bridge programs with the NSA and Army in cyber security through Dakota State University.

Another barrier was the embedded bureaucracy in our system causing an inability to move quickly with policy changes. This bureaucracy is intentional and generally serves positive purposes, but it can limit mobility. South Dakota uses a shared course catalog and shared academic policies among its six public universities. As such, changes at one institution directly impact all of the other institutions. A major policy change for how veteran credits are accepted, for example, must go through review and approval at the institutional level, by the system Academic Affairs Council (and sometimes the system Business Affairs Council), the Council of Presidents, and then the Board of Regents. Because of this process, there are still changes we are making to our processes to benefit veterans that have yet to be finalized.

The last barrier we have faced is one of general ignorance of the high level of education that is provided by military branches. Many faculty members and administrators were initially resistant to finding pathways to provide academic credit for military training until they gained better understanding of the education that occurs in the military. MCMC work provided opportunities to increase awareness on this issues. This is expected to be an ongoing issue; South Dakota and other states need to determine ways to continually educate our personnel.

5. Do you have any needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity? Any recommendations for the next cycle of grant funding?

We do not have any specific needs or concerns. South Dakota has taken a methodical, deliberate approach to making changes that impact our veteran students. That means that we have not spent much of our grant money to date (see answer to **Specific to 2016-2017** for additional information). In our system, various meetings with the key representatives needed to effect change occur regularly (system council meetings, Board of Regents meetings, etc.) so many of the conversations needed were already embedded in our schedules and did not need additional financial assistance. In addition, some of our initial MCMC work was subsumed in state under our broader efforts to increase our educated workforce (statewide education attainment goal). However, after three years of close study, policy changes, implementing our first bridge programs, etc., South Dakota now has areas of funding need so that we can inform veterans of the opportunities available. We are using a portion of our funding to publish handouts that will be available to veterans both on campus and beyond to share information as broadly as possible. We appreciate the leniency in using the funds.

Successes - Tell us how your project was successful.

1. Identify any successes you have as a result of your MHEC/MCMC activity.

1. South Dakota had been tracking veteran student retention and success for several years prior to MCMC work. However, knowledge gained through the MCMC has provided us with better methods of tracking veteran students, more meaningful metrics, and more complete data. We are currently finalizing what will become an annual report detailing our efforts with veteran students.
2. Discussions about how best to utilize prior learning assessment to aid veteran students has turned into a system-wide initiative to improve prior learning assessment for all students.
3. Increased campus awareness of veteran issues and credit transfer challenges has led to continuing dialogue on each campus.
4. Creation of bridge programs and articulation agreements that specifically target military veterans (e.g., University of South Dakota military track within general studies degree, Dakota State agreements on credit articulation with the NSA and Army on cyber security).

Impact - We want to know how the grants are making a difference to the military connected students in your state.

1. How did these grants make an impact or a difference?

1. All honorably discharged veterans have a more efficient pathway to a postsecondary credential through the military science track within the general studies degree. This leads to option leads to faster and cheaper degree completion. Online versions of this program are available, potentially increasing the number of students that could benefit from this program.
2. Policy revisions increasing the allowable amount of credits brought in through prior learning assessment provide veteran students with greater options for credit for military training, potentially decreasing time to degree and expense.
3. Continuing dialogue on best practices in prior learning assessment, as well as recent and upcoming changes in related practices, should lead to an increase in the number of credits awarded prior to enrollment for veteran students.
4. Continued discussion about veteran issues exposes more staff, faculty, and policy makers to the issues faced by veteran students. These discussions have led to substantive change but should continue to lead to more change in the future.

Other Comments

1. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?
The formation of the working groups through MHEC have established a network of contacts that will exist into the future. The work and impact of the grant will continue coming through years due to the professional relationships fostered and the exposure to veterans’ issues.
2. How else could we have helped you?
N/A

Specific to 2016-2017

Please feel free to add additional rows if necessary. If you did not spend any grant funds, please explain why in the notes section.

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	Cost

Notes:

South Dakota has not spent MCMC grant money for three reasons:

1. The way the SD system operates, regular meetings and discussion occur between all six universities through a variety of appointed councils. These meetings have regularly included discussion about issues directly related to the MCMC; however, as the meetings were already budgeted and occurring, there was no need to spend grant money to organize them. In addition, much of our state work of the MCMC has occurred under the umbrella of other initiatives, especially our current priority, a statewide education attainment goal of 65% of workers aged 24-35 having some kind of postsecondary credential. There has been funding available for those efforts already.
2. Our goal has been to make substantive changes to our policies and practices prior to promoting our efforts. We did not want to move forward with policy and practice changes for veteran students just to do something different; since we operate as a unified system with a common catalog and single transcript among six institutions, any substantive change to practice on one campus impacts all campuses.

3. Now that we have formulated multiple approaches to improving pathways to credentials for veteran students, we are ready to publicize the opportunities available to veteran students. Last summer, we utilized a summer intern with a background both in educational policy and graphic design. That intern helped us design brochures and posters as well as website updates that will be used to promote opportunities for veterans. Our intention is to use remaining MCMC funds print and distribute those pieces in the coming weeks (we have a final meeting scheduled to discuss revisions to the print pieces prior to publishing). In addition, we are working with campus personnel to identify professional development opportunities that would benefit their work with veteran students.



MHEC/MCMC State Grants Final Report

Grant Period: November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2017

Date: November 6, 2017

System: University of Wisconsin

Report submitted by: Diane Treis Rusk, Director of Academic Programs and Learning Assessment
Email: dtreirusk@uwsa.edu

Total funds received from MHEC/MCMC: \$30,000 Amount spent to date: \$ 20,288.45 (MCMC Grant Funds) and \$8,000 in UWSA funding

Project Original Goals and Objectives:

The MCMC University of Wisconsin System project goal was to increase military and veteran student capacity to access and engage in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) opportunities, as well as institutional capacity to meet that demand. Project objectives were:

1. UW System Administration (UWSA) and its institutions will have access to information that will facilitate military training and credit evaluation.
2. UW institution faculty and staff will be aware of prior learning evaluation options available to current and former military personnel, and will be able to advise students how to access these services.
3. Students will be able to access, through a central web portal, information regarding all formats of PLA services available to them at UW System institutions.

Lessons Learned, Successes, and Impact

Were your original objectives in your state plan met or changed? If changed, please briefly describe the key challenges, and reasons they developed. What have been project successes and impacts?

Objectives 1 and 2:

Previous to the project UWSA sponsored and delivered several trainings regarding mapping of military training to institutional courses using the ACE Credit recommendations. During the first half of the project we made these resources available to institutional contacts. We adapted ongoing activities to address challenges articulated by institutional credit for prior learning (CPL) coordinators. While the outcome of these activities served to advance our original objectives, the strategies shifted. Here are some examples.

Early in the MCMC project, we received feedback from institutions indicating that understanding of accreditation policies, as they related to PLA and the awarded of CPL, may impact faculty and staff confidence to offer PLA options to current and former military service members. The project lead, in collaboration with MHEC, staff of the Higher Learning Commission, and the MCMC Articulation of Academic Credit Workgroup, co-developed a webinar. The program was presented by staff of the Higher Learning Commission and addressed HLC policy and assumed practices connected to prior learning assessment. The program is archived on the MHEC/MCMC website. Faculty and staff from both the UW and Wisconsin Technical College System institutions are frequently referred to this resource.

In 2015, UW System Administration created resources that UW institutions can use to map military training and American Council for Education (ACE) Credit Recommendations to academic coursework. During the

trainings we realized that the task of mapping credit recommendations to specific academic programs was a large and intensive undertaking, relative to the resources available. Furthermore, a review of credit recommendation equivalencies indicated that ACE credit recommendations do not articulate cleanly to courses available in UW institution catalogs, including general education courses. Much of the CPL granted for military training is focused toward occupational coursework. However, learning acquired through military service often spans formal training and on-the-job experiences that allow the service member to develop and apply additional learning and skills. Finally, in discussions with university students who are Veterans, we found that general education coursework, specifically coursework that is oriented toward building communication and social and behavioral sciences competencies, is often cited as the kind of learning students perceived they acquired during their service and must repeat when returning to college. The insights we heard from students are similar to those describe by the student panel at the MCMC spring 2016 convening. As one UW student put it:

“Here are my life skills. Here are my JSTs. Here are the things that I have done in my career and something I can be evaluated for to get credits [...]. I wanted to take Math courses so I took them. But the speech class? In my last job, I talked to 250 people in a room. I talked to congressmen and generals, and I have to take a course like that in front of recent high school graduates?”

I had to take speech classes in the summer and I was bored because I had done everything. I told him that I should teach it how we do it there [in the Army.] We had to do it and I didn't think about it and just did it. I just got straight A's in the compressed time period. It is kind of a joke for me taking a basic 100 level course. They should have given me credit for it for my 10 years of the service work plus all the leadership schools I have been to.... My program didn't know how to evaluate it.”

Incorporating American Council for Education (ACE) Credit Recommendations into a Prior Learning Assessment by portfolio process may serve as a way to expand the assessment of learning beyond the formal learning outcomes contained (and assessed) by ACE for the formal training. Further, utilizing such a methodology may expand opportunities for veterans to acquire CPL for coursework outside of the occupational area and accelerate the availability of CPL opportunities for Veterans at UW System comprehensive institutions. Currently, nine of the eleven UW comprehensive institutions report offering PLA by portfolio options to students.

As a means to explore and address these challenges, we shifted our focus from training-to-course matching to consider how military training may be used as a component of a more comprehensive and reflective prior learning assessment process, and how we may develop specific academic program pathways. During the 2016 and 2017 MCMC program years, UW-Whitewater, a leader in the assessment of prior learning by portfolio, explored methods to join American Council on Education (ACE) Credit Recommendations to their successful credit for prior learning portfolio process. During the process staff learned that one barrier to Veterans pursuing credit for prior learning by portfolio was that GI benefits could not be used to take the required one-credit portfolio preparation course. UW-Whitewater project staff are in the process of exploring ways to make this course financially accessible to Veterans. Staff are also completing a PLA program guide that may be utilized and interpretable to potential students, and shared with other institutions.

Another primary objective of this project was to increase institutional capacity to develop military training to credit equivalencies. Given the limitation of resources, one attainable way to make an impact is by focusing efforts at institutions that serve a large number of students who are former or current military service members. The UW-Milwaukee academic mapping pilot was implemented during the MCMC 2016 and 2017 project years. As a result of this pilot, UW-Milwaukee project staff completed the following tasks. Specific learning from the project and an example of student resources may be found in Appendix A. In summary, as a result of the project the campus,

1. Implemented a methodology to evaluate military training and ACE Credit Recommendations and map learning competencies to specific degree requirements, applying the method to the B.S. for Information Sciences and Technology. The program enrolls approximately 766 students each year. As well, the mapping of this degree program may open new transfer pathways for students. The B.S. in IST articulates well to associate degree programs offered by technical colleges, and may potentially engage additional students who after completing a the AAS, wish to complete a bachelor degree.
2. Based on the outcome of the evaluation, establish an articulation of military training/ACE Credit Recommendations to degree program requirements for the B.S. for Information Sciences and Technology.
3. Create an articulation / program guide that may be utilized and interpretable to potential students.

Over the next six months, project staff will disseminate information and findings regarding the project to other departments within their institution. Findings of the project were shared with WTCS and UW representatives at the Fall 2017 joint meeting of credit transfer coordinators. In both cases, tools and findings can be adapted for use in relation to other academic programs and institutional settings. As well, staff will be sharing their learning with other MCMC colleagues through a winter webinar that will be coordinate in collaboration with MHEC / MCMC. These communications will be even more important give recent legislation requiring WTCS and UW institutions to accept military training.

Objective 3:

The third objective of the UW System plan indicated students will be able to access, through a central web-portal, information regarding all formats of PLA/CPL services available to them at UW System institutions. Web-based resources will put tools in the hands of student Veterans so they can better understand what PLA formats may be most appropriate to assess their military training and academic and career goals.

During the 2016 and 2017 project year we expanded that goal to include Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) as a partner in the web content development. Though we did not meet our goal to have this information published to the web portal by the end of September 2017, we maintained cross-system collaboration to carry out the following activities.

1. WTCS staff presented information regarding the WTCS prior learning assessment initiatives and program development at the October 2016 annual joint meeting of WTCS and UW System credit transfer coordinators, advisors, and transfer information system contacts.
2. WTCS and UW System staff recruited for and established the PLA for Veterans Web-Resource Workgroup. The Workgroup convened in January of 2017 and was comprised of cross-functional WTCS and UW campus faculty and staff from both System offices, three WTCS districts, both UW doctoral institutions, two UW comprehensives, UW Colleges, and UW-Extension.
3. UW MCMC project staff completed an inventory of WTCS and UW public facing web-based resources. The inventory was shared with workgroup members.
4. The Workgroup established a framework to guide web-content and resource development that included the following principles:
 - a. Consider timing and point of contact the student Veteran will have with the information, understanding that the point of contact may not be at one of our institutions.
 - b. Promote student fluency around the topic of CPL by including a glossary of definitions.
 - c. Promote student competencies so that after reviewing materials the student has sufficient knowledge and abilities to make enrollment decisions; choices about the CPL format that is most appropriate for them given their academic and career goals; and access CPL opportunities.
 - d. Consider the responsibilities of institutions of higher education when communicating information regarding CPL to students.

- e. Consider the potential academic/military/career pathways a student Veteran may take, and communicate appropriate information.

UW and WTCS system office staff in the summer and fall of 2017. Staff with expertise in the areas of Veterans services, prior learning assessment, and student advising, applied the principles established by the web-content team to develop a set of questions that will be the focus of a Q&A student guide. As referenced above, one element of change impacting our communication and outreach objectives was been the summer/fall passage of Act 59. Provisions within ACT 59 require that all UW and WTCS institutions review Joint Service Transcripts and Community College of the Air Force transcripts and award credit based on ACE credit recommendations. Because we know that the value of the credit award is dependent on the degree to which the credit is applicable to the program of study, the student guide will focus on all formats of prior learning assessment. The set of the student guide questions may be found in Appendix B.

Though nine of the eleven UW comprehensive institutions report offering PLA by portfolio options to students, and at least one-half of all WTCS districts offer CPL options, discussions with various stakeholder groups revealed that more staff communications are needed to generate greater awareness of PLA and CPL. To aid in the communications, the UW System MCMC project lead presented keynote at the Wisconsin Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (WACRAO) Veterans Conference. Participants represented both private and public IHEs.

**Additional benefits in terms of outcomes, beyond the original proposed goals or activities.
How did the grant help you form new relationships, partnerships or build capacity?**

One challenge experienced was that the work was limited to the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) within the UW System. Working with our counterparts at the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS), we've compared our MCMC project objectives to WTCS CPL goals. We've identified common objectives relative to web-based resources and possible areas for academic program collaboration, anticipating student transfer. As well WTCS representatives are now serving on MCMC workgroups. Cross-system discussions have served to maintain project momentum that we believe will persist beyond the grant period.

A list of organizations and people that were active partners with this grant, may be found in Appendix C.

Do you have any outstanding needs or concerns pertaining to this granting activity?

The unencumbered project balance is \$9,711.55. We understand that we may retain these funds to complete the work of our project. We intend to expend these funds as follow:

- \$1,711.55 – completion of the Q&A student resource, and web content
- \$8,000.00 – professional development in the area of prior learning assessment for Veteran student populations so as to support compliance with new statutory requirements.

Expenditures Specific to 2016-2017 Funding Year

Date	Activity	Participants/Location	Goals/Metrics of the Activity	MCMC Cost	UWSA Cost
11/1/2016-10/31/2017	Institutional military training assessment pilots	UW-Milwaukee UW-Whitewater	See narrative for goals and deliverables	\$20,000.00	\$8,000.00
May 2017	Travel to MCMC Spring Meeting	Dennis Rhodes MSN to ORD	Ground Transportation to Chicago	\$30.00	
July 2017	Mapping Consultation	Diane Treis Rusk MSN to UW-	Travel - UW System MCMC project lead	\$103.28	

		Milwaukee	provided consultation to UW-Milwaukee staff regarding use of the ACE Military guide and mapping.		
July 2017	WACRAO Veterans Conference Presentation	La Crosse Wisconsin – staff from UW, WTCS, and Wisconsin private institutions	Provided a CPL / PLA primer to conference attendees	\$155.17	
Total 16-17				\$20,288.45	\$8,000.00