

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER**  
**AIR UNIVERSITY (AETC)**

**AIR UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION 36-2312**

**16 NOVEMBER 2011**



**Personnel**

**AIR UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT  
PROGRAMS**

---

**COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY**

---

**ACCESSIBILITY:** Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing web site at [www.e-publishing.af.mil](http://www.e-publishing.af.mil) for downloading or ordering.

**RELEASABILITY:** There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

---

OPR: AU/CFAE

Certified by: AU/CF  
(Dr. Bruce T. Murphy)

Supersedes: AUI 36-2312, 4 February  
2004

Pages: 26

---

This instruction establishes policies and procedures for assessment programs in Air University (AU) educational and support service programs. It complements information contained in AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development*; AFI 36-2301, *Developmental Education*; AFI 38-501, *Air Force Survey Program AU Sup 1, Air Force Survey Program*; AUI 36-2322, *Air University Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research*; AUI 36-105, *Responsibilities for Faculty Development and Enrichment*; AUI 36-2309, *Academic Integrity*; AUI 36-2303, *Recognition of Outstanding Student Achievement*; and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2010 Edition*. Refer recommended changes and/or corrections to this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, through your chain of command. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://www.my.af.mil/afirms/afirms/afirms/rims.cfm>. This instruction applies to all AU educational programs, educational support units, administrative support units, research within the AU mission and community/public service programs.

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

**This document is substantially revised and should be thoroughly reviewed.** This revision adds updated guidance to ensure that comprehensive institutional effectiveness practices are

implemented throughout Air University. It requires collection of institutional data on measures related to the AU Strategic Plan, Balanced Score Card, program efficiency and program effectiveness data. It changes the definition of educational programs subject to assessment, IAW new SACS-COC standards.

1.	Purpose and Scope. ....	3
2.	Roles and Responsibilities. ....	3
3.	Assessment Programs ....	7
Figure 3.1.	Preferred Response Order ....	9
<b>ATTACHMENT 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>Attachment 2—ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT FORMAT</b>		<b>17</b>
<b>Attachment 3—HQ/AU INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OFFICE (HQ/AU CFAE)</b>		<b>18</b>

**1. Purpose and Scope.** Air University is a regionally accredited institution of higher education. Because it is fundamentally a military organization, there are numerous directives, instructions, guidance and policies published by higher headquarters that affect Air University faculty and students. This document complements without repeating, that guidance. This instruction provides guidance for development and implementation of systematic, comprehensive assessment programs. Academic assessment programs are designed by faculty, senior educational leaders and assessment professionals at each Center. They should generate data and provide information to decision makers on the degree to which students achieve expected outcomes and on the effectiveness and efficiency of programs. Assessment is a central function that takes place in every phase of the curriculum and/or program development process. The Instructional Systems Development process should be followed IAW AFMAN 36-2234 for academic programs. Support programs may use AFSO-21, Balanced Scorecard, functionally mandated assessment systems or other evaluation methods most appropriate to the services provided. This instruction describes the assessment process for program-level outcomes. The assessment of intermediate goals, course outcomes and objectives and other continuous process improvement initiatives that support achievement of program-level outcomes is the purview of Center and school commanders/commandants.

**1.1. Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT).** AFIT shall develop its own operating instruction on assessment of academic programs and educational and support services. AFIT's operating instruction will guide the development and execution of its assessment programs, but will comply with the intent of this instruction, differing only as needed to meet North Central Association Higher Learning Commission accreditation standards appropriately applied to AFIT's unique requirements.

## **2. Roles and Responsibilities.**

**2.1. HQ AU Commander and President.** AU Commander/President (AU/CC) is responsible for ensuring the institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and assessment processes that 1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; 2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and 3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

**2.2. HQ AU Vice President for Academic Affairs.** The AU/CC implements university-wide program assessment and evaluation program through its Academic Affairs Office of Institutional Effectiveness (AU/CFAE).

**2.2.1. AU Institutional Effectiveness.** The Chief of Institutional Effectiveness provides oversight and advice on program assessment policy, procedures, and methods employed by centers, colleges and support services throughout the university. It ensures systematic, explicit, and documented processes exist to measure performance

**2.2.1.1. Accreditation.** Collects and evaluates documentation from educational programs, educational and administrative support services, research programs and community/public service programs. This information is used to determine the degree to which program level outcomes are met across the university and may also be used to support reaffirmation of accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS COC).

2.2.1.2. Compliance Certification. Prepares compliance certification documents in support of accreditation with SACS-COC.

2.2.1.3. Liaison. Establishes and maintains communication with the cadre of program evaluators in AU centers, colleges and schools through regular formal and informal meetings of the AU Institutional Effectiveness Working Group.

2.2.1.4. Human Subjects Research. Air University engages in research-based planning and assessment processes. It also fosters research in support of its educational mission. Routine program assessment studies are generally exempt from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight. However, some studies that collect data from students, faculty or other participants may require IRB approval. The Academic Office develops and maintains a Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) IAW AFMSA/SGE-C, Air Force Research Oversight and Compliance Office guidance to ensure compliance with the 32 CFR 219, *Protection of Human Subjects*, and AFI 40-402 *Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research*. This program includes an engagement agreement between AU and United States Air Force Academy's (USAFA) IRB for the purposes of gaining IRB approval for human subject research. It conforms to all of USAFA's IRB requirements. AFI 40-402 describes the responsibilities, requirements and procedures for conducting studies involving human subjects.

2.2.1.5. Survey Control. All surveys, including interview and focus group protocols, used in program assessment require an Air University survey control number. AU/CFAE serves as Survey Control Officer for Air University and performs activities in accordance with AFI 38-501 and its Air University Supplement; assigns AU survey control numbers and gains approval for surveys that cannot be approved locally; and maintains a copy of all program surveys. The Survey Control Officer may also provide advice on survey construction and analysis of data, and may review survey results.

2.2.1.6. Strategic Plan and Balanced Scorecard. AU Plans and Programs Directorate (AU/A5/8) develops and manages AU strategy using a combination of the AU Strategic Plan and the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) strategy management system in accordance with AETCI 90-1101 *Strategy Management*. BSC is a measurement system, strategic management system, and communication tool that provides a balance between long and short-term objectives, financial and non-financial measures, lagging and leading indicators, and external and internal performance perspectives. AU/A5/8 develops and coordinates AU/CC (in his dual-role as AETC Director of Education, AETC/ED) input to AETC's strategic plans, BSC, and initiatives to form the basis of an effective and integrated strategic management process. AU/CFAE collects data for AU and AETC Balanced Scorecards (BSC) related to assessment of programs and institutional research for which AU/CF is the action officer or objective champion. AU/CFAE coordinates with AFIT's Institutional Effectiveness office to assist AFIT in presenting BSC data for those objectives to the AU and AETC BSC board and council structures and to provide analyses of program effectiveness to leadership.

2.2.1.7. Compliance with Air University instructions. AU/CFAE conducts annual staff assistance visits of programs to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of program assessment methods, planned outcomes, compliance with relevant Air University instructions and other required guidance, faculty evaluation processes, data collection, systematic and comprehensive use of data for decision-making, formative and summative decisions and related results, and documentation. This applies to all delivery formats including resident, non-resident and distance learning administered by Air University's Maxwell-Gunter AFB campus. A standardized checklist (Attachment 3) is provided to program evaluators prior to the visit. Feedback on the results will be provided to the center's, college's or school's assessment POC, the program's commander/commandant and AU Chief Academic Officer in the form of a summary report within 30 days of the visit.

2.3. **Academic Centers.** Program assessment at Air University is conducted by faculty, program evaluation and assessment personnel and administrators responsible for each academic program. Assessment programs provide data to determine the extent to which expected student outcomes are achieved and to inform formative and summative decisions that support the school's mission. Key aspects of the program should be examined to determine the efficient and effective use of resources. The AU Academic Office will be included on distribution list of program assessment reports for both resident and non-resident/distance learning programs sent to higher headquarters or other entities outside of Air University.

2.3.1. Centers should employ a deliberate data-supported review and decision process to make significant or substantive changes to the program. Decisions resulting from these deliberations and the results of actions taken should be documented and kept on file for five years to support reaffirmation of accreditation. The working group, board and council review process, used at HQ/AU, is the recommended model, however, other processes may be used if they engage key stakeholders in the decision process who are able to implement actions and measure results. If a school changes any program such that it significantly modifies its purpose or expands its scope, changes the nature of its affiliation or its ownership, or makes other changes such as those described in AUI 36-2317, *Air University Degree Granting, Accreditation, Reaffirmation and Substantive Change*, it constitutes a substantive change. The AU Academic Affairs office will work with the affected school to complete the appropriate notifications to external agencies prior to initiating action on the change. AU defines a significant change as one which requires additions, deletions or alterations (other than for editorial reasons) which may change more than half of the program outcomes, but does not change the nature or mission of the program, and does not meet the criteria for a substantive change. Because AU programs exist to meet Air Force and Joint Staff requirements, one can anticipate that significant and substantive changes will occur relatively rarely and as a response to major changes directed by those agencies.

2.3.2. Faculty Qualifications. Schools/programs must identify the academic and/or experiential qualifications required to teach each course. Faculty member qualifications should be maintained in one of the AU faculty databases such as the SRIS/Faculty Qualification Matrix (FQM) or the enlisted faculty database, STARS-FD.

**2.4. Educational Support Services.** Assessment of educational support services is conducted by designated staff responsible for each educational support program and/or key processes. If students use the services directly, learning outcomes should be established if appropriate. Critical/high visibility aspects of the program should be measured and evaluated to determine the value consumers receive and satisfaction with various aspects of service quality. Efficient and effective use of resources should also be measured. Assessment provides data to determine the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved and to inform decisions that support the unit's mission. Educational support services should be measured at the HQ/AU level and also within the academic centers and 42 ABW as appropriate. Centers will determine appropriate assessment methods, decision processes and documentation for their programs.

2.4.1. Educational support services not belonging to a center should employ a deliberate data-supported review and decision process to make continuous improvements to services. Decisions resulting from these deliberations should be documented and kept on file for five years.

**2.5. Administrative Support Services.** Assessment of administrative support services is conducted by designated staff responsible for key administrative products and services. These should be examined to determine the value consumers receive and satisfaction with various aspects of service quality. Efficient and effective use of resources should also be measured. Assessment provides data to determine the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved and to inform decisions that support the unit's mission. Administrative support services should be measured at the HQ/AU level and also within the academic centers and 42 ABW as appropriate. Centers will determine appropriate assessment methods, decision processes and documentation for their programs.

2.5.1. Administrative support services not belonging to a center should employ a deliberate data-supported review and decision process to make continuous improvements to services. Decisions resulting from these deliberations should be documented and kept on file for five years.

**2.6. Research.** Assessment of the research mission of Air University is conducted by designated staff and administrators responsible for the research program IAW AUI 36-2321, *Research and Publication*. Assessment provides data to determine the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved and to inform decisions that support the unit's mission. Goals and objectives of the program should be examined to determine mission accomplishment and the efficient and effective use of resources. The AU research mission is primarily undertaken by the Air Force Research Institute (AFRI) who acts as lead agent for program assessment. Faculty and students at the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies (SAASS), Air War College, Air Command and Staff College and the Air Force Culture and Language Center, contribute to the research mission.

2.6.1. The research program employs a deliberate data-supported review and decision process to make significant or substantive changes. Decisions resulting from these deliberations should be documented and kept on file for five years. The working group, board and council structure used at HQ/AU is the recommended model for change decisions, however, other processes may be used if they engage key stakeholders in the decision process who are able to implement actions and measure results.

**2.7. Community/Public Service Programs.** Assessment of community and public services programs is conducted by designated staff and administrators responsible for each educational support program and/or key processes. Goals and objectives of the program should be examined to determine how effectively the mission is being accomplished. Efficient and effective use of resources should also be measured. Assessment provides data to determine the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved and to inform decisions that support the unit's mission. Educational support services should be measured at the HQ/AU level and also within the academic centers as appropriate. Community and Public Service programs are primarily undertaken by the Holm Center's Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Civil Air Patrol-USAF programs.

2.7.1. Community/Public Service programs not participating in a center's corporate process should employ a deliberate data-supported review and decision process to make significant or substantive changes to the program. Decisions resulting from these deliberations should be documented and kept on file for five years. The working group, board and council structure is used at HQ/AU and is the recommended model, however, other processes may be used if they engage key stakeholders in the decision process that are able to implement actions and measure results.

### **3. Assessment Programs**

**3.1. Appointment of Assessment Point of Contact.** Each academic center or AU service unit will designate by letter a primary and an alternate program assessment contact. The primary POC is responsible for ensuring an adequate assessment program is developed and executed for each educational program or service as defined in this instruction. The POC will provide current assessment plan and resulting data to AU/CFAE when requested and is the liaison for staff assistance visits.

3.1.1. Provide a copy of the appointment letter to AU/CFAE upon assumption of responsibility

3.1.2. The primary POC for each Academic Center is encouraged to participate in the Air University Institutional Effectiveness Working Group and attend formal meetings. All program assessment personnel are welcome to attend meetings and events planned by the group.

### **3.2. Academic Program Assessment Plan**

3.2.1. Program Level Outcomes. All programs should define program level outcomes that are published in the AU Catalog. Three to five learning outcomes are usually sufficient, however, more may be pursued as faculty deem necessary. These outcomes must describe what a graduate is expected to know or be able to do, at a specified level of competency, after completing the program of study. This level of student outcomes should reflect the major objectives of the overall program rather than lesson or course objectives/goals. Outcomes should be observable and measurable. Other program level outcomes can be defined, measured and monitored as desired by senior educational administrators and faculty. Outcomes should logically align with the mission of the college/school.

3.2.2. Assessment Methods. Faculty and program evaluators should collaborate on selecting appropriate assessment methods and designing data collection systems.

Assessment programs should develop multiple sources of data to triangulate results in support of outcomes assessment. Both direct and indirect measures of learning should be implemented. Ensure sufficient and appropriate data are collected to determine the degree to which students have achieved program level outcomes and to inform formative and summative program decisions. Develop methodology/systems for collecting data and plan frequency of data collection. Develop metrics that include standards or targets for achievement for each program outcome. Aggregate individual student data to determine the extent to which expected outcomes are achieved at the program level. Document the method of calculation and data sources for each measure.

3.2.3. Analysis. Compare actual data to program targets to determine the degree to which objectives were met. Data should be trended over time. Data and results should be discussed in a routine forum such as a staff meeting, production meeting, strategic planning meeting etc. Document a summary of important observations and decisions made at least annually. Minutes should include the date, names of the attendees, duty title, and duty section.

3.2.4. Direct Measures of Learning. Direct measures must be used to assess learning at the level expressed in the outcome statements. Aggregate data across all students in a program during the academic year to determine curriculum and instruction strengths and areas needing improvement. Sampling may be used if appropriate methods are used to ensure the resulting data can be inferred to the population from which it is drawn. Direct measures include comprehensive multiple choice tests, essays, performance assessments, research papers, wargames, observation protocols etc. These assessments should result in individual student products such as answer sheets, written compositions, performance of skills, theses, oral presentations etc. from which a student's achievement of learning outcomes can be directly assessed.

3.2.4.1. Curriculum and Test Validation. New curriculum and tests should be evaluated for validity and reliability, particularly in cases where multiple seminars and multiple schools will be using the materials. Qualitative and quantitative data can be used. Statistical analyses on multiple choice test items such as point biserial correlation coefficient and difficulty index should be calculated. In accordance with the standard of practice in academe, whole test measures and other statistical descriptive measures and tests should be employed in the development of tests and inventories as appropriate to ensure validity and reliability of results.

3.2.4.2. Test Compromise. When the security of a test has been compromised, particularly if it is required to determine satisfactory course completion or class standing/ranking, an appropriate investigation should be initiated immediately.

3.2.5. Indirect Measures of Learning. Indirect measures indicate learning has occurred, but do not actually measure it. Indirect measures are encouraged to corroborate the data provided by direct measures, but cannot be used alone. They may include promotion rates of graduates versus non-graduates; job placement; and survey responses from students, graduates, supervisors of graduates, and other external stakeholders. Course grades are indirect measures of learning because they do not provide specific data on student achievement nor provide actionable data/vectors to inform program improvements.

3.2.5.1. Surveys. Surveys may be used to gather opinion data from students, graduates, supervisors of graduates and other external stakeholders. Students may be sampled to reduce survey fatigue. All surveys must be submitted to AU/CFAE to receive a survey control number prior to administration or data collection IAW AUS-1 to AFI 38-501, *Air Force Survey Program*.

3.2.5.1.1. Level of Confidence. Achieve a survey response rate that provides an appropriate level of confidence."For short programs, data can be aggregated over all courses offered that academic year, using the annual student population in the calculation. Level of confidence data should be reported with survey results requested by HQ/AU CF.

3.2.5.1.2. AU Survey Scale. Survey items that will be used in AU and higher headquarters reports such as Balanced Scorecard (BSC), will be gathered using the 6-pt scale described below. It is strongly recommended that this scale is used on all surveys due to the dynamic nature of BSC which results in data requests across the university for items that may be administered in program assessment surveys. Place Strongly Agree first and Strongly Disagree last. Each response should be offered in the order that it appears in Figure 3.1 below.

**Figure 3.1. Preferred Response Order**

6-Strongly Agree
5-Agree
4-Slightly Agree
3-Slightly Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

3.2.6. Closed-loop Improvement Cycle. When indicated, determine actions needed to gain improvements in outcomes and document implementation plan. Use the closed-loop assessment cycle described below to document changes intended to improve the degree to which program outcomes are achieved. This is particularly important when actual outcomes fall short of targets/standards. Use all available sources of information to inform decisions for change.

3.2.6.1. Outcome. Step 1) Identify expected program-level learning outcome being reviewed including its associated achievement target(s).

3.2.6.2. Metric. Step 2) Document aggregated data gathered on measurement instruments employed to assess achievement of outcome. Include a summary of other pertinent information (faculty observations, survey comments, resource issues etc.).

3.2.6.3. Analysis. Step 3) Analyze data, including the impact of other factors bearing on the outcome, to determine areas needing improvement and to inform action plan.

3.2.6.4. Actions. Step 4) Document decisions/actions taken to improve outcomes achievement.

3.2.6.5. Results. Step 5) After implementation of decisions has been completed and the process allowed to run for an appropriate amount of time, analyze data and assess results. This must be done at least annually and reported to AU/CFAE in the Annual Program Evaluation Report (Attachment 2). Documentation will be used as evidence of continuous compliance with SACS-COC Principles of Accreditation. Include trended data on outcome to show the difference, if any, made by actions taken in step four of this model. For program level student learning outcomes, trend data over the years.

3.2.7. Other Program Improvement Documents. Program Assessment offices should maintain a list of reports/minutes the center/school develops to document program decisions, but do not have to maintain the reports themselves. These reports can come from working group, board and council meetings, academic council meetings, resource management meetings, curriculum team meetings, faculty meetings, executive staff meetings, hotwashes etc. Faculty participation in curriculum decisions should be demonstrated in at least one of the meeting minutes/reports. Formal meeting minutes should identify attendees. Provide examples of documentation during annual CFA staff assistance visit.

3.2.8. Faculty Evaluation. The primary focus for faculty evaluation is to provide diagnostic feedback to faculty members to enhance their professional growth and development. A secondary focus is to assess faculty member performance. Develop a faculty evaluation plan or instruction. Cite the instruction, add the plan as an attachment to the academic Program Assessment Plan, or identify its elements within the body of the program assessment plan. Identify who is responsible for conducting, documenting and storing faculty evaluations.

3.2.8.1. A list of general teaching competencies or performance expectations should be provided to the faculty member/instructor upon hiring or during orientation to the program.

3.2.8.2. Faculty members should be evaluated periodically against published criteria. AETC Form 620, *Academic Instructor Monitoring Checklist*, and AU Form 13, *Period Evaluation*, are commonly used to document instructional performance, however other forms may be developed to satisfy the unique requirements of the program. This instruction serves as the requirement to maintain form AU Form 13 for schools who prefer to use it.

3.2.8.3. Faculty members should receive student feedback after course grades are assigned.

3.3. **Annual Program Assessment Report.** Use the format at Attachment 2 to complete the Annual Program Assessment Report. It should contain important and/or representative improvement decisions rather than an exhaustive accounting of all formative actions. It provides a useful summary of program assessment information for the academic year and evidence of how programs improve outcomes.

3.3.1. Reporting Cycle. Forward a copy of the Annual Program Assessment Report to AU Institutional Effectiveness office (AU/CFAE) no later than 31 December. All

programs should report findings from the previous academic year using available data. The report should be maintained on file at each program assessment office.

3.3.1.1. Forward a copy of the program assessment plan used for the reporting period.

3.3.1.2. Upon publication, provide AU/CFAE a copy, or access to the site, of instructions/supplements concerning faculty evaluation, test control procedures, student grievance procedures, student assessment and grading guidelines, award programs, and internal and external assessment programs. Include policies on research and public service/outreach if applicable.

3.3.1.3. Strategic Planning/Balanced Scorecard Data. Describe how the center/college/school collects and uses data related to the AU and/or center/college strategic plans and Balanced Scorecards; identify who analyses the data and who reports the results and decisions/actions; and identify where documentation of data and reports are kept. Program evaluators should include the use of information relevant to program assessment in the Annual Program Assessment Report.

**3.4. Educational and Administrative Support Services, Research and Community/Public Service Programs.** Each unit should have a written mission statement and internal goals and/or objectives that promote mission accomplishment and achievement of strategic goals. Alignment of unit strategic objectives to the AU Strategic Plan should be evident.

3.4.1. Program Assessment. Develop methods of measurement and criteria/targets for success. Measurement methods must provide actionable data that can be used to compare the current state to the desired end-state. It should be used to inform leadership and management decisions. The measure statement clearly defines how the metric is calculated and the format in which the results are consistently reported.

3.4.2. Outcomes. Unit goals and/or objectives must be clearly defined and written in a way that lend themselves to measurement. Key processes and/or enduring objectives should be monitored. If more than four measures are identified, the unit may opt to employ a rotational basis for assessment and reporting. Measures should be assessed at least biennially.

3.4.3. Assessment Cycle. Define the data collection and analysis period for each objective and supporting metric.

3.4.3.1. Measurement/Data Collection. Determine what kind of data will be needed to measure achievement of program-level objectives. Develop methodology/systems for collecting data and frequency of data collection.

3.4.3.2. Analysis. Compare actual data to program targets to determine the degree to which objectives were met. Data and results should be discussed in a routine forum such as a staff meeting, production meeting, strategic planning meeting etc. Document a summary of important observations and decisions made at least annually. Minutes should include the date, names of the attendees, duty title, and duty section.

3.4.3.3. Improvement Decisions. When indicated, design actions to gain improvements in outcomes and document implementation plan.

3.4.3.4. Results. After implementation of decisions has been completed and the process allowed to run for an appropriate amount of time, analyze data and assess results. This must be done at least annually.

3.4.3.5. Documentation. Document outcomes, effectiveness and overall impact on program outcomes/program improvement. Maintain documentation for ten years as it provides evidence of compliance with standards and will be used to support reaffirmation of accreditation.

3.4.4. Annual Report. Use the format at Attachment 2 to complete the Annual Program Assessment Report. It should contain important and/or representative cases rather than an exhaustive accounting of all improvements. It provides a useful summary of program assessment information for the academic/fiscal year and evidence of how programs improve outcomes.

3.5. **Other Assessments.** Units undertake periodic evaluations such as annual self inspections, evaluation of progress on strategic objectives, triennial Operational Readiness Inspections, accreditation self studies etc. which are valuable sources of information on how well the unit accomplishes its mission. These can be used as supporting documentation for how well goals and objectives are achieved.

3.5.1. Document progress toward accomplishment of internal goals and strategic objectives. Provide a copy of this report to AU/CFAE annually in December for the previous academic year. This can be in the form of existing documentation of Annual Improvement Plan actions maintained on the AETC Process Improvement Office Sharepoint site at <https://eis.aetc.af.mil/hq/cc/AFSO21/default.aspx> and/or Balanced Scorecard status initiative slides on the AU BSC SharePoint at <https://maxpoint.maxwell.af.mil/sites/au/xp/xpr/bsc/default.aspx> as evidence of accomplishment of strategic goals and objectives. However, it should include narrative to explain the process, dates changes were made to the process and the outcome of the changes.

3.5.2. Efficiency analysis. Efficiency analysis is continuous and inherent in AU's strategy management and AFSO 21 processes. Document efficiency improvements using the existing AF and AU Balanced Scorecard and Measures of Performance reporting processes. Areas for potential improvement may include the impact of the organizational structure. Where feasible and desirable, units should measure productivity relative to inputs of human and material resources. Analyze the impact of the organizational structure, business processes, policies, budget, staffing, training/development and communications on program performance. Document decisions and results. Report savings and/or more efficient use of: time, scheduling, physical and personnel resources, travel, operational funds and other monetary inputs, resource sharing etc. resulting in more effective student production, instructional delivery and learning, faculty research, personnel retention/development, administrative and educational support services, outreach activities or support services. Include results to program in Annual Program Evaluation Report as appropriate. The AFSO21 process may be used to guide these studies/initiatives.

DAVID S. FADOK, Lieutenant General, USAF  
Commander, Air University

## ATTACHMENT 1

### GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

#### *References*

32 CFR 219, *Protection of Human Subjects*

AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development*, 1 November 1993

AFI 36-2301, *Developmental Education*, 16 July 2010

AFI 38-501, *Air Force Survey Program*, 12 May 2010

AFI 40-402 *Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research*, 5 May 2005

AETCI 90-1101 *Strategy Management*, 16 November 2009

AUI 36-105, *Responsibilities for Faculty Development and Enrichment*, 9 February 2009

AUI 36-2303, *Recognition of Outstanding Student Achievement*, 21 December 1995

AUI 36-2309, *Academic Integrity*, 22 August 2008

AUI 36-2317, *Air University Degree Granting, Accreditation, Reaffirmation and Substantive Change*, 5 July 2006

AUI 36-2321, *Research and Publication*, 24 July 2006

AUI 36-2322, *Air University Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research*, 22 October 2003

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2010 Edition*

#### *Prescribed Forms*

AU Form 13, *Period Evaluation*, 23 March 2007

#### *Adopted Forms*

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, 1 April 2010

AETC Form 620, *Academic Instructor Monitoring Checklist*, 31 October 2006

#### *Abbreviations and Acronyms*

**AETC**—Air Education and Training Command

**AFIT**—Air Force Institute of Technology

**AU**—Air University

**AU/CC**—Air University Commander/President

**AU/CFAE**—Academic Affairs Office of Institutional Effectiveness

**BSC**—Balanced Scorecard

**SACS**—COC—Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges

**USAFA**—United States Air Force Academy

### *Terms*

**Accreditation**—Air University is regionally accredited through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) and follows the SACS-COC Principles of Accreditation guidelines for program assessment. The Air Force Institute of Technology is regionally accredited through the North Central Association Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and follows HLC guidelines for program assessment.

Specialized Accreditation. Programs within the institution may have accreditation with professional organizations.

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). AFIT has earned specialized accreditation for their engineering program through ABET.

Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE). ACSC and AWC confer Joint PME I and Joint PME II credit respectively for selected programs by virtue of accreditation awarded by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff through the PAJE process.

**Administrative Support Services**—Administrative support services are units that support university processes and educational program administration and delivery through services to leaders, administrators, faculty, students and staff at Air University. Examples include Academic Office, Financial Management, Office of the Registrar, Plans and Programs, Protocol, Public Affairs, Education Logistics and Communications Directorate, and Manpower and Personnel.

**Assessment**—For the purpose of this instruction, AU defines assessment as a multi-step process examining the quality and productivity of educational activities.

**Community/Public Service Program**—Community and Public Service programs that fit within the educational mission of Air University. Examples include Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) and Civil Air Patrol-USAF (CAP-USAF).

**Educational Programs**—Any educational program, developed by faculty as defined in 1.8 of this instruction, that awards a degree, diploma, certificate or certification is considered to be a program and is subject to the assessment requirements herein.

**Educational Support Services**—Educational support services are units that support teaching, learning and research through services to students, faculty, administrators and staff assigned to education and training programs. Examples include the Muir S. Fairchild Research and Information Center, Extension Course Program, Air University Press, Enlisted Heritage Research Institute and the Air University Office of History.

Student Support Services. Units that provide support services to students to enhance the quality and accessibility of their educational experience are considered Student Support Services.

Examples include Child Development Center, Housing Office, International Affairs, Public Affairs Center of Excellence, Law Center, Personnel Office and Inspector General.

**Evaluation**—For the purpose of this instruction, AU defines evaluation as a discrete step in the assessment process where the results of some measurement are compared to a standard of performance.

**Faculty**—Faculty are defined as those with relevant academic credentials and/or experience which qualifies them to offer the courses to which they are assigned, and who fulfill some or all of the following functions: course design and curriculum development; program assessment including identification and assessment of student learning outcomes; teaching; academic

advising; research, authorship and presentation; and service to the institution. Schools identify their faculty members and evaluate, document and monitor their qualifications.

**Institution**—References to the ‘institution’ refer to Air University as a whole and not to an academic center, college, school or support unit.

Academic Centers include Spaatz Center, LeMay Center, Holm Center, Eaker Center and Barnes Center.

Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), maintaining separate regional accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, is also considered to be an institution for the purposes of its accreditation.

**Attachment 2****ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT FORMAT**

1. Mission Statement for program/school or service unit/program.
2. Brief narrative summary of assessment activities, analyses, decisions and results particularly as they relate to student outcomes, mission accomplishment, formative program changes, and strategic objectives. Include the following for each outcome in a-e below:
  - a. Outcome.** Describe expected program level outcomes. For academic programs, outcomes should be a result of successful completion of the entire program of study. They should be stated, "The graduate will (know or be able to...). Outcomes should be described at the program level with data aggregated across all students attending the program during the academic year. Include a measurement metric and a standard/target for each outcome in this section. For service programs, describe outcomes as appropriate.
  - b. Assessment Methods.** Describe the process used to collect data and the frequency data is collected. Cite each measurement instrument used, such as specific tests/exams/performance evaluations. For service programs, describe methods as appropriate such as percentage, dollars, production data, manhours, time etc. Qualitative data is encouraged, but is generally used to support/validate quantitative data.
  - c. Analysis.** Description of mathematical/statistical and other methods used to calculate results. Summarize and analyze qualitative and quantitative data, trends, faculty observations, discussions used to determine the extent to which the outcome is achieved. Identify areas needing improvement based on analysis.
  - d. Decision.** Document decisions/actions taken to improve curriculum, instruction, program delivery, faculty procedures or other support processes based on data, faculty/staff inputs, and discussions. This is required if program outcome targets were not met.
  - e. Result.** Describe results in terms of the impact on the program outcome. Show data trends on program outcome across years.
3. Strategic objectives related to mission, their measures, summary of data for previous AY. (If this is done through a strategy management methodology such as Balanced Scorecard, simply refer to that process and location of documentation.)
4. Briefly describe other significant changes planned for upcoming academic year and rationale, if not driven by the processes in item 2 above.

Attachment 3

HQ/AU INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OFFICE (HQ/AU CFAE)

ANNUAL STAFF ASSISTANCE VISIT CHECKLIST

SECTION A: ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION		YES	NO	N/A
A1.	<p>Does the college/school have a POC for assessment appointed by letter?</p> <p><i>AUI 36-2312 Para 3.1. requires units to designate a POC for AU assessment programs and forward the letter to HQ/AU CFAE</i></p> <p><i>AUI 36-2322, Para 5.6.1. Points of Contact Appointment. Each educational program and administrative or educational support activity must designate, by letter of appointment, primary and alternate points of contact (POC) to serve as assessment POCs. These individuals will work closely with the HQ AU Chief, Institutional Effectiveness on assessment issues. POCs serve as liaisons between HQ AU and their respective programs.</i></p>			
A2.	<p>Does the college/school have an assessment plan that complies with guidance found in AUI 36-2312? Does it identify program-level student outcomes; service/program outcomes and/or goals; and the effectiveness/efficiency at producing desired outcomes? Where are learning outcomes or service/program goals published?</p> <p><i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2. and all subparagraphs. The assessment plan will be composed of the following applicable materials:</i></p> <p><i>3.2.1. Describes/lists student learning outcomes at the program level. These should be enduring so trend data can be collected over years. They should match the outcomes in the AU Catalog or other designated publications.</i></p> <p><i>3.2.2. Describes methods, procedures and timelines for evaluating the degree to which learning outcomes were achieved.</i></p>			

	<p><b>3.2.4.</b> <i>Contains direct measures of learning.</i></p> <p><b>3.2.5.1.</b> <i>Surveys conform to guidance in AUS1 to AFI 38-501.</i></p> <p><b>3.2.6</b> <i>Closed-loop Improvement Cycle is used to document actions that address missed targets on program-level outcomes.</i></p>			
A3.	<p>Was Annual Program Assessment Report completed as required and submitted on time?</p> <p><b>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.3</b></p>			
A4.	<p>Is faculty involved in the development of the assessment plan and in assessment activities?</p> <p><b>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2.2.</b></p>			
A5.	<p>Does the center/school use a deliberate review and decision process (such as that defined in AETCI 16-501, <i>Corporate Structure</i>) to make substantive or significant changes to the program? If not, describe the process. Does the body meet periodically? Is the process systematically employed for key decisions? Is there a policy document describing this process? Are attendees and decisions documented? Where are the minutes maintained?</p> <p><b>AUI 36-2312, Para 2.2.1.</b></p>			
A6.	<p>Has AU/CFAE been provided a copy of the most current academic assessment plan?</p> <p><b>AUI 36-2312, para 3.1.</b> <i>The POC will provide current assessment plan and resulting data to AU/CFAE when requested and is the liaison for staff assistance visits.</i></p>			
A7.	<p>Does the center/school provide training on assessment issues to the faculty/instructors?</p> <p><b>AUI 36-105, Para 3.5.1.</b> <i>states "Faculty orientation serves as a pre-service program, properly orienting and preparing new</i></p>			

	<i>faculty as to the respective school's mission, organization, facilities, purpose, expectations, teaching philosophies, curriculum, teaching requirements, and if required, teaching mentoring and evaluative skills..."</i>			
A8.	Has AU/CFAE been provided a copy of the center's Strategic Plan and strategy management plan?  <i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.5.</i>			
A9.	Is the academic assessment plan linked to the AU Strategic Plan and the center's strategic plan and strategy management methodology?  <i>AUI 36-2322, Para 5.6.2. Unit Mission Statements and Planning Documents. Each school or college and educational support unit is required to develop, publish, disseminate, and maintain unit-level mission statements and planning documents that reflect objectives and measures clearly linked to the AU planning documents.</i>			
A10.	Is data on strategic objectives routinely collected, analyzed and used for improvement? If a strategy management methodology such as Balanced Scorecard is used to implement strategic objectives, refer to location of documents. <i>AUI 36-2312 Para 3.5.1</i>			
<b>SECTION B: STUDENT ASSESSMENT PROGRAM</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
B1.	Does the program directly evaluate students to determine the degree to which learning has been achieved?  <i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2.4. Direct measures must be used to assess learning at the level expressed in the outcome statements.</i>			
B2.	Does the program employ indirect measures to triangulate data when assessing student learning outcomes? How is the data used? Are changes to the tests or curriculum documented?  <i>AUI 35-2312, Para 3.2.5. Indirect measures are encouraged to corroborate the data provided by direct measures, but cannot be used alone. They may include promotion rates of graduates versus non-graduates; job placement; and survey responses</i>			

	<i>from students, graduates, supervisors of graduates, and other external stakeholders. Course grades are indirect measures of learning because they do not provide specific data on student achievement nor provide actionable data/vectors to inform program improvements.</i>			
<b>SECTION C: DATA ANALYSIS AND SURVEY PROGRAM</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>C1.</b>	<p>Does the program have a documented data collection process developed for its assessment program?</p> <p><i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2.2. Develop methodology/systems for collecting data and plan frequency of data collection. Develop metrics that include standards or targets for achievement for each program outcome. Aggregate individual student data to determine the extent to which expected outcomes are achieved at the program level. Document the method of calculation and data sources for each measure.</i></p>			
<b>C2.</b>	<p>Does the school follow guidelines established in AUS-1 to AFI 38-501, <i>Air Force Survey Program</i>, to obtain survey control numbers as needed?</p> <p><b><i>AUS-1 to AFI 38-501</i></b></p>			
<b>C3.</b>	<p>Are guidelines for obtaining an appropriate level of confidence followed and reported with survey results? Is the return rate reported with results?</p> <p><b><i>AUI 36-2312, Para, 3.2.5.1.1.</i></b></p>			
<b>C4.</b>	<p>Do students have an opportunity to submit feedback on the execution and effectiveness of the curriculum and instruction?</p> <p><i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2.51. Surveys may be used to gather opinion data from students, graduates, supervisors of graduates and other external stakeholders. Students may be sampled to reduce survey fatigue.</i></p>			
<b>C5.</b>	<p>Does the school conduct analyses to validate tests and curriculum using guidelines suggested in AUI 36-2312?</p>			

	<b><i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2.4.1.</i></b>			
<b>C6.</b>	<p>Does the school/program have a “closed loop” process developed for its assessment program?</p> <p><i>AUI 36-2322, Para 5.6.4. “Closed-Loop” Documentation. In addition to documenting measures, findings, and use of results for goals and objectives, educational programs are required to ensure “closed-loop” documentation of the use of assessment data in curriculum review and other IE processes. School and college-level operating instructions must include a requirement for the documentation of the use of assessment data in curriculum review and program assessment processes.</i></p> <p><b><i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.2.6. Closed-loop Improvement Cycle.</i></b></p>			
<b>SECTION D: TEST DEVELOPMENT, CONTROL &amp; ADMINISTRATION</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>D1.</b>	<p>Does the college/school immediately initiate an appropriate investigation in the case of test compromise?</p> <p><b><i>AUI 36-2312 Para, 3.2.4.2</i></b></p>			
<b>D2.</b>	<p>Does the program develop validation plans for new curriculum and tests? Are the validation plans and results of the validation process documented?</p> <p><b><i>AUI 36-2312 Para, 3.2.4.1</i></b></p>			
<b>SECTION E: FACULTY EVALUATION PROGRAM</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>E1.</b>	<p>Does the college/school have a faculty evaluation plan in place?</p> <p><b><i>AUI 36-2312 Para 3.2.8. Faculty Evaluation. The primary focus for faculty evaluation is to provide diagnostic feedback to faculty members to enhance their professional growth and development. A secondary focus is to assess faculty member performance. Develop a faculty evaluation plan or instruction.</i></b></p>			
<b>E2.</b>	<p>Do faculty members receive student feedback?</p> <p><b><i>AUI 36-2312 Para 3.2.8.3.</i></b></p>			
<b>E3.</b>				

	Does the school/center publish a master list of expected teaching competencies or performance expectations? Are these provided to faculty members prior to teaching?  <i>AUI 36-2312 Para 3.2.8.1</i>			
E4.	Has the school/program published faculty qualifications required for teaching each course?  <i>AUI 36-2312 Para 2.2.2. Schools/programs must identify the academic and/or experiential qualifications required to teach a course. Faculty members' qualifications should be tracked in one of the AU faculty databases such as the SRIS/Faculty Qualification Matrix (FQM) or the enlisted faculty database, STARS-FD.</i>			
E5.	Has the college/school documented faculty qualifications for all faculty members? (Preferably in the on-line AU Faculty Qualification Matrix in SRIS for Maxwell campus faculty or STARS-FD for Barnes Center/CCAF instructors)  <i>AUI 36-2312 Para 2.2.2. and AUI 36-105, Para 3.4.</i>			
E6.	Do supervisors/evaluators provide faculty/instructors written feedback that is directed at improving teaching effectiveness?  <i>AUI 36-2312 Para 3.2.8.2</i>			
<b>SECTION F: FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
F1.	Does the school/center have a Faculty Professional Development POC identified by an appointment letter?  <i>AUI 36-105, Para 3.1. To fulfill this requirement, each school and college will develop a supplement to this instruction and will designate by an official appointment letter the faculty member responsible for the oversight of its faculty development and enrichment program. Schools and colleges will provide a copy of this letter to AU/CFAE</i>			
F2.	Does the school/center have a supplement/OI to AUI 36-105, Faculty Development, Enrichment and Responsibilities?			

	<p><i><b>AUI 36-105, Para 3.1.</b> To fulfill this requirement, each school and college will develop a supplement to this instruction and will designate by an official appointment letter the faculty member responsible for the oversight of its faculty development and enrichment program.</i></p>			
F3.	<p>Does the center/school have a process for maintaining faculty folders (whether online or paper)?</p> <p><i><b>AUI 36-105, Para 3.4.</b> AU schools and colleges will create mechanisms to track the development and accomplishment of individual professional growth programs of their faculty members.</i></p>			
F4.	<p>Does the center/school properly maintain faculty/instructor information and degree status?</p> <p><i><b>AUI 36-105, Para 3.4.</b> AU schools and colleges will create mechanisms to track the development and accomplishment of individual professional growth programs of their faculty members.</i></p>			
F5.	<p>Does the center/school have an In-Service Training (IST) program established?</p> <p><i><b>AUI 36-105, Para 3.5.</b> Faculty programs: Air University schools and colleges will develop and administer internal faculty growth programs. There shall be three primary faculty growth programs: faculty orientation, faculty development via in-service training (IST), and individual-focused professional development. Faculty programs will be described in each college and school's Program Review Board (PRB) presentation.</i></p>			
F6.	<p>Does the center/school maintain an IST Log or summary to record/document attendance at IST sessions?</p> <p><i>Not explicitly required by an AUI but is a good operating practice.</i></p>			
<b>SECTION G: AWARDS PROGRAM</b>				
G1.	<p>Is the college/school authorized to have a DG program?</p>			

	<i>AUI 36-2303, para 2</i>			
G2.	Does the college/school have an achievement awards program?  <i>AUI 36-2303. This instruction establishes policies and procedures designed to give recognition to outstanding student achievement in Air University schools.</i>			
G3.	Do the criteria used by the college/school to designate DG or award status encompass academic scores, professional skills, and or performance skills (where applicable)?  <i>AUI 36-2303, para 2.1.</i>			
G4.	Does the college/school only present Distinguished Graduate Awards to the top 10 percent of the class?  <i>AUI 36-2303, para 2.</i>			
G5.	Does the college/school make maximum use of awards such as certificates, citations, and scrolls, as well as letters of commendation for outstanding achievement in the areas of skills, knowledge, and understanding?  <i>AUI 36-2303, para 5.2.</i>			
<b>SECTION H: ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICE PROGRAMS AND COMMUNITY/PUBLIC SERVICE AND RESEARCH PROGRAMS</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
H1.	Does the program have an assessment plan, instruction or written guidance for evaluating effectiveness?  <i>AUI 36-2312 para 3.4.1.</i>			
H2.	Are goals and/or objectives aligned to strategic objectives for the unit and/or higher headquarters?  <i>AUI 36-2312 para 3.4.</i>			
H3.	Are program level outcomes identified and monitored?			

	<i>AUI 36-2312 para 3.4.2.</i>			
H4.	Does the unit follow a deliberate cycle of assessment?  <i>AUI 36-2312 para 3.4.3.</i>			
H5.	Was Annual Program Assessment Report completed as required and submitted on time?  <i>AUI 36-2312, Para 3.4.4.</i>			