

**Military Strategic Implementation Team**  
**Wednesday, March 19, 2014**  
**B-004, 25 South Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215**

This was the second Military Strategic Implementation Team meeting. Present were:

- Committee Members: Mike Carrell, Richard DeChant, James Favuzzi, Barbara Henry, Brad Myers, Jared Shank
- Ohio Board of Regents Staff: Michelle Blaney, Paula Compton, Katie Giardello, Hideo Tsuchida

When the meeting reconvened after lunch, the working groups provided progress updates.

**Working Group Report Outs**

***Group One (Brad Myers and Karla Mugler)***

This group is doing foundational work. Progress is being made, but not as quickly as group members had originally planned.

***#3. No charge to veterans for the awarding of credit***

The group is currently working through the data that have been gathered. They are also setting up a list of contacts and reaching out to those contacts to get additional information. The plan is to write a proposal that can be used for discussion and to obtain feedback. There is still a need to find a 2-yr representative that is someone in a registrar or academic administration type of role. They have a few referrals. This person will be helping out the work group, but not a member of the implementation team.

***#5. Develop tools to better identify student veterans and servicemembers***

Mr. Brad Myers and Mr. Mike Carrell are working on this area. Strategies need developed for identifying service members for different tracking purposes. There is a need to determine the difference between service members and their family members for the purposes of priority registration. Wisconsin and Arizona are sending information about their systems. It is a requirement of the White House [Principles of Excellence](#) to track service members. The group is seeking feedback from anyone that has a good system.

***#6. Provide priority registration for veterans and servicemembers***

This has been taken care of by the new legislation (House Bill 488).

***#7. Create a veterans-specific appeals process***

The group is talking to people who manage the appeals processes to see if they are confident in how it is managed. The process itself may be fine, but those working with it may not be comfortable. The credit transfer process needs to be set up first and then continue working from there. There is not a need to set up a separate appeals process, but more a need to align existing appeals processes with other working processes.

Issues/Challenges:

- There is a need to find out what kind of money is being discussed when talking about fee application. Some institutions may use fees to justify the amount of manual work. The volume of military work needs to be considered, as well as if this will have a great impact on any institutions' budgets.
- OSU started waiving the credit-by-examination fee for veterans last year. They wanted to encourage veterans to take a test that would evaluate prior learning.
- It is possible that some institutions are charging all students, not just veterans. This may be an important part of the budget process.
- Moving forward technology issues will need to be addressed.
- A question was asked whether any schools still charge for the statewide transfer guarantees.
- Doing a good job on the MTAG process would eliminate the need for many evaluations.
- The group is making progress. There are no major issues that need to be reported.
- Funding could be an issue.
- A question for Mr. Eli Faes: What is the chance of this legislation (HB 488) sailing through and passing?
- Some team members were wondering if there would be any pushback regarding priority registration. The recommendations were grassroots. There hasn't been any pushback to date.
- Mr. Richard DeChant mentioned Tri-C veterans are graduating at twice the rate of the regular student body. There has not been pushback on priority registration because of the success rates there.
- Priority registration is more important for veterans on GI Bill funding for benefit eligibility.

**Group Two** (*Jean Chappell, Joe Law, Jared Shank*)

*#1. Develop a baseline set of standards and procedures for military credit*

Group Two developed a flow chart to illustrate its plans to the full team. This group is preparing to do a survey that seeks to determine which courses are under the highest demand. The survey will need to be sent out and then survey results compiled. The Ohio National Guard and the Ohio Air National Guard have been contacted to get information on their job functions. The group is waiting for a response. Once the results have been gathered, the group will divide up the work. Ms. Karen Dickerson has volunteered her time to help the group. Three specific questions will guide the work: what are service member students bringing to the institutions, how do these courses align to existing statewide articulation agreements, what jobs exist in Ohio where new statewide articulation agreements can be created. Once the group determines what students are bringing into institutions, it will look at potential alignments and then send information to the faculty review panels to determine equivalency.

Issues/Challenges:

- Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) does not distribute its syllabi. There is a possibility that the group may be able to obtain the syllabi locally, but not sure at this time. Minnesota was able to get syllabi from CCAF.
- It is not known what information will be available from American Council on Education (ACE).

- There is a deadline of 80% completion by 2014. This is 80% completion of the goal, which has yet to be defined.
- Cincinnati State Technical and Community College is offering a generic Applied Technology Specialist degree where military credit can be applied toward completion.
- Wright State University has Military Head Start that aligns with certain programs.
- The work of this group is moving along according to schedule. There will be a need for institutions to respond to the survey in a timely manner, and cooperation from the CCAF, Ohio National Guard, and Ohio Air National Guard to stay on schedule.

**Group Three** (Mike Carrell, Barbara Henry, Rick DeChant)

**#4. Create a single point of contact for veterans on campus**

This was mentioned in the legislation. It may have financial ramifications for many schools. The group is adamant that this person should not be the certifying official. A description is needed for what is meant by a single point of contact. The bill might need to be changed if it is not correct. Minnesota [passed a law](#) to [provide an office on campuses](#). The point of contact can be co-located with the certifying official, but definitely not the same person. A good argument for establishing the position is the incoming revenue from service members. Tri-C receives \$1.9 million from the G.I. Bill.

**#8. Develop a new student orientation specifically for military students**

Group Three thought this would be easy. They were surprised to find that only 9 institutions had one. Ms. Katie Giardello will send detailed survey data {from the Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) survey} to Mr. Carrell on the 9 institutions. He will then look for commonalities and establish a baseline. The goal is to collect information and provide a repository for schools who don't want to build their own orientation. There may have been some misinterpretation of the survey question in terms of the orientation being a separate part of an overall orientation (half hour or an hour) or an entire day. The group is looking for information, specific to veterans, not being provided at other orientations.

**Group Four** (Barbara Henry, Mike Carrell, James Funk)

Several things are happening simultaneously within this group.

**#2. Translating experience for college credit appropriately**

Group Four has looked at 3 examples of how institutions are translating military experiences for credits. The examples were from The Ohio State University (OSU), Marion Technical College (MTC), and Bowling Green State University (BGSU). At BGSU, the translating process errs on the side of providing more credits rather than less, while being careful not to post duplicate credits. This group will need to recommend a baseline set of standards and procedures. More examples will be needed to identify commonalities and best practices.

**#10. Facilitate training based on state standards and procedures**

Guidelines will be needed as well as additional work before setting up a meeting with Dr. Patricia Brewer from the ACE. She is very supportive of the regional style trainings.

*#1. Develop a baseline set of standards and procedures for military credit*

Dr. Barbara Henry currently has student workers who are veterans assigned to researching. They looked at Arizona, Minnesota, and Texas for a handbook or documentation. There was not one available. The group would like to obtain guest access to the Minnesota system. The end product will likely be a set of guidelines or a handbook. This section is also mentioned in the legislation. The group needs to set up conference calls or a working meeting.

**For the Good of the Order**

The team requested half an hour on the agenda at the beginning of each meeting to work in their subgroups. The team also agreed that having report outs and discussion is a good format that should be continued for the April meeting. Team members should let Dr. Paula Compton know what discussion points need to be included on the agenda for the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 1:45pm.