Over 65 participants joined the October 2018 webinar discussion for the Academic Credit for Prior Learning Workgroup. The following is a summary of questions and comments with responses.

**Clarifications on the 2017 ACPL Report to the Legislature:**
- In the 2017 ACPL Report’s increase of over 41% in ACPL credits awarded, it was clarified that military credits were included.
- In the recommendations section of the report, could you unpack the ‘streamlining data collection process’ recommendation?
  - Comment that the spreadsheet data collection process has been effective. Online data collection which was attempted in the past was cumbersome.
  - Deb O’Neill, WSAC staff who worked on the previous report, shared after the meeting that this recommendation related to consistency in data collection and the importance of maintaining the point of contact from the schools.

**The ACPL legislative report for 2018:**
- Feedback on 2016-2017 Recommendations in preparation for the next report:
  - Comment: Question of convening for ACPL work group came up last time getting info for the report. There were concerns about frequency of work group, overlap with other groups like ICRC and ATC that also discuss ACPL...a “continuous meeting approach” is not necessary. The work group goals should be different than those for professional development (ie. Workshops), which have been “vibrant and meaningful.”
  - Comment: It’s unclear if workgroup still has work to do. A goal-setting exercise for ACPL workgroup at the beginning of the year could be helpful to know where there could be value added.
- Comment: A lot of COP institutions view the development of policy as a local issue. Some of the language used in the past ACPL work group, to “help promote, increase adoption” “blurs the line of what’s institutional policy versus the things that the ACPL workgroup has done in the past. Unclear that it’s within the scope of the work group to be determining ACPL academic credit equivalencies.
  - In the 2016-17 report, recommendations 2 and 3 (PPT slide 10) are things that should be institutional and faculty-driven. While they may be recommendations the ACPL workgroup has, it would be important to run
them through the Joint Transfer Council or ICRC or through the different sectors
  o There is a question of what and who these Recommended Actions from last year are for - the workgroup, or what? The work group’s existence is in the legislation, but it didn’t say how long or what its real purpose was. Additional comments that the goals of the work group need to be very defined.
  o Some participants expressed interest in reviewing the legislative report once it is drafted.

- **ACPL system questions:**
  o Is it faculty that determine ACPL awards at all institutions? Yes; NWCCU standards cited.
  o Is there a resource on military crosswalks in different schools?
    ▪ Each institution has separate lists of crosswalks used; there is no current master list of crosswalks. (more on this in recommendations)

- **Research:** Has the data from the 2010 CAEL report on ACPL ever been replicated?
  o While I’m not aware of an update to this specific study, CAEL offers several other PLA publications that might be of interest, including a 2017 publication *Measuring the benefits of Prior Learning Assessment*. Gray Sterling and I of WSAC Policy and Planning will be attending the November CAEL conference, and can share relevant ACPL updates with this group.

- **Overall Recommendations:**
  o It would be useful to have a collection of military training crosswalks with system-wide courses.
    ▪ Comment: That would be useful for anything that’s common course numbered. “If one school is offering ACPL for it, then either we all should be or we should be telling students to go to that school and get it and transfer it back.”
    ▪ WEC surveyed the state and about 13 colleges responded with the certifications and the courses that align with those certifications and how many credits they would give a student if they came with that cert.

- **ACPL related training / professional development?**
  There weren’t suggestions in the discussion on this.