

Subj: AY16 MCU INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT REPORT



From: Director Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning, Marine Corps University
To: President, Marine Corps University
Via: Vice President for Education, Integration, Operations, & Planning, Marine Corps University

Subj: ACADEMIC YEAR 16 MARINE CORPS UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT REPORT – Academic Units

Encl: (1) MCWAR AY16 Academic Unit Annual Assessment Reports
(2) SAW AY16 Academic Unit Annual Assessment Reports
(3) CSC AY16 Academic Unit Annual Assessment Reports
(4) EWS AY16 Academic Unit Annual Assessment Reports
(5) EPME AY16 Academic Unit Annual Assessment Reports
(6) CDET AY16 Academic Unit Annual Assessment Reports

1. Purpose. The purpose of this document is to provide the results of the assessment of the Academic units within Marine Corps University for AY16. The AY17 recommendations from the analysis of the results from the Course Content Review Boards for the Academic Units are included in this report.

2. Academic Units. The closeout of the four-column matrix for AY16 provides a systematic evaluation of the University's academic units. Enclosure 1 represents the data and narrative reports provided by each of the schools and colleges. The evaluation of the Academic units via the four-column matrix process during AY16 proved to validate the critical curriculum review process that was implemented at the University during AY07. Each schoolhouse reported encouraging results that demonstrated learning outcomes are being met and students are retaining the material as depicted in the overall results of the measurements. A holistic view of AY16 at MCU to include the resident, nonresident and EPME curriculum depicts 45 blocks of instruction were delivered, 175 learning outcomes were achieved, and 217 measurements were used to assess the learning outcomes. (This data includes the following academic units - MCWAR, SAW, CSC, EWS, EPME, and CDET). The following is a synopsis of each of the schools and colleges for AY16 with Director's Recommendations for AY17. This summary includes if applicable the following:

- AY16 Student Survey Analysis as it relates to the school or college
- Results of the MCU Four Column Matrix
- School Directors' Comments for AY16
- School Directors' Recommendations for AY17

(1) Marine Corps War College (MCWAR)

a. Student Survey Results – 26 out of the 30 students responded to the MCU AY16 student survey for MCWAR. The focus areas of the student survey were academic programs, faculty, organizational quality, MCU support and services, Information Technology (IT), Education Technology (ET), and the Leadership Communications Skills Center. Listed below are the overall results of the MCWAR respondents by focus area.

- *Student satisfaction with the academic programs – 97.93%
 - *Student satisfaction with the faculty – 99.23% (excluding technology question)
 - Student satisfaction with organization quality – 98.15%
 - *Student satisfaction with MCU support and services – 94.28%
 - *Student satisfaction with IT support – 88.14%
 - Student satisfaction with ET support – 100% (new section this year)
 - *80% of MCWAR Students utilized the LCSC
- *Indicates an improvement from last year.

b. Four Column Matrix Results - MCWAR concluded the curriculum review process in AY16 by completing the MCU Four Column Matrix. The completion of this process provided a detailed review of the learning outcomes and measurements for AY16 and provided the way ahead for AY17. A synopsis of the MCWAR courses for AY16 is provided below. Additionally, the Director's recommendations as a result of the analysis are provided for each course as a way to proceed for AY17. The complete Director's report and wrap-up of the four-column matrix are enclosed.

- 6 Blocks of Instruction
- 22 Learning Outcomes
- 26 Measurements used to assess the learning outcomes

c. Director's Discussion/Comments for AY16 –

- a) On 8 June 2016 the Marine Corps War College (MCWAR) concluded another successful academic year, graduating 30 students, 27 with master's degrees. Two international students lacked the bachelor's degree upon entry that is required to enter the Masters of Strategic Studies Program and one international student with a bachelor's degree was unable to meet the TOEFL requirement. Instead, they earned certificates of attendance. The College's academic achievements are reflected in the students' scores below, the positive comments in the student course critiques and end-of-year survey, and in faculty assessments presented during the Course Content Review Boards (CCRBs) conducted in April 2016 (refer to enclosures for details).
- b) In AY16, MCWAR continued the highly successful Advanced Studies Program (ASP) begun in AY13. The ASP consisted of ten deep dive modules in each of the core courses, which allowed for greater exploration of targeted topics. Each of MCWAR's core courses executes an ASP of three to nine students. Each ASP assigns roughly 3500 pages of reading over the 10 sessions and students write 20-25 roughly pages in various written assignments.
- c) As recommended in the AY15 CCRB, the Advanced Studies Program (ASP) did away with the approach of having students take an ASP in the fall and write their Individual Research Project (IRP) in the spring. The goal was to provide students more time to conduct the intensive research necessary for the IRP.

- d) As recommended in the AY15 CCRB, the Diplomacy and Statecraft (DS) course added classes on UN Peacekeeping Operations, strengthened its treatment of policy analysis, lengthened seminar time from 2 hours to 3 hours where possible, and maintained its very fruitful collaboration with the Middle East Studies Program.
- e) As recommended in the AY15 CCRB, Economics and National Power (ENP) refined its approach to Topics in Economics (Trade, Development, and Resources) and added a simulation on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS).
- f) As recommended in the AY15 CCRB, Leadership and Ethics (L&E) added a lesson and practical application on creative reasoning, added a seminar on strategic ethics with Dr. Albert Pierce, and added Dr. Ori Brafman as a Perspectives on Leadership seminar.
- g) As recommended in the AY15 CCRB, National Security and Joint Warfare (NSJW) maintained media training as part of their JCLASSP preparation. NSJW instituted a "Low Pass" for students who submit poorly written or late journal entries.
- h) As recommended in the AY15 CCRB, War, Policy, and Strategy (WPS) has continued to add additional simulations and war games, much to students' appreciation.

d. Results –

1. Economics and National Power grades averaged 93.1%
2. Leadership and Ethics: grades averaged 91.3%
3. National Security and Joint Warfare: grades averaged 89.4%
4. Diplomacy and Statecraft: grades averaged 91.9%
5. War, Policy, and Strategy: grades averaged 92.6%

e. Recommendations for AY17 – MCWAR deserves its reputation as a leader in JPME. While already strong, the AY16 program review identified areas for improvement. See the Director's Annual Report (enclosure 1) for more detailed information.

(2) School of Advanced Warfighting (SAW)

a. Student Survey Results – 23 out of the 24 SAW students responded to the MCU AY16 student survey. The focus areas of the student survey were academic programs, faculty, organizational quality, MCU support and services, Information Technology (IT), Education Technology (ET), and the Leadership Communications Skills Center. Listed below are the overall results of the SAW respondents by focus area.

- Student satisfaction with the academic programs – 94.51%
- Student satisfaction with the faculty – 96.67% (excluding technology question)
- *Student satisfaction with organization quality – 100%
- *Student satisfaction with MCU support and services – 95.21%
- Student satisfaction with IT support – 85.51%
- Student satisfaction with ET support – 75% (new section this year)
- *54% of SAW students utilized the LCSC

*Indicates an improvement from last year.

b. Four Column Matrix Results - SAW concluded the curriculum review process in AY16 by completing the MCU Four Column Matrix. The completion of this process provided a detailed review of the learning outcomes and measurements for AY16 and provided the way ahead for AY17. The Director's recommendations as a result of the analysis are provided below. The complete Director's report and wrap-up of the four-column matrix are enclosed.

- 3 Blocks of Instruction
- 16 Learning Outcomes
- 22 Measurements used to assess the learning outcomes
- 90% average score reported on the measurements

c. Director's Discussion/Comments for AY16 –

The School of Advanced Warfighting (SAW) concluded another successful academic year (AY) on 8 June 2016 with 26 graduating students achieving the educational and organizational objectives set forth for the year. As with previous years, SAW faced significant personnel challenges over the course of this AY.

Teaching standards in SAW are high. Due to the continuity of the civilian faculty, unusual at MCU, teaching standards have risen continually (there have actually only been four civilian professors at SAW in its entire twenty-six year history. Three of them are currently on the staff!). (See the Director's Report for more information, enclosure 2)

d. Results – All of the major elements of the SAW curriculum achieved a better than 80% success rate as reported in Column 3 of the MCU AY 16 Four-Column Matrix. Briefly, the average student grade for the two Oral Comprehensive Mid-Term examinations was 92%. Average student grades for the six papers that were part of the Foundations of the Operational Art course ranged from 88 - 91. The average student grade for the ten seminars evaluated as part of the Foundations of the Operational Art class averaged 90. (See the Director's Report for more information, enclosure 2)

e. Recommendations for AY17 - All the major elements of the SAW curriculum in AY16 were successful according to the success criteria established in column 2 of the MCU Four Column Matrix. However, some substantive improvements were decided upon as a result of discussions

Subj: AY16 MCU INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT REPORT

among the faculty, and the two CCRBs conducted, one for the Fall instruction, and one for the Spring. Discussion here will be limited to addition and subtraction of lessons. More detailed changes, such as plans to examine or change reading assignments, can be examined in the two CCRBs, copies of which are included with this report. See the Director's Annual Report (enclosure 2)

(3) Command and Staff College (CSC)

a. Student Survey Results - 155 out of the 232 CSC students responded to the MCU AY16 student survey for CSC. The focus areas of the student survey were academic programs, faculty, organizational quality, MCU support and services, Information Technology (IT), Education Technology (ET), and the Leadership Communications Skills Center. Listed below are the overall results of the CSC respondents by focus area.

- *Student satisfaction with the academic programs – 96.05%
 - *Student satisfaction with the faculty – 97.06% (excluding technology question)
 - Student satisfaction with organization quality – 96.06%
 - *Student satisfaction with MCU support and services – 96.00%
 - *Student satisfaction with IT support – 85.49%
 - Student satisfaction with ET support – 98.27% (new section this year)
 - *88% of CSC students utilized the LCSC
- *Indicates an improvement from last year.

b. Four Column Matrix Results - CSC concluded the curriculum review process in AY16 by completing the MCU Four Column Matrix. The completion of this process provided a detailed review of the learning outcomes and measurements for AY16 and provided the way ahead for AY17. The Director's recommendations as a result of the analysis are provided below. The complete Director's report and wrap-up of the four-column matrix are enclosed.

- 11 Blocks of Instruction
- 36 Learning Outcomes
- 39 Measurements used to assess the learning outcomes

c. Director's Discussion/Comments for AY16 – This academic year witnessed the maturation and continuing development of the curriculum put fully in place during AY 14-15. The transition from 4 to 11 core courses has gone smoothly, and, despite the slow process of filling three civilian professor vacancies, the civilian department heads filled in admirably, and the education of our students did not suffer in the least. As indicated by the results captured on the various 4-column matrices, students achieved the learning outcomes defined by the college. (See the Director's Annual Report for more detailed information, enclosure 3)

d. Results - See enclosure 3.

e. Recommendations for AY17 – Changes in particular lesson content, type of writing assignments, character of evaluation rubrics, sequence and timing of particular lessons of exercises were the subjects of course content review boards for particular courses. As the minutes of the End of Year Program Review observe, and analysis of the survey data from both the college's and the university's end of year surveys indicates, the reaction to AY 15-16 was largely positive. The timing of the MCU Curriculum Review Board, held on 9 June 2016, was premature, coming as it did literally the day after this year's class graduated, and before any serious evaluation of decision-making within the college could take place. The transition to the Warner Center has been a great improvement for the learning environment, and we are only in the early stages of experiencing what the .edu domain offers for long term improvement. With the refinements identified in the respective core course reports and CCRB minutes, the college looks forward enthusiastically to AY 16-17.

(4) Expeditionary Warfare School (EWS)

a. Student Survey Results - 78 out of the 247 EWS students responded to the MCU AY16 student survey for EWS. The focus areas of the student survey were academic programs, faculty, organizational quality, MCU support and services, Information Technology (IT), Education Technology (ET), and the Professional Communication Section of EWS. Listed below are the overall results of the EWS respondents by focus area.

- Student satisfaction with the academic programs – 93.77%
 - *Student satisfaction with the faculty – 95.07% (excluding technology question)
 - Student satisfaction with organization quality – 94.12%
 - Student satisfaction with MCU support and services – 94.47%
 - Student satisfaction with IT support – 79.66%
 - Student satisfaction with ET support – 73.91% (new section this year)
 - 75% of students utilized the EWS Communications Department
- *Indicates an improvement from last year.

b. Four Column Matrix Results - EWS concluded the curriculum review process in AY16 by completing the MCU Four Column Matrix. The completion of this process provided a detailed review of the learning outcomes and measurements for AY16 and provided the way ahead for AY17. The Director's recommendations as a result of the analysis are provided below. The complete Director's report and wrap-up of the four-column matrix can be found in enclosure 4.

- 9 Blocks of instruction
- 23 Learning Outcomes
- 54 Measurements used to assess the learning outcomes
- 91.56% average score reported on the measurements

c. Director's Discussion/Comments for AY16 – During AY16, EWS educated and trained 247 Marine, sister service, and international military students. EWS can state with confidence that it accomplished its mission of "educating and training company grade Marine Air-Ground Task Force officers to lead and succeed in the expeditionary environment." EWS undertook several initiatives: Academic Reorganization, Faculty Advisors, Faculty Selection, Horizon and Focus—The Next Five Years, Academic Accountability, Small Wars Course, Combined Arms OFEC at 29 Palms, Amphibious Operations Planning Exercise—Angkor Cross, State of the Corps Seminar, Standardized CCRB Process and Report, Navy Amphibious and Mine Warfare Weapons and Tactics Instructor Course, and Royal Marine Engagement. New initiatives included: Additional SPMAGTF and MEB Lessons, ISR Rotation, Leader Development Course, General Officer Guest Lectures, Educational Objective Review, Increased Written Requirements, Enrichment Program, Research Fellows, Force Protection, and Published Work. (Please see the enclosure for more details.)

d. Results – AY16 EWS graduate accomplished the 23 learning outcomes (LOs) as described and assessed in the EWS AY16 Four Column Matrix. See enclosures.

e. Recommendations for AY17 – See the Director's Annual Report (enclosure 4)

(5) Enlisted Professional Military Education (EPME)

a. Student Survey Results – Not applicable: EPME students do not participate in MCU's Annual Student Survey; however, EPME offers numerous surveys throughout the year to students in a variety of courses.

b. Four Column Matrix Results – EPME concluded the curriculum review process in AY16 by completing the MCU Four Column Matrix. The completion of this process provided a detailed review of the learning outcomes and measurements for AY16 and provided the way ahead for AY17. The Director's recommendations as a result of the analysis are provided below. The complete Director's report and wrap-up of the four-column matrix can be found in enclosure 5.

- 4 Programs of Instruction
- 25 Learning Outcomes
- 35 Measurements used to assess the learning outcomes

c. Director's Discussion/Comments for AY16 – Academy Year 2015/2016 was another busy year for Enlisted Professional Military Education (EPME). To meet the requirements of MarAdmin 521/14 which required every Marine in the ranks or sergeant through gunnery sergeant to attend a resident or resident-like PME course, the directorate made its revised schedule fully operational capable. As a result, the total number of Advanced and Career Courses was reduced from 23 to 15 each annually, and the number of Sergeants Courses increased from 62 to 76 annually. To accomplish this, both Career and Advanced Course Faculty Advisors had to certify in Sergeants Course curricula.

d. Results – During the 2015/2016 academic year, students from the Staff Noncommissioned Officer Academies (SNCOA) demonstrated their understanding of content through various assessments that consisted of: multiple choice exams, fill-in-the-blank tests, position papers, oral presentations, operation field events, performance-based assessments, and individual performance evaluations. An achievement score of 80 percent or higher for each assessment was the metric used to determine mastery of Learning Outcomes. An analysis of data from the six academies showed that the average passage rate for Sergeants through Advanced Courses remained at greater than 98 percent. Less than 2 percent of the students failed courses during the 2015/2016 academic year, which is indicative of student mastery of overall content.

e. Recommendations for AY17 – See the EPME Director's Annual Report (enclosure 5)

(6) College of Distance Education & Training (CDET)

a. Student Survey Results – Not applicable: CDET students do not participate in MCU's Annual Student Survey.

b. Four Column Matrix Results - CDET concluded the curriculum review process in AY16 by completing the MCU Four Column Matrix for both CSCDEP and EWSDEP. The Director's recommendations as a result of the analysis are provided below. The complete Director's report and wrap-up of the four-column matrix can be found in enclosure 6.

- 12 Programs of Instruction
- 53 Learning Outcomes
- 41 Measurements used to assess the learning outcomes

c. Director's Discussion/Comments for AY16 –

- CSCDEP: AY16 executed with the complete inclusion of all applicable MCU learning outcomes derived from the zero-based curriculum review. There were no significant milestones or changes which dramatically impacted academic performance during AY16. The MCU Four Column Matrices for AY-16 submitted by the CSCDEP denote specifically approved changes for each course based on Course Content Review Boards (CCRBs), and the impact those changes will have on the AY-17 course offerings. Feedback that follows will discuss recommendations from the AY15 CCRBs and how these recommendations were either successfully implemented or if shortcomings still exist per the AY16 CCRB reports. At this time not all AY16 CCRBs have been conducted due to course close-out timing during the CDET AY. CDET will submit an update addendum by 30 Sep 2016.
The data in this report shows performance with respect to MCU learning outcomes. The percentages found in the Four Column Matrices are based on all assessments performed during the course. Some learning outcomes were assessed by all of the course's assessment tools while other learning outcomes were assessed only through a single assessment tool. MCU learning outcomes were incorporated and effectively assessed according to the data. All data indicate that learners are achieving appropriate levels of performance as measured by the assessments directly linked to MCU and JPME learning outcomes. The data show that the vast majority of learners are performing well on the course assessments and are attaining a higher level of learning of the key concepts addressed in the overall CSCDEP. Additionally, the data demonstrate that there is no appreciable difference between onsite and online learner performance. Overall, both categories of learners are performing well.
(More detailed information can be found in enclosure 6.)
- EWSDEP: In Academic Year 2016, the EWSDEP completed its second full year with the new 8660 curriculum and its first year offering MAGTF Operations Ashore (8662) with a self-study or seminar option. The curriculum is designed to ensure all students complete, at a minimum, an entire academic year in seminar; the independent guided study option has been completely phased out. Students complete the first courses, Warfighting (8661), through online self-study and, as mentioned, may take MAGTF Operations Ashore (8662) through online self-study or seminar. The courseware is accessed via Blackboard. Upon completing the prerequisites, students complete the remaining courses, MAGTF Operations

Ashore Practical Exercise (8663) and Amphibious Operations (8664), in seminar. Onsite seminar is the default option, although an online option is available for those geographically separated from major bases and stations. Results of the changes made to this year's curriculum were favorably received by faculty and students. Warfighting realigned the sub-courses in order to spread the readings more equitably throughout each; and, hence more closely balance the assessments across the curriculum. MAGTF Operations Ashore had a test item analysis resulting in 29 questions being changed (modified, deleted, or added) from a 127 question bank. The MAGTF Operations Ashore Practical Exercise added a Google Earth based mapping option due to difficulties students had encountered with the TerraGo mapping products. Amphibious Operations replaced the Rapid Response Planning Process (R2P2) exercise with a guided discussion. Lack of an experienced cohesive staff and rehearsed SOPs made the exercise counterproductive. The lesson results in an understanding of the process and the conditions required to execute it effectively. (More detailed information can be found in enclosure 6.)

d. Results –

- CSCDEP: Course averages were all above 90%. More detailed information can be found in enclosure 6.
- EWSDEP: Student performance in each course:

8661:	90%
8662:	84%
8663:	92%
8664:	92%

e. Recommendations for AY17 –

- CSCDEP: Numerous changes have been recommended for the next Academic year separated by course. Detailed information can be found in enclosure 6.
- EWSDEP: Numerous changes have been recommended for the next Academic year. Detailed information can be found in enclosure 6.

Subj: AY16 MCU INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT REPORT

Summary of the MCU AY16 Academic Units

- 45 Blocks of Instruction
- 175 Learning Outcomes
- 217 Measurements were used to assess the effectiveness of academic unit outcomes

3. Summary. This document has provided the results of the assessment of the academic units within Marine Corps University for AY16. The recommendations for changes to the units for AY17 have also been presented in this report. The continued systematic enhancement of the curriculum review process coupled with the evolving improvements to the AES unit review will continue to provide the method which will ensure MCU sustains its commitment to offer a world-class professional military education.



DR. SUSAN JOHNSTON