

Part I. General Information

Program Discussed: Military Science
 Current Semester: Spring 2017
 Date of Assessment Meeting(s): August 23, 2016; January 11, 2017; April 27, 2017; May 31, 2017, August 23, 2017
 Participants in Assessment Meeting(s): May: Matt Johnson, James Sanders, Travis Leonhardt, Joseph McCluskey, David Junior, Janet Hendlin. August and April meetings included selected Junior and Senior class students. August: Matt Johnson, Joe McCluskey, Janet Hendlin, Eric Krantz, Tim Jenkins, Andrew Bischoff

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 | Off-Campus Users |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Freely available | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Freely available |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Available upon request | <input type="checkbox"/> Available upon request |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 (AY 16/17) cannot be compared to the previous year (AY 15/16) because many of the standard metrics used by the Army (Cadet Command) changed in 2014/15, and have changed every year. As a result, this year can only be compared to the year prior when 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 survey 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.

Finally, the faculty/staff are evaluated through the Army Evaluation System. The Officer Evaluation Report and the Non Commissioned Officer Report provide an annual evaluation that stays in the service members file their entire career. The report is designed to have the immediate supervisor (known as the "Rater") evaluate the person's *performance* over the past year, with a section for the supervisor's supervisor (known as the "Senior Rater") to comment on the person's *potential* for the future. I rate each one of my instructors and staff members on one of these evaluation forms once a year. I also counsel them quarterly. As the Department Chair, I receive counseling and an evaluation from my Army chain of command as well as the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Examples of the Army evaluations are found in Appendix 10.

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 within the program.

The student (cadet) input for AY 2016/2017 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 2016/2017, the Cadet feedback varied, with several identified improvements that were validated by faculty observation. The more significant organizational themes were associated with their ability to communicate and share information (see Appendix 3). One sentiment was more mentoring between Cadets themselves. They also desired to lengthen their leadership position time. Too long is too much work, but too little doesn't provide the number of opportunities. 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 2016. We reviewed all our lines of effort that encompass all the responsibilities for the program. We reviewed the AAR from the Cadet perspective, as discussed above. Appendices 4 and 5 provide the design and some of the information that is used to guide and facilitate the Cadre workshop. In this past workshop, we reviewed progress along our Lines of Efforts (LOEs). Curriculum, Operations, Training, and Extra Curricular LOEs were all assessed as successful because we met or exceeded the outcomes related to each area. Curriculum improvements were applied from the gaps identified last year (repetitive material). Operations and Training ran smoothly, largely imparted to experienced Cadre coaching Cadets toward successful execution.

However, our enrolled numbers were down in the Junior and Senior classes, forcing us to miss our contract and commission mission in the Recruiting and Retention LOE. This is in large part due to externalities in 2015 that reduced scholarships and Cadets nationwide, and we never quite recovered. There is a bright spot as we worked extremely hard in the Freshman and Sophomore classes with on-campus recruiting, at all 3 of our main campuses (JCU, CSU, and CWRU).

The final part of the workshop, we shifted focus given that the current Cadre were all finishing their 3 years of time here, and were to be replaced. So the workshop discussed the transition of each Line of Effort from each functional area (SMI, APMS, HRA) and realignment of duties to account for manning gaps. We identified the way forward for the organization, all in the context of meeting our mission of commissioning officers, developing students, and meeting our Army and University requirements. Part V below will discuss these in more detail.

Final conclusions from AY 16/17 in terms of meeting our outcomes overall 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 had a higher rate of job satisfaction rate than last year- (Component Rate of 100% satisfied (93% for AY 15/16)); and Branch Satisfaction Rate of 93% satisfied (93% for AY 15/16). We also had 4 Distinguished Military Graduates, which means in the top 20% of all Cadets nationwide. (See Appendix 6)

Although we improved quality, we did not improve in quantity. We only commissioned 11 from a goal of 15 commissions this year. Next year is not likely better in that we project

commissioning only 13 Cadets from our goal of 15. However, the outlying years of mission sets 2019, 2020, and 2021 have an increase in numbers higher than this time of year in years past.

Finally, Cadet evaluations were consistent in years past relative to each class. The graduating class of 2017 did especially well in terms of overall OMS and in teamwork and demonstrated leadership within the program. The Cadre did well to with my evaluations, with room to improve. As Chair, my evaluation from the Dean was insightful and relatively good as well. Still pending results from the Army chain of command.

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: AMS JCU Accessions Management Worksheet

Appendix 10: Army Evaluations

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. At the micro level, from the Cadet perspective, I believe they are getting quality summative and formative assessment with the detailed process above.

However, at the program level, I think we can improve both our summative and formative assessment processes. We can improve our data collection and analysis in respect to OMS scores. We need to better compare internally to draw correlations with Cadet success (using OMS scores), as well to compare across Cadet Command national averages. Appendices 1 and 6 both show the system I will be using, but I continue to be short some critical data to finish the analysis (national averages).

I also want to establish an internal spreadsheet that tracks enrolled Cadets at the beginning of each year by class, and when/if they drop out. Track when they contract and when they commission. This will allow me to better “see” when potential friction points are in the year typical for dropping out, as well as track areas of retention focus.

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 assessments gathered throughout Academic year 2016/2017, 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:

Curriculum. We have new instructors for the MS I, MS II, and MS III courses, and will use this change to better sequence classes, deepen content, and emphasize the positive ROTC culture. We will also fully incorporate changes from the overall Cadet Command directed curriculum, as well as ensure labs and experiential training is sequenced to follow classroom instruction.

We will use the new instructors to remind the program of understanding the outcomes. 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 7 (JCU ROTC Outcome Crosswalk).

During our design Cadet/cadre workshop in September, 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 (summer 2018), working backwards to identify interim goals to achieve the ultimate endstate at the end of the year. 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 8 (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, and new instructor cohort, 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.

Training/Operations/Extra-Curricular Events. Better implementation of the Cadet training planning process must occur, but will need better Cadre coaching and involvement. As Chair, I will better align and communicate the new cadre to what their responsibilities will be for the year, giving them more time to prepare. With new personnel, comes new strengths and opportunities. We can best leverage and align this during the Fall '17 semester.

Also, 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 9 for Storyboard example.)

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, clarity occurs for 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.

Recruiting and Retention. We implemented new systems to encourage Cadets to take responsibility for, and contribute to, recruiting and retaining new and current Cadets. Campus recruiting must occur, and the best recruiters are fellow classmates. We created a new Cadet staff position to do this, as well as two new “working groups” involving both Cadets and then local key influencers to serve as another mechanism to achieve results. As the PMS, I will continue to message this in action but also as a constant talking point during briefings. It cannot be a “one and done” attitude, and must be a constant message. Although all this was introduced this past year, this year and next will institutionalize the system, as well as reinforce the organizational culture.

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.

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: AMS JCU Accessions Mgt Sheet
- Appendix 7: (USACC Outcome Crosswalk)
- Appendix 8: (Outcome Curriculum Crosswalk)
- Appendix 9: (Storyboard Example)
- Appendix 10: (Evaluation Examples)