

May 2019  
Issue 3 Volume II

Quarterly Newsletter from the  
Directorate of Academic Affairs  
at The Army University

# THE CHALKBOARD



## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Online Course Evaluations  
PG. 2

Army Management Staff  
College-Senior Leader Seminar  
PG. 3

Mid-grade Learning Continuum  
PG. 4

Microlearning in the Military  
PG. 5

The Revised Bloom's Taxonomy  
PG. 6

FDRP Deadlines  
PG. 7

Beyond a Learner-Centric  
Approach  
PG. 8

Civilian AIB Lapel Pin  
PG. 9



Photo By: Staff Sgt. Jim Heuston

## Getting Students to Take ONLINE Course Evaluations

Dr. Vista Bealsey  
ArmyU

Does your school still use paper for course evaluations? In our last article, we presented examples of the benefits of using online survey software instead of paper for course evaluations. Despite these benefits, some schools still rely on paper administrations. One of the reasons that schools still use paper is due to a fear that students will be less likely to complete the online course evaluations. To help, we have sifted through research to identify ways to increase the number of students who complete the online form of course evaluations.

The best response rate for online course evaluations is obtained when the course schedule includes class time to complete the course evaluation. If there are computers in the classroom, students may use those to complete the evaluation. If not, the class session can be scheduled in a campus computer room, library, or other base facility that has computers with internet connectivity. Alternatively, the instructor can release the student for 20 minutes to complete the course evaluation using a device with internet connectivity (e.g., cell phone, personal laptop).

Perhaps you're wondering, "Course evaluations are anonymous, so how will I know if the student did it during the time I gave them to do it?" The online surveys can be set up so that the instructor, or the person with access to the online software, can quickly see which students did or not complete the course eval. This can be set up in a way that the instructor is able to see whether students completed the survey, yet not see which student provided specific answers.

Of course, per DOD policy, it's not mandatory that students complete a course

evaluation. Therefore, we recommend requiring students to access the online course evaluation. You can set it up so they're given the option to mark that they don't wish to take the survey. This way, you can still see which students completed the course eval, either by answering the items, or by declining to do so.

Research suggests that one of the most powerful ways to increase response rates on online course evaluations is to give students examples of how student feedback from past course evaluations actually resulted in positive changes. For example, prior to asking students to complete the course eval, say "We learned from the survey that students didn't like this [specify], so the following year, we changed that, and that's why you don't have to do that today." Knowing concrete actions have been taken as a result of student feedback increases the likelihood of students giving feedback.

IRAD personnel have more recommendations for how to increase your response rate on online course evaluations. If you would like to brainstorm solutions customized to your situation, please contact Dr. Sena Garven, IRAD Chief, [alice.j.garven.civ@mail.mil](mailto:alice.j.garven.civ@mail.mil).



Photo By: SGT Connie Jones

## Army Management Staff College Senior Leader Seminar

Mr. Romuald Stone  
AMSC

The Army Management Staff Colleges hosts a senior leader seminar four times each year. The Continuing Education for Senior Leaders (CESL) course is a 4 ½ day resident experience offered at the Army Management Staff College's Fort Leavenworth Campus. CESL is offered to Army Civilians in the grades GS14/15, Lieutenant Colonels and above, Chief Warrant Officers 4 and 5, and Command Sergeants Major who supervise Army Civilian supervisors and managers.

We typically see only a few uniformed members attend this course. We would like to invite more qualified military officers and Command Sergeants Major to attend the course. The class size is typically 64 students. Our Army Civilian Corps members greatly appreciate and want to see more military leaders in the course.

The course is designed to give senior civilian leaders an Executive Enterprise education and training experience required to enable effective Enterprise

leadership. The learning outcomes of CESL include:

- 1) Improve student understanding of the contemporary operating environment to include current and anticipated Army strategic level challenges, issues and priorities.
- 2) Broaden student understanding of how to manage strategic direction, lead and implement change.

To achieve these outcomes, students participate in a Strategic Leadership Seminar facilitated by private sector facilitators. CESL also provides a forum for distinguished senior leaders to discuss their views on issues of importance to the Army and our students as well as broaden student understanding of how to think strategically and lead fundamental change within their organizations. To register please visit <https://www.atrrs.army.mil/channels/chrtas/>

Photo By: William Costello



“ The course is designed to give senior civilian leaders an Executive/ Enterprise education and training experience required to enable effective Enterprise leadership.”



## **Mid-grade Learning Continuum**

MAJ Jason Reed  
ArmyU

The Mid-grade Learning Continuum (MLC) team within the Instructional Design Division (IDD) hosted its second annual MLC Course Leaders Workshop at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas from April 16-18, 2019. The purpose of the workshop was to provide an opportunity for course leaders to discuss the development and implementation of the common core curriculum in the Captains Career Courses (CCC) and Warrant Officer Advanced Course (WOAC). Twenty Soldiers and Civilians from seventeen different branch schools participated in this three-day event designed to share effective CCC and WOAC course management techniques across all schools. The workshop included: a curriculum overview of FY20 AC and RC common core, MLC knowledge management on MilBook, a writing rubric calibration exercise, a discussion of learning management systems/VERINT survey, updates from Combined Arms Doctrine Directorate (CADD), GRE administration and funding updates, as well as, an academic standards and rigor presentation.

During the workshop, the course leaders also received presentations on integrating special topics of interest from Army Space and Missile Defense School (D3SOE) and Army Cyber Operations

Training strategies (ACOTs), Captain's Cognitive Self-Assessment Battery (CCSAB) overview from the Institutional Research and Assessment Division (IRAD), and an update on the RC-CCC common core residency phase from the MLC program manager. Also, the group had the opportunity to listen to Dr. Jim Martin (Chief Academic Officer, ArmyU and Dean, Command and General Staff College), COL Paul Berg (Director, Directorate of Academic Affairs, ArmyU), and COL Rob Ault (Director, Command and General Staff School, CGSS); all three highlighted the importance of education at CCC and WOAC and shared their appreciation for all the work the course leaders were doing at their respective schools. The MLC team is looking forward to hosting the next MLC Course Leaders Workshop in April, 2020.

Next Up - MLC Curriculum Workshops: IDD will facilitate the next series of workshops at Fort Gordon (10-12 SEP 19) and Fort Lee (10-12 DEC 19). These workshops are focused specifically on MLC FY 20 curriculum and open to all MLC instructors.

If you are not located at one of the listed locations and would like to attend, please contact MAJ Jason Reed at [jason.g.reed2@mail.mil](mailto:jason.g.reed2@mail.mil).

## **Microlearning in the Military**

Dr. Amanda Goyeneche Theus  
FCoE

Have you ever used YouTube to teach yourself anything? Chances are, you said yes to this question. If so, you may contribute to the 5 billion hours of YouTube watched daily.<sup>1</sup> Although there are a multitude of reasons YouTube's success has improved exponentially in recent years, the drive for a different type of learning rests at heart of adult learning principles; learning that is brief, clear, and accessible right at the time of need. Microlearning is a current buzz word within educational communities and has recently made its way into the military learning lexicon.

What? Microlearning is coined as "bite-sized" learning and typically delivered through videos, self-paced e-learning, and visuals/infographics.<sup>2</sup> The principles of microlearning are actually not a novel concept within academia or the military. Best practices among instructional design and curriculum development exists on the premise that instruction is "chunked" and sequenced according to the student and the intended objective. The military frequently uses "just in time" (JIT) training to adapt to the ever changing operational environment as well as updated technology and equipment.<sup>3</sup> Similar to JIT training, microlearning teaches "digestible" chunks of information that are relevant, concise, and targeted for a specific audience.

Who? One benefit of microlearning is that anyone can gain knowledge from it; hence the success of YouTube instructional videos across generations and skill levels. Typical users of this methodology span across industry, public education, and the military. Microlearning often begins life as job aids, created for and by professionals out of direct need. As a result, dynamic professions are ideal for employing this method of learning within professional development.

When? Most research supports microlearning as supplementary education versus replacement of formal education due to the brevity of the material. The challenge of implementing microlearning thus lies within determining the necessary critical content. For highly

technical courses that require intensive instruction of threshold concepts or complicated schematics, microlearning becomes a great reach back resource for professionals staying abreast of innovative advancements. Essentially providing a way to "restructure" the cognitive folders in the brain rather than creating brand new ones.

How? Optimal learning occurs when students are provided motivating, practical, and relevant instruction. In the case of microlearning, the use of interactive visuals or media to deliver instruction leads to the type of retention that microlearning is selling. Infographics and short tutorials can help mitigate for saturation of dense material and ease the cognitive load of learners. It is why many individuals may transfer more knowledge from a ten minute YouTube video than eight hours of a face to face class.

Why? In a modern workforce that is highly concerned with increasing readiness on a daily basis, identifying possible efficiencies is critical. Microlearning is an approach to hit a moving target because it encompasses the ideals of adult learning while remaining agile and adjustable to a changing military population. There are always implications for learning that must be mitigated but the benefits of resources saved and the adaptability of microlearning makes the reward worth the risk.

### References

1. YouTube by the Numbers. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/yt/about/press/>
2. Cole, M. (2018, December 05). Just How Micro Is Microlearning? Retrieved from <https://www.td.org/insights/just-how-micro-is-microlearning>
3. Iannarelli, B. (2009). Just-in-Time Training (JITT) and its Implications for Teaching and Learning. Encyclopedia of Distance Learning, Second Edition, 1297-1305. doi:10.4018/978-1-60566-198-8.ch186

## Bloom's Taxonomy and the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Dr. Harold A. Laurence, IV  
ArmyU

When Army curriculum developers and teachers create curriculum or teach students, they will have a desired learning goal in mind. To achieve coordination between what content we write, what we want students to learn, and how we assess them a learning objective is created as the target. Part of this process includes a specification of not just what we want students to learn but also at what level of cognitive complexity we want them to know it. We need a common language to express the cognitive complexity level. Two primary methods are commonly used to provide specificity for cognitive complexity, either the original Bloom's Taxonomy published in 1956, or the Revised Bloom's published in 2001 (see book references listed below).

The original Bloom's Taxonomy was developed to serve as a common language for educators to use when communicating what cognitive complexity level they desired for their students to achieve. It was also intended to help writers of curriculum to coordinate the connection between the learning goal, the activities used in teaching, and the assessment of learning that occurred. The original Bloom's is laid out in a linear and cumulative list of six levels. It is cumulative in the sense that Bloom posited that a learner needs to achieve the lower levels before they can grasp the next higher level. The six levels are Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation.

The Revised Bloom's was published 45 years later with some new perspectives. The emphasis shifted from the original focus on higher education toward the secondary school level to make it, "more useful for all teachers." Another intent was to make the taxonomy clearer and easier to use for the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Whether they accomplished this goal is a matter of some debate. Krathwohl describes the revised taxonomy as a two dimensional method of locating the intended learning level, although it may appear to some as better

described as a three dimensional spatial matrix. The three dimensions being the Knowledge dimension (with 4 levels), the Cognitive Process dimension (with 6 levels) and the Specific Cognitive Process Level (with anywhere from 2 to 7 levels). Because the authors describe their taxonomy as having only two dimensions we will limit our discussion to the first two. Laying out a 4 by 6 table, Krathwohl encourages educators to locate their objectives, learning activities, and assessments visually by filling them into cells in the table. By doing so the educator can clearly see whether there is a correlation between the three elements and possibly note some blank areas of the table where there may be opportunities for additional learning.

Why is any of this important? As we seek to clarify the content, activities, and assessments we use across the Army learning enterprise using a taxonomy to define our desired outcomes is highly valuable. The cognitive learning level can be specified using either the 1956 or the 2001 version of the taxonomy. The 1956 is simpler and requires only one dimension to specify. The 2002 version is more complex and will require two (or possibly three) dimensions to exactly specify the desired cognitive learning level.

### References:

1. Bloom, Benjamin S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of Education Objectives: Book 1 Cognitive Domain*. New York: Longman.
2. Anderson, Lorin W. & Krathwohl, David R. (Eds.). (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.

## **FDRP Deadlines**

SFC Randall Provost  
ArmyU

Congratulations to the over 2,500 faculty members from all cohorts and components who have earned the Army Instructor Badge (AIB)! Those interested in pursuing the AIB after the end of the transition period (May 2, 2019) may still do so. The Army University's Faculty and Staff Development Division (FSDD) has posted key information online at our FDRP milBook page and SharePoint.

As you all may know, May 2, 2018 brought the transition period from the previous Instructor Development and Recognition Program (IDRP) to the current Faculty Development and Recognition Program (FDRP). Individuals who were previously assigned to instructor billets could apply their certified Primary Instructor hours earned since July 10, 2013 towards the FDRP in future assignments. Instructors who participated in the IDRP

or served in instructor positions had until May 2, 2019 to utilize their primary instructing hours towards earning the various levels of the Army Instructor Badges (AIB). Now that the grace period has passed, only hours and time that have been accrued from May 2, 2018 are eligible for use toward FDRP. Civilians can earn and wear U.S. Army Civilian Instructor Lapel Pin. However, we are waiting on a vendor to produce the lapel pin for purchase. Army University will post information to the FDRP MilBook when the Civilian Lapel Pin has been produced. The recently updated Army Regulation 600-8-22 dated March 5, 2019 can provide you with additional guidance.

Please feel free to ask questions about these changes to our organizational e-mail below. [usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-fsdd-policy@mail.mil](mailto:usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-fsdd-policy@mail.mil)

## **Army University Managing of United Services Military Apprenticeship Program**

Dr. Robert Henry  
ArmyU

On 1 June 2019, The Army University takes over as the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for the Army's United Services Military Apprenticeship Program (USMAP). The apprenticeship program's objective is to provide a registered certification of training. This includes on-the-job training of military service members to achieve recognition for service that is equal to their civilian counterparts. USMAP provides service members of the Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, and Army with a streamlined ability to identify and register for apprenticeships. Apprenticeships are formalized structured training programs that combine MOS training with 2,000 to 8,000 work hours of on-the-job training (OJT). The Department of Labor (DOL) establishes the standards for national apprenticeship and provides a nationally recognized certificate of completion. Overall, the program improves Soldier readiness by verifying skill development within their occupational specialties and awarding a nationally recognized certificate. The work certificate may enhance employment opportunities for

military veterans. The program is no cost to Soldiers and provides documented work experience.

Army University (ArmyU) is a direct administrative liaison for centers and schools to update USMAP. Centers and schools have the ability to directly influence MOS apprenticeships selected through ArmyU. Schools will be able to assess the appropriate apprenticeship program for Soldiers in their branch by using the MOS qualification course and duties. These apprenticeships can then be loaded for Soldiers to select on USMAP site.

The Department of Academic Affairs (DAA) at Army University will administer the Army portion of the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program. The DAA POC for apprenticeships is [USARMY Ft Leavenworth CAC Mailbox ArmyU-CRED](mailto:USARMY.FtLeavenworthCACMailboxArmyU-CRED). For more information on USMAP or to register for an apprenticeship please visit [United Services Military Apprenticeship Program](#).



## **Beyond a Learner-Centric Approach—to Learner-Led (LED) in Army Classrooms**

Ms. Brittany Crawley  
ArmyU

Learner-centric and learner-led, while similar methods of learning, are distinctive approaches to learning and education in the classroom. The Army adopted the Army Learning Model (ALM), originally published in January 2011, in an effort to promote a more learner-centered approach to training and education across the Army enterprise. Essentially, the model advocates converting most Army classroom environments into collaborative, problem-solving settings—that radically reduces the use of slide presentations and lectures—led by expert facilitators. Although this method has been effective, the need for students to be more active in their learning still generates debate about students' ultimate readiness upon leaving the classroom.

The learner-centric approach enables learning to be focused and tailored around the student, but it doesn't necessarily encompass active and experiential learning in all cases. This is because much of the learning in classroom settings still requires a facilitator (instructor) to lead classroom learning activities. While effective facilitation methods are critical in learning environments, instructor-led learning can limit the students' access to experiential and practical learning, thereby creating a loss of opportunities for transfer of learning. To empower meaningful learning, prominent adult learning theorists such as Malcolm Knowles and David Kolb suggest that adults learn from their experiences, by taking ownership and self-direction in their learning, and by doing.

The term LED (learner-led approaches in higher education) was introduced in the research article *Learning, Leading and Letting Go of Control: Learner-Led Approaches in Education* (Iversen, Pedersen, Krogh, & Jensen, 2015). As described in the article, LED is the process by which students themselves facilitate their own learning—deciding on the content and format, taking more responsibility for teaching activities and lectures—and collaborating with facilitators. LED is characterized by learners being involved in the design process of instructing, self-directing research, co-creating new ideas and innovative ways to teach, and actually teaching in the classroom.

For example, initial entry students at the Defense Information School are required to research emerging technology in the broadcast industry. Once the students conduct the research, they have to teach their classmates

about what they've learned and how it is important to their job. Students are encouraged by the instructor to relate the things they will learn in class to the emerging technology that they may possibly use in the future. Hence, through a learner-led approach, "meaningful learning" is commenced and accomplished by the learner. Subsequently, facilitators must be open to adjusting content based on students' needs and proposals. "Educational research indicates that the more learners find instruction meaningful, engaging, and relevant, the more they truly learn. This means that learning goals for education must also aim to make students capable of searching for knowledge, of selecting, analyzing, and evaluating findings against criteria and standards..." (Iversen, Pedersen, Krogh, & Jensen, 2015).

The learner-led approach enhances the opportunity to change learner behaviors and attitudes and shifts more accountability of learning to the learner. The key principle for LED is that knowledge construction is in sync with students' experience of meaningfulness, within the context of prescribed educational goals. Thus, a key concept for facilitators to understand is that it is critical to provide a frame of reference for learners (including an assessment that is aligned with course goals). The most critical aspect for the learner-led approach is understanding the student has a more dynamic role. Therefore, this approach will require facilitators to eliminate routine agendas and merely guide the process of learners seeking knowledge for themselves. To encourage a more rigorous and evocative learning experience—one that will render adaptive leaders and sustained adaptation—then students will need to do more leading in their learning. Any questions or additional discussion about LED, please contact Ms. Brittany Crawley at [Brittany.r.crawley.civ@mail.mil](mailto:Brittany.r.crawley.civ@mail.mil)

### References:

1. TP 350-70-14, *Training and Education in Support of the Institutional Domain*. 27 March 2015.
2. Iversen, A., Pedersen, A. S., Krogh, L., & Jensen, A. A. (2015). *Learning, Leading, and Letting Go of Control*. SAGE Open, 5(4), 215824401560842. doi:10.1177/2158244015608423



## **Civilian AIB Lapel Pin**

SFC Robert Lovell

ArmyU

The Faculty Development & Recognition Program (FDRP) recognizes excellence in our instructors through the Army Instructor Badge (AIB). The Basic, Senior and Master badges each come with their own set of criteria that an instructor must complete in order to be awarded the badge. With the implementation of the FDRP in May 2018, Army Civilian Corps instructors are authorized to participate in the FDRP and earn the Civilian AIB lapel Pin. On 5 May 2019, the new Military Awards (AR 600-8-22) regulation authorized the AIB Lapel Pin for wear by Civilian instructors. Since then Army University has been working closely with The Institute of Heraldry (TIOH) to begin the production of the AIB Lapel Pin so that Centers and School can begin awarding them to their outstanding instructors. At roughly 11/16th of an inch, the lapel pin will be a miniature replica of the full-size AIB currently awarded to our Soldiers. We expect the design and development stage by TIOH to take roughly 90-120 days. After that, the Lapel Pin will move on to the production phase and units can begin to place orders through certified production companies.

In anticipation of the lapel pin release, many questions have been raised on how the AIB Lapel Pin would equate to AIBs earned within another cohort. For example, if a Soldier earned an AIB, can he/she wear the equivalent AIB Lapel Pin if they continue their service as a civilian instructor upon retirement? With the help of individuals across the force, Army University

conducted a work group to clarify how and when the lapel pin would be recognized as an equivalent to the AIB earned while in another cohort. On 2 May 19 the FSDD Chief, Dr. Jay Van Der Werff (Army U), signed a memorandum providing guidance on this topic. The guidance reiterates that AIBs earned by Soldiers will be recognized as equivalent to the AIB Lapel Pin. The approval process to wear the lapel pin should be granted by the civilian instructor's FDRP manager upon showing proof of earning the badge on the individual's DD-214 or component equivalent. Civilian contractors serving as instructors are also authorized to wear the lapel pin equivalent to the AIB they earned previously as well. However, they still are precluded from participating in the FDRP as outlined in TR 600-21.

If you have any further questions regarding this guidance, please feel free to contact the Army University FSDD Policy and Quality Assurance branch at: [Usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-fsdd-policy@mail.mil](mailto:Usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-fsdd-policy@mail.mil)

---

## **Contact Us**

FSDD Policy and QA: [Usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-fsdd-policy@mail.mil](mailto:Usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-fsdd-policy@mail.mil)

FSDD Curriculum Management: [usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mesg.armyu-fsdd-curriculum-management@mail.mil](mailto:usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mesg.armyu-fsdd-curriculum-management@mail.mil)

Instructional Design Division: [usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-common-core-development@mail.mil](mailto:usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-common-core-development@mail.mil)

Accreditation & Programs: [usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-accreditation-programs@mail.mil](mailto:usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.armyu-accreditation-programs@mail.mil)