

Part I. General Information

Program Discussed: Military Science
Current Semester: Spring 2016
Date of Assessment Meeting(s): May 6, 2015; December, 14, 2015; April 28, 2016;
May 26, 2016
Participants in Assessment Meeting(s): Matt Johnson, James Sanders, Travis Leonhardt,
Joseph McCluskey, David Junior, Janet Hendlin. December and April meetings included
selected Junior and Senior class students.

All Annual Assessment Reports are available to the appropriate Associate Dean, Dean, and the Provost, as well as to other administrators for institutional effectiveness and accreditation purposes. Please indicate the degree to which your program would like this information more widely shared.

On-Campus Users

- Freely available
 Available upon request
 Unavailable

Off-Campus Users

- Freely available
 Available upon request
 Unavailable

Part II. Assessment Process

Prompt: In one or two paragraphs, describe your assessment process. Did you gather data on all of your program's student learning goals? If not, which student learning goals did you measure in this assessment cycle? What tools did you use to attempt to measure student learning? Where and how were they administered? Who scored them?

The Department of Military Science's assessment program occurs on several different levels at several different frequencies. The program assesses itself yearly, with several interim "course correction" assessments. Each military science cohort also assesses itself throughout each semester and at completion of the year as well. Finally, we assess each Military Science student in a variety of ways to ensure each individual grows in their own way. Starting "big" and working toward "small," each assessment process is explained further.

The Army ROTC program resides in the Department of Military Science and receives specific commissioning guidance from the US Army, who also provides general guidance for all ROTC programs. At JCU, we adhere to both the Army guidance, as well as JCU's guidance and mission. To ensure we are graduating/commissioning in accordance with both mission statements, we measure our success against several metrics both *within* the Academic Year and *between* Academic Years. This past year did not allow us to measure accurately between academic years because many of the standard metrics used by the Army (Cadet Command) changed in 2014/15. As a result, this year will establish a baseline in assessing using the Outcome Metric Score that compares us nationally.

Program assessment occurs both in several key ways that are both formative and summative in nature. First, we have After Action Reviews (AARs) at the conclusion of each semester and at the conclusion of the academic year. We formally sit down with faculty/staff, as well as faculty/staff and students, and discuss the good/bad of the program. We are also able to look at the senior class

Outcome Metric Score (OMS), and their component and job placement into the Army to assess program success in comparison with national averages. The other significant assessment of success is through observation of each cadet's performance, which is then qualified and quantified on a Cadet Officer Evaluation Report (COER). Overtime, this will allow performance trends to be identified.

Each cohort year group is also assessed as a group. Each Military Science cohort, and its respective instruction in Military Science class, is assessed in a variety of ways, some of which were discussed above. During the end of term/year AARs, the faculty/staff and students provide analysis on course instruction, on the program at large, and other aspects of their development. Each cohort class will have unique strengths/weaknesses that allow us to cater their instruction and experiential development to account for differences between cohorts and changes in resources. Course grades and averages are also informative, as well as counseling and evaluation reports.

Each individual student is assessed throughout the year as well. This occurs through observation, and is then validated through counseling by the cadet chain of command and faculty instructors. Counseling is done twice a semester each by a cadet, and then by a faculty member (i.e. four times total at a minimum). It is also done more informally throughout the Cadet Chain of Command (student leadership) and the execution of the Leadership Development Program (LDP). Within the LDP, cadets observe and counsel more junior cadets on all aspects of student and ROTC functions. Instructors do this as well for their individual classes, but is complimented with other faculty who consistently coach and mentor all cadets in the program.

Part III. Findings

Prompt: Along with this report, please submit the data charts the program used during the assessment meeting. Describe, in words, what your program learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were your strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals you set for them?

Overall, this program is producing quality officers and confident, mature leaders. I have confidence in saying this from what I observe, but also from what the national ROTC system indicates using the OMS metric. As stated above, this year's OMS score cannot be compared to previous years, but it is still a good indicator of overall success compared nationally. This past year, our cadets had a 93% success rate in receiving their component of choice (Active duty Army, National Guard service, or Army Reserve component) and a 93% success rate in receiving their branch of choice (job assignment within the Army). These high rates indicate two things. First, a high OMS score means they are well above the national average because they are more likely to get their component and branch choices. The second thing it means is that our cadets tend to know themselves in terms of matching their desires with their strengths. The OMS score is the most obvious qualitative measure we have that encompasses most aspects of student success (Appendix 1). That said, the remainder of this report will focus more on our internal processes.

At the conclusion of every semester, the cadet detachment conducts their own After Action Review, with faculty monitoring and guiding when needed. The faculty/staff also do this in December and May. These two events are more summative and deliberate than those that happen throughout the semester, and allow for potentially more significant change.

The student (cadet) input for AY 2015/2016 was gathered in April during the second to last leadership laboratory together as a group, with subordinate input from each class's end of year surveys. To lead the cadet discussion, a suggested agenda is provided to the senior cadet leadership to lead the discussion (see Appendix 2). For AY 2015/2016, the feedback varied, with several identified improvements that were validated by faculty observation. The more significant organizational themes were associated with their ability to work together as a team professionally, as well as how they

communicate and share information (see Appendix 3). With regard to classroom instruction, the feedback also varied but did include concern about repetitive instruction in some of the classes between years (example is land navigation in MS 101 and again in MS 201), as well as a desire for more personal vignettes and scenarios from instructors (especially at the MS 3 and 4 level classes).

The faculty/staff conducted a workshop to review the year and identify changes for the next Academic Year in May. We review all our lines of effort that encompass all the responsibilities for the program. Appendices 4 and 5 provide the design and some of the information that is used to guide and facilitate the workshop. In this past workshop, we shared the previously gathered cadet insights, as well as information from each of our classes, functional areas, and from our higher Army headquarters. The cadre acknowledged and agreed to address the cadet issues of teamwork, communication, and classroom instruction, as well as explored more improvements for the detachment as a whole. Part V below will discuss these in more detail.

Final conclusions though were positive. The program is developing and commissioning leaders of character who serve the common defense. Cadets progress within the program, and do meet the standards for commissioning in respect to the cadet leader outcomes as well as their holistic Be (character and presence), Know (intellect), and Do (Leads, Develops, and Achieves) attributes desired in Army officers. In fact, we will commission 14 from a goal of 15 commissions this year, and had a high rate of job placement (93% component and job choice).

Appendix 1: Accessions OMS Tracker

Appendix 2: AAR Method

Appendix 3: Cadet AAR data

Appendix 4: Cadre Workshop Session 1- annual program review held by faculty/staff

Appendix 5: Cadre Workshop Session 1 Mission Analysis- facts and environmental review

Part IV. Planned Changes to the Assessment System

Prompt: What changes, if any, do you need to make to your assessment system? (Questions to consider include: 1) Do your measures and processes provide useful data with a reasonable amount of effort? and 2) Are your measures reliable, valid, and sufficient?) On which student learning goals do you plan to focus your attention during the next assessment cycle? Do you need to implement additional formative assessment tools to better understand some of your findings? If so, describe those here.

Our assessment system is largely adequate, although there is always room to improve. The level and frequency is sufficient to gather information needed for quick change, as well as potential systemic change. Weekly cadet and cadre meetings, end of course surveys, end of semester AARs by both cadet detachment and program cadre, and then end of year workshops for both cadet and cadre alike, provide ample opportunity for accurate feedback. The information is reliable and valid because it is first hand and timely. It is also contextualized by the experience existing in the cadre from their previous organizational experience, and used as a developmental opportunity for cadets in and of itself, meaning sometimes it is not necessarily about the data results, but the feedback process in the first place. The data is also sufficient as the data provides information that drives both individual cadet and cadre improvement, but also program system adjustments or changes.

At this time, the summative assessment as described above is adequate. The formative method of assessment, although sufficient, needs to improve in its execution. The quality of “in stride” assessment and After Action Reviews at the time of training or instruction, should improve. The program conducts AARs throughout, but the quality and cataloging of the data largely depends on the person conducting the session. This will improve through re-training on the assessment process as well as improved cadre oversight. Program changes that address these concerns follow in Section V.

Part V. Planned Changes to the Program in Response to Data

Prompt: What changes, if any, do you need to make to your program in response to what you now know about student learning? (Possibilities include changes to learning goals, pedagogy, assignments in particular classes, activities, and curricular requirements and/or structure.) What is your anticipated timeline for both implementation and assessment of the planned changes?

Given the summative assessments gathered throughout Academic year 2015/2016, we will make several program changes. Cadet and cadre identified program changes with respect to curriculum, method of instruction, After Action Review quality, cadre responsibility alignment, and counseling process. Our five changes follow:

First, the program identified changes to the curriculum to ensure it is not repetitive, but still progresses a cadet's understanding of critical concepts throughout the program. For example, one of our cadet command outcomes is Character and Accountability and a cadet will "*embrace* their role as an Army officer..." The outcome is different though for each level of Military Science. An MS 1 cadet should "*comprehend and accept* the Army values...", an MS 2 should "*demonstrate* Army values," an MS 3 should "*analyze and apply* the Army values..." and an MS 4 should be able to "*synthesize* all aspects of Army values..." This is detailed for each of the nine ROTC outcomes on Appendix 6 (JCU ROTC Outcome Crosswalk).

During the cadre workshop, we conducted an instructor crosswalk providing more detail on what those outcomes (comprehend vs demonstrate vs synthesize) looked like and how we are assessing them in terms of class activity (both in class, lab, and other program activities) and class assignments. We started at the end goal (MS 4 year) and briefed the course and the syllabi to the other instructors, essentially working backwards so that supporting and previous classes could better understand the final outcome (MS 3 instructor briefed his course, then MS 2 instructor, and so on). This allowed each instructor to better define their outcome, and adjust their syllabus to support the overall outcome. This also addressed the concern of repetitive classes in that the depth and breadth of each topic is better focused and nuanced to that MS year. Appendix 7 (Outcome Curriculum Crosswalk) shows this effort.

Second, in terms of improving instruction within each Military Science course, this is largely dependent on the instructor, but several improvements will occur. First, with a better understanding of the outcomes at each MS level, as well as a more experienced group of instructors, each class can be revised to reduce the less important material and/or better address the more critical material by adjusting objectives. Second, we will develop better instruction methods that reinforce the learning through varied means. Instructors will include more group discussions, vignette and scenario training, and align classes to complement the experiential aspect in our leadership laboratories. Finally, we are sending one of our instructors to the Army's Cadet Faculty Development Course this summer where he will learn about the Adult Learning Model and methods of instruction. Upon his return, the program will grow as he infuses some more current and new ideas to improve our instruction.

Thirdly, the quality with *how* we execute our After Action Reviews will improve in three primary areas- ability, time, and collection. First, we will incorporate a class of instruction within the MS 4 course on how to properly conduct an AAR. This will also be shared and reviewed by all cadre instructors that will facilitate and supervise AARs throughout the year. This will improve the quality of each AAR. Second, we will also program more time at the end of class or the leadership laboratory to ensure there is time for immediate feedback. As each training plan is reviewed and approved by a cadre member, time must be assigned for productive AARs. Finally, within the training process and cadet chain of command, a "storyboard" will be submitted to cadre for review. The storyboard forces reflection and documented feedback of any event, and will help integrate an "assessment" mindset throughout the culture of the organization, as well as help us catalog our own lesson's learned. (see Appendix 8 for Storyboard example.)

Fourth, to improve both communication and teamwork within the detachment, at the cadet and cadre levels, each cadre responsibility must be understood by the detachment. As the chair, I will do this by counseling each cadre member on their individual responsibilities, briefing the detachment at large on who is responsible for what, and what that looks like in practice. This will be reinforced through respective updates at my weekly staff meeting in regard to their additional responsibilities to hold them and ourselves accountable. Once we are executing within our own specific functions, it will be more clear to cadets on who to approach for assistance or guidance in a particular area.

The final, but certainly not least important, adjustment we will make is in improving the counseling process. Cadets counsel subordinate cadets, cadre counsel cadets, for both overall semester performance as well as event or task oriented counseling. Not only is the feedback essential for each cadet's personal development, it is also an Army standard and a professional responsibility that is taken very seriously in the Army organization. First, as in the AAR, the quality must improve among the cadets in terms of their ability to conduct effective counseling and evaluations. We will address this through increased class time in educating this with observed practical exercises. The second thing we will do is provide more frequent oversight on the quality of the counseling and evaluation reports when written by supervising cadets. Cadre must provide better feedback to those doing the counseling. And finally, as in the AAR process, we will program more time to allow quality counseling to occur within our standard developmental activities.

In conclusion, I am confident in the product this program is producing in terms of cadet leaders that are ready for service as an Officer in the US Army and graduates that their respective institutions can be proud to call their own. Although confident, I am not satisfied because we can do better in many ways. What is listed above, are improvements that we can address and make the next academic year even better than the last in achieving our stated outcomes and the mission of both JCU and the Army.

Appendix 6 (USACC ROTC Outcome Crosswalk)

Appendix 7 (JCU Outcome Curriculum Crosswalk-working)

Appendix 8 (Storyboard Examples)

Total Attachments:

Appendix 1: Accessions OMS Tracker

Appendix 2: AAR Method

Appendix 3: Cadet AAR data

Appendix 4: Cadre Workshop Session 1- annual program review held by faculty/staff

Appendix 5: Cadre Workshop Session 1 Mission Analysis- facts and environmental review

Appendix 6: (USACC Outcome Crosswalk)

Appendix 7: (Outcome Curriculum Crosswalk)

Appendix 8: (Storyboard Example)