



Commanders Mission Analysis and Review (CMAR) Handbook

Prepared by
The Air University Office of Academic Affairs (OAA)

23 June 2023
with Change 1, 18 September 2023

INDEX

Change 1 Summary	4
Introduction.....	5
Overview	5
References.....	6
Table 1. Reference Documents	6
Roles and Responsibilities	7
Central Concepts.....	9
Common Purpose, Distinct Processes: DAFI 90-302 and CMAR	10
Table 2. DAFI 90-302 Purposes and CMAR Linkage (Highlighted).....	10
Common Operating Picture:	11
Table 3: Common Operating Picture for Unit Performance	12
The “Program Perspective”	13
Data Analysis and Decision-Making.....	14
Checklist Update Crosswalk.....	16
Appendix 1: CMAR Checklists.....	17
Overview	17
Quarter 1 Checklist (Faculty; General Admin).....	18
Quarter 2 Checklist (Non-Instructional Services; Student Admin).....	23
Quarter 3 Checklist (Program Execution; Academic Support Services).....	27
Appendix 2: CMAR Data-Collection Expectations	31
Air University (AU) Work Centers	31
Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT)	32
Air Command and Staff College (ACSC)	33
Air War College (AWC)	34
Thomas N. Barnes Center for Enlisted Education (BCEE)	35
Community College of the Air Force (CCAF).....	35
Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development (ECPD)	36
Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development (ECPD) – CADP Only	37
Global College of Professional Military Education (GCPME)	38

Jeanne M. Holm Center for Officer Accessions and Citizen Development (Holm Center).....39

International Officer School (IOS)40

Curtis E. LeMay Center for Doctrine Development and Education (LeMay Center).....41

School of Advanced Air and Space Studies (SAASS)42

Squadron Officer School (SOS).....43

USAF Test Pilot School (TPS).....44

(DELETED) Appendix 3: CMAR Checklist Questions for Inspections.....44

Appendix 4: The Road to CMAR45

Change 1 Summary

This Handbook has been substantially updated. Changed/added text is annotated in **BLUE** font.

1. **Deleted** CAO and Academic Affairs office symbols pending Air University A-Staff structure.
2. **Updated** Inspector General references.
 - 2.1. DAFI 90-302 supersedes AFI 90-201.
 - 2.2. Incorporated DAFI 90-302 terms in place of superseded terms.
 - 2.3. Updated “Common Purpose, Distinct Processes” section extensively.
 - 2.4. Added Table 2 to show linkage of CMAR to Inspector General (IG) purposes and process.
 - 2.5. Updated Appendix 1, CMAR Checklist references for Major Graded Areas
3. **Added** AFI 1-2, *Commander’s Responsibilities*, references and linkage.
4. **Added** “Unit Performance” table to link DAFI 90-302, AFI 1-2, and CMAR.
5. **Added** “Program Perspective” discussion to define “program” for CMAR.
6. **Updated** Appendix 1, CMAR Checklist, Item #20, for grammar.
7. **Updated** Appendix 2, CMAR Data Collection Expectations for multiple units/programs based on data collection and discussion with programs during CMAR 2022Q4 and 2023 Q1/Q2 data calls.
8. **Updated** Appendix 2, CMAR Data Collection Expectations, to align the column sequence with the CMAR checklist and quarterly reporting flow.
 - 8.1. Faculty (Q1)
 - 8.2. General Administration (Q1)
 - 8.3. Non-instructional Services (Q2)
 - 8.4. Student Administration (Q2)
 - 8.5. Program Execution (Q3)
 - 8.6. Academic Support Services (Q3)
9. Deleted Appendix 3, CMAR Checklist Questions for IG Inspections

Introduction

Implementation of the Commander’s Mission Analysis and Review (CMAR) process is a key turning point in the command, governance, and administration of educational and support services activities at Air University (AU). CMAR is the nexus where multiple requirements come together; where data from multiple sources can be fused to support data-informed analysis; and where educational leaders can develop processes to better monitor the performance of their programs (measured through student achievement of program learning outcomes or PLOs) and make appropriate control inputs to improve program performance through measurable improvements in student achievement. [The CMAR process and central concepts apply](#) to all echelons of command and leadership at the university—individual educational programs; combinations of programs within a school, college, or center; and for the AU Commander and President (AU/CC) to maintain appropriate oversight of the institutional mission while subordinate commanders execute their roles to command and lead their educational programs.

The challenge to implementation of the CMAR process is one of inertia. The military “can do” mindset has served the university well; we have accomplished the mission [despite challenging circumstances](#). The military “can do” mindset can once again step up to the challenge to innovate and adapt to the CMAR process that brings a common ground to the challenges and requirements faced by all mission elements with The Air University. The point of CMAR is not to demonstrate compliance with yes/no questions, but to provide leaders at all levels with the framework for the policies, processes, and evidence they need to monitor their program’s performance and apply appropriate controls. Rarely is a mission executed perfectly; we should not expect our programs to be perfect. But we should also expect leaders to monitor mission performance and make appropriate control adjustments.

Overview

The CMAR process was developed to support commanders at all levels by providing the tools to monitor the performance of the mission—education and education support programs for AU—through systematic implementation of policy, process, and evidence for data-informed decision-making (and thus directly supports Action Order B: Bureaucracy). CMAR also supports standard data collection and reporting processes required by Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1322.35, Volume 1, *Military Education: Program Management and Administration*, 26 April 2022, and inspection system guidance found in Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 90-302, *The Inspection System of the Department of the Air Force*. AU Instruction (AUI) 36-2602, *Command, Governance and Administration Policy*, 18 August 2021, established the CMAR to consolidate primary reporting requirements into a single process and links program-level actions to the AU Strategic Plan. A more complete history of the background and development of the CMAR process is in Appendix 4.

This User’s Guide supports AUI 36-2602 by providing program-level clarity on the *expectations for unit process where units are conducting or supporting Air University’s education and education support missions*. In other words, AUI 36-2602, Chapter 9, provides the CMAR policy; this Guide provides the processes for what is expected from all education and education support units under or supporting AU. This guide compiles all CMAR-related process documents moving forward – procedures, schedules, expectations, and the CMAR checklist – to improve continuity as CMAR is implemented and continuously improved. This Guide also supports the dynamics of organizational alignment, program changes, personnel changes, and other events without having to update the core policy of AUI 36-2602.

References

The CMAR process references and leverages common requirements from the following documents into a single annual cycle. As such, the CMAR Checklist (Appendix 1) items include a “reference” element to these documents. Table 1, below, is presented in order of precedence – Department of Defense (DoD) reporting at the top and institutional accreditation at the bottom.

Table 1. Reference Documents

Reference	Applies To...
1. DoDI 1322.35: Military Education (ME): Program Management and Administration (26 April 2022)	All programs
2. CJCSI 1800.01F, Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP) (15 May 2020)	JPME only
3. CJCSI 1800.05C, Enlisted Professional Military Education Policy (EPMEP) (01 November 2021)	EPME only
4. JCS Vision: Joint Chiefs of Staff Vision and Guidance for Professional Military Education and Talent Management (1 May 2020)	All PME
5. DAFI 90-302: The Inspection System of the Department of the Air Force (15 March 2023)	All units
6. AFI 1-2, Commander’s Responsibilities , 8 May 2014	All units
7. DAFI 36-2670, Total Force Development (24 June 2020)	All programs
8. AUI 36-2602, Command, Governance and Administration Policy (18 August 2021)	All programs
9. <i>The Principles of Accreditation</i> , Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), (1 January 2018)	All college credit-bearing programs except AFIT
10. <i>Criteria for Accreditation</i> , Higher Learning Commission (HLC), (online, 9 December 2022)	AFIT only
11. Air University Unit Self-Assessment Program (USAP) Handbook, 1 June 2023 (published by AU Inspector General)	All organizations listed in paragraph 2
12. Air University Institutional Effectiveness Plan (AU IE Plan)	All programs

NOTE: There are other AF, DAFI, DoD, and guidance documents that impact units/programs. As such, this list is not comprehensive—it represents the guidance that applies broadly across The Air University.

Roles and Responsibilities

1. **Air University Commander and President** (AU/CC). AU mission stakeholder.
2. **Provost and Chief Academic Officer** (CAO). Implements the university-wide program review and evaluation components through the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA); establishes and implements institutional effectiveness, assessment, and evaluation processes for AU academic and associated administrative programs; oversees the coordination between AU Inspector General (AU/IG), the HQ Staff, and Centers/Schools to ensure all higher-level directive requirements are met. Senior advisor to AU/CC for academic functions, educational program execution, faculty, university-wide educational program quality and joint, institutional, and specialized accreditation related matters.
3. **Deputy Provost**. Oversees all instructional programs, curriculum integration, teaching, faculty, research, scholarship, institutional effectiveness, and analytics through the Institutional Policy, Institutional and Program Review and Evaluation, Process, and Institutional Assessment and Planning Process. Staff Assistance Visit (SAV) member. Administers/executes the CMAR process through Academic Affairs members who specialize in elements of the CMAR along with broad CMAR expertise.
4. **Chief, Advisory Boards and Strategic Operations**. Serves as the key staff officer for AU governance and advisory board activities to include the Board of Visitors (BoV) and all approved subcommittees and working groups. Provides subject matter expertise, supports SAVs, and assesses the quality of evidence provided to demonstrate compliance as needed. Primary focus on BoV interface, support, and sustainment.
5. **Chief, Institutional Effectiveness (IE)**. Operates the Human Subjects Research Protection Program (HRPP); manages the AU Survey Control Program; assigns AU survey control numbers, provides guidance on survey design, deployment, and interpretation. Supports SAVs and assesses the quality of evidence provided to demonstrate compliance as needed. Primary focus on assessment planning and outcomes reporting from programs. Leads AU-level program assessment data collection and reporting; oversees program assessment plan quality and executability; and partners with **Chief of Institutional Analytics and Research Data** for data requirements, direct and indirect, that support IE efforts. CMAR expert in student administration and program execution checklists.
6. **Chief, Faculty Relations**. Provides execution, coordination, and support on faculty related matters across the AU enterprise such as new faculty development processes, onboarding, training, orientation, and mentoring through peer and academic support programs. Additionally, serve as the primary advisor on faculty initiatives, policies, processes, and relations. CMAR expert for the faculty administration checklist.
7. **Chief, Graduate Professional Education and Program Enhancement**. Ensures AU curricula remains current and aligned with AU priorities; and maintains, builds, and monitors the execution of CMAR across the AU enterprise. CMAR process co-administrator; supports SAVs; coordinates with the IG for integration of CMAR within IG processes; collaborates with work centers for completion of CMAR checklists; and updates the CMAR checklist to reflect changing conditions, requirements, or unique mission sets for specific work centers. Primary interface with officer PME (OPME) and graduate degree program missions at AU. CMAR expert in all CMAR checklists; primary responsibilities in the program execution checklist.

8. **Chief, Institutional Analytics and Research Data.** Serves the University with information and special studies; conducts research and analyses on the characteristics of educational processes, student body, faculty and staff; assists with accreditation efforts; including the planning and evaluation process for all units; develops and maintains AU's strategic plan and strategy management processes; and prepares reports for the campus, the Board, and other outside agencies by developing and managing data to facilitate AU efforts in institutional effectiveness. Supports SAVs and assesses the quality of evidence provided to demonstrate compliance as needed. CMAR expert in student administration checklist.
9. **Chief, Undergraduate and Continuing Education.** Oversees the activities of AU's undergraduate and professional continuing education (PCE) programs. Ensures curricula remain current, updated, and aligned with AU priorities; collects data and conducts research analysis for institutional continuous process improvements; and maintains, builds, and monitors the execution of the program review process. CMAR process co-administrator and member of SAV team to support CMAR implementation. Coordinates with the IG for integration of CMAR within IG processes. Collaborates with work centers for completion of CMAR checklists; advises work centers on resolving any findings from IG inspections; and updates the CMAR checklist to reflect changing conditions, requirements, or unique mission sets for specific work centers. Primary interface with PCE, enlisted PME (EPME), and undergraduate degree program missions at AU. CMAR subject matter expert in all CMAR checklists with primary responsibilities in the general administration and program execution checklists.
10. **Director, Program Evaluation.** Provides program assessment and evaluation services spanning all direct and indirect assessment data, such as development of annual assessment plans and annual program learning outcomes reporting; development of data collection instruments; administration of data collections and analysis of results; aggregation of survey data and measures of student performance (such as data captured on rubrics). The Director is aided by a team of experts to provide these services that directly support the CMAR process and evidence requirements.
11. **Individual Units.** Execute the Q1, Q2, and Q3 CMAR Checklists of Appendix 1 to collect data IAW the data collection expectations of Appendix 2 to meet the DoD's reporting requirements. In Q4, analyze unit data and develop data-informed program improvements. *These responsibilities apply to all units assigned to AU and any non-AU unit executing an education or training program affiliated with obtaining credit towards any AU program.*

Central Concepts

The CMAR process is central to the AU IE Plan and focuses on data associated with education and education support programs to support *continuous process improvement*: improve the curriculum; improve the students' experience; and improve the intellectual, leadership, and joint warfighting skills of program graduates. To achieve this goal, the Office of Academic Affairs embraces the following central concepts to implement CMAR.

1. Support Commanders.

- a. The CMAR process supports commanders at all levels – educational program, center, and university – through a comprehensive process that collects relevant data that is analyzed to provide commanders usable information for decision making. The data and analysis will not tell the whole story—command leadership is essential—but the data and analysis will inform commanders who can then make “data-informed decisions” in line with the military decision-making process (MDMP). As such, the CMAR process supports local decision making as well as **linking program activity to the Air University Strategic Action Plan (SAP) key focus areas and lines of effort**.
- b. **The Air University Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) staff supports commanders and work centers by reviewing the data and responses submitted by each program** and conducting multiple levels of analysis in order to provide feedback on the quality of responses and evidence provided. OAA feedback is for each work center to use to improve its program oversight and administration as well as to keep AU/CC and CAO informed. The feedback is NOT a grade, score, or stoplight color; the “rubric” for feedback is the quality of the submission in supporting dialog, reporting, and other inquiries about the quality of AU education and education support programs. Finally, OAA supports the AU/IG Inspection Team (AUI 36-2602, Chapter 9) to ensure “the Commander’s Inspection Program (CCIP) and Unit Self-Assessment Program (USAP) focus on readiness capabilities, detecting noncompliance with applicable governing directives, and unit effectiveness through the four major graded areas (MGAs)” as they relate to the CMAR process (see Table 2 for linkage between DAFI 90-302 and the CMAR purposes; and Table 3 for development of the same common operating picture). The goal is for program data and analysis to support the chain of command by answering four questions that frequently function in pairs:

Are we doing the right things? (Policy) ← → Are we doing things the right way? (Process)
How well are we doing? (Evidence) ← → How do we know? (Analysis)

2. **Integrate and Simplify.** Integrate guidance documents impacting mission execution, quality, and credentials into a single process to eliminate redundancy, reduce reporting requirements, centralize institutional data, rationalize checklists, and support internal and external inspection through integrated and simplified data collection and reporting processes.
3. **Leverage Existing Systems.** Leverage the Electronic Task Management System (ETMS) or similar systems to provide commanders with standard checklists unique to education and education support missions. Through ETMS, CMAR leverages the USAP process to conduct quarterly reviews of education and education support mission elements.
4. **Provide Transparency, Develop Rapport.** Transparency establishes public, professional, and personal rapport throughout a range of audiences. Through transparency in policy, process, and

evidence the Air University is able to clearly show the impact of the educational programs on the development of the intellectual and leadership skills of its graduates.

5. **Create a Baseline Database.** Documents produced by the CMAR process create a baseline database for HQ Staff to use in responding to tasks or to shape tasks. CMAR will not answer every task, but the substance of the process covers most known requirements.

Common Purpose, Distinct Processes: DAFI 90-302 and CMAR

Common Purpose: DAFI 90-302, paragraph 1.2, “Purpose of The Inspection System” closely aligns with the purpose of the CMAR process. Data collected for the Unit Self-Assessment Program (USAP) is often the same data needed for CMAR reporting and unit commander is the responsible official for both. Table 2 highlights the similarity between DAFI 90-302 inspection system processes and CMAR.

Table 2. DAFI 90-302 Purposes and CMAR Linkage (Highlighted)

<p>1.2.1. Evaluates leadership effectiveness, management performance, aspects of unit culture and command climate, and prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse. The Inspection System identifies and reports issues interfering with readiness, economy, efficiency, discipline, effectiveness, compliance, performance, and surety.</p>
<p>1.2.2. Enables and strengthens commanders’ mission effectiveness and efficiency through independent assessment and accurate reporting of readiness, economy, efficiency, discipline, and the ability to execute assigned missions.</p>
<p>1.2.3. Provides commanders at all levels an independent assessment of compliance with established directives.</p>
<p>1.2.4. Motivates and promotes military discipline, improved unit performance, and management excellence throughout the chain of command, within units, and across staffs.</p>
<p>1.2.5. Supports and informs commanders’ risk management at all levels. IGs must ensure The Inspection System supports prudent decisions by commanders that have documented or elevated risk acceptance, as appropriate.</p>
<p>1.2.6. Enables MAJCOM/FLDCOM/FOA/DRU, ANG, and POA assessment of functional effectiveness, field compliance, and adequacy of organization, policy, guidance, training, and resources.</p>
<p>1.2.7. Provides a mechanism for senior leaders to direct a targeted, detailed, and thorough inspection of specific programs, organizations, and issues.</p>
<p>1.2.8. Realizes the capability and encourages the execution of remote inspection whenever practical.</p>

Through DAFI 90-302 processes the IG opens lines of communication between commanders at all levels to show compliance with *policy* and *process* with documented *evidence*. The CMAR checklists have the same purpose locally as well as expanding that purpose to external reporting requirements such as those to USAF higher headquarters (HHQ) and the Department of Defense; Congressional requests for

information; the Joint Staff; and institutional academic accreditation. More significantly, the CMAR process supports the data needed to assess multiple lines of effort across the key focus areas of the Air University Strategic Action Plan (AU SAP).

Distinct Processes: While the purposes are the similar, there are key differences between [DAFI 90-302](#) and CMAR.

1. Process Focus.
 - a. [DAFI 90-302](#): Commander's Programs and Commander's Responsibilities.
 - b. CMAR: Specifics unique to education and education support missions.
2. Response Content.
 - a. [DAFI 90-302](#): Require yes/no responses and some supporting documents.
 - b. CMAR: Responses require short narratives along with documentation.
3. Response Submission.
 - a. [DAFI 90-302](#): Completed using the Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT).
 - b. CMAR: Completed using the Enterprise Task Management Software Solution (ETMS2) application (also known as Task Management Tool or TMT).

Common Operating Picture:

Together, the [DAFI 90-302](#) and CMAR processes provide a common operating picture of mission accomplishment through commander's actions to assess and report the effectiveness of programs and specific mission elements unique to education and education support units. This combination supports a cohesive assessment of the major graded areas discussed in [DAFI 90-302](#), Figure 3.2, the commander's duties and responsibilities defined in [AFI 1-2](#), *Commander's Responsibilities*, paragraph 3, and aid the commander in conducting assessments of the mission as well as risks to the mission and daily operations as called for in the USAP Handbook. Thus, CMAR supports commander's by integrating requirements, simplifying reporting procedures, and leveraging existing systems.

The common operating picture should result in the reporting of all activities that are assessed, but only once. In this way all the activities to execute the mission are examined comprehensively and all actions support holistic assessment of the major graded areas of [DAFI 90-302](#) and support commander's in executing their USAP. In short, [DAFI 90-302](#) and CMAR support the mission. The difference is that the CMAR checklists focus on the performance of education and education support missions in the unique education environment of a university.

Table 3 shows how [DAFI 90-302](#), [AFI 1-2](#), and CMAR share focus areas used by commanders to develop an assessment of unit performance. Note that CMAR does not add new focus areas but refines the common elements of [DAFI 90-302](#) and [AFI 1-2](#) as they appear in the education mission sets. For example, CMAR faculty development and management includes development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners that incorporate focus areas from "executing the mission" and "leading people." Thus, CMAR provides all AU commanders with the tools to gather data for the education mission sets. The key difference is that CMAR checklist items (Appendix 1) focus on education mission sets conducted by the Air University rather than the generic unit addressed by [DAFI 90-302](#) and [AFI 1-2](#).

With the common ground of the [DAFI 90-302](#), [AFI 1-2](#), and the CMAR processes, it is important to establish common expectations for CMAR data collection and reporting among AU Schools, Colleges, and Centers at the program level where reportable data reside. The "CMAR Data-Collection Expectations" table (Appendix 2) represents the baseline for implementing the CMAR process. Each unit will need to determine how to implement processes for CMAR based on the unique structure of the work

centers within each center, college, or school where reportable data reside. While DoDI 1322.35 and CMAR are new, the underlying requirements are well established. The goal is to centralize and simplify. With that in mind, work center checklists may be “rolled-up” where it makes sense—such as when a single faculty or staff executes multiple programs.

Table 3: Common Operating Picture for Unit Performance

	DAFI 90-302 Figure 3.2 Major Graded Areas	AFI 1-2 Paragraph 3 Commander’s Duties and Responsibilities	CMAR Checklists and Focus Areas
UNIT PERFORMANCE	Executing the Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readiness • Daily Operations • Installation Preparedness 	Execute the Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Mission • AEF Readiness • Mission Assurance Command and Control 	Faculty Development and Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Quantity • Recognition • Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teachers ○ Scholars ○ Practitioners (Airmen) General Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Alignment • Support Coordination • External Reviews • Program Change and Results Non-Instructional Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission • Effectiveness • Awareness Student Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity • Talent Management • Grievances • Disenrollment Program Execution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content requirements • Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curriculum ○ Teaching ○ Student Learning • Closed-Loop Analysis Academic Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of Services • Effectiveness • Awareness
	Managing Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy • Stewardship 	Manage Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manpower • Funds • Equipment • Facilities and Environment • Guidance • Airman’s Time 	
	Leading People <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication • Discipline • Training • Development • Quality of Life 	Lead People <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication • Discipline • Training • Development • Quality of Life Engagement 	
	Improving the Unit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Alignment • Process Operations • Commander’s Inspection Program (CCIP) • Data-Driven Decisions 	Improve the Unit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Alignment • Process Operations • Commander’s Inspection Program (CCIP) • Data-Driven Decisions 	

The “Program Perspective”

DoD “Programs.” The term “program” is used in many ways in the Department of Defense (DoD). For example, funding is provided to each Service through the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) process where a strategic level program, such as the F-35 *program*, is funded to procure airframes. At the operational level (Major Command), a *program* may be executed to provide warfighting skills to Airmen, such as the pilot training *program* for Air Education and Training Command. At the unit level, flying squadrons must execute a flying hour *program* each year where flight hours are allocated to each unit as a means to fund the unit and for funding maintenance, fuels, and support functions. In these examples the *program* is linked to aircraft in some way—procurement of airframes; training personnel to fly; funding flight operations; and funding flying maintenance (among other things), respectively.

Air University “Programs.” At the Air University, the mission focuses on education and education support programs. By establishing a *program perspective* across AU, units can meet the requirements of DoDI 1322.35 reporting without undue burden. What this means is that all units with an education or education support mission need to view the courses or services offered more holistically where courses/services are part of a program for reporting and program analysis functions. In this way, units can aggregate courses/services into logical structures that mirror academic degree program structures. This empowers commanders to conduct reporting and analysis functions at the program level—programs are the unit of analysis for DoDI 1322.35 reporting, not individual courses or services. It is important to note that this handbook is not defining every unit’s mission set as a program but rather suggests that every unit consider its mission with a program perspective. This provides separation from academic programs assessed by institutional accreditors while infusing a degree of standardization throughout the AU enterprise for the AU Commander and President.

Definitions. There are at least two relevant definitions of “education program”- one from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) and one from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

34 CFR § 99.3: “Education program” is defined as any program principally engaged in the provision of education, including, but not limited to, early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, postsecondary education, special education, job training, career and technical education, and adult education, and any program that is administered by an educational agency or institution.

SACSCOC: Educational programs (a) embody a coherent course of study, (b) are compatible with the stated mission and goals of the institution, and (c) are based on fields of study appropriate to higher education (The Principles of Accreditation, 2018, Section 9, Critical Requirement 9.1).

A “Program Perspectives” Framework for CMAR and DoDI 1322.35 Reporting. Both definitions above apply specifically to academic degree programs, but core elements could be extracted to create a working definition of a program perspective: “*career and technical education presented in a coherent course of study that is administered by an educational agency or institution.*”

Data Analysis and Decision-Making

The data collected through the CMAR process will be analyzed in several ways to support making data-informed decisions. For example, the primary analysis is of the policy, process, and evidence (PPE) documentation. Do written documents exist that codify policy and process? Is there evidence that policy and process have been followed to produce usable data? Leaders at all levels—commanders, commandants, deans, course directors—should consider PPE analysis as just one tool for critical examination of mission accomplishment and the need for program improvement to improve student achievement or meet emerging requirements.

1. **Policy, Process, and Evidence (PPE)**
 - a. Do written documents exist that codify policy and process?
 - b. Is there evidence that policy and process have been followed to produce usable data?
2. **Key Questions.** Does the response support use of the data/information for decision making and meeting reporting requirements?
 - a. **Are we doing the right things? (Policy)**
 - 1) What are the policy documents/specific chapters/paragraphs that apply to the question?
 - 2) Does the policy cover all the requirements that need to be done—the right things?
 - b. **Are we doing things the right way? (Process)**
 - 1) What are the processes that apply to implement the policies referenced above?
 - 2) Are the processes broad enough to be enduring and focused enough to be meaningful?
 - c. **How well are we doing? (Evidence)**
 - 1) What are the data are used to determine mission success?
 - 2) What analysis of the data has been done and to what conclusions?
 - d. **How do we know? (Analysis)**
 - 1) Are the conclusions based on anecdotal data (single data set) or longitudinal data (using multiple data sets to reduce variance from student and faculty changeover)?
 - 2) Are the assessments and data collection processes valid?
 - a) Construct validity: Does the assessment measure the intended concept?
 - b) Content validity: Is the assessment fully representative of what it aims to measure?
 - c) Face validity: Does the content of the assessment appear to be suitable to its aims?
 - d) Criterion validity: Do the results accurately measure the concrete outcome they are designed to measure?
 - 3) Are the data collection processes reliable (use of rubrics with inter-rater reliability)?
3. **Student Achievement.** Does the evidence support assessment of student achievement relative to the program learning outcomes (PLOs)? Is there a statement on the degree to which PLOs were met (fully met, partially met, not met)? Evidence of these efforts includes the following:
 - a) Program's graduation rate
 - b) Program outcome attainment
 - a. Consider key assessments as SAMPLES of PLO attainment.
 - b. PLO attainment is NOT an assessment of the program value.
 - c) Potential in research, writing, analysis, and leadership
 - d) Processes to convey data to personnel systems for enhanced talent management (e.g., assignment potential and selection, career progression, retention).

4. **Program Changes and Improvements**
 - a. What areas are indicated as needing change for currency, relevance, etc.?
 - b. What areas are indicated as needing improvements to increase student achievement?
5. **Closed Loop Analysis.**
 - a. What were the results of prior changes and improvement actions?
 - b. Did the prior changes and improvement actions have the desired impact (did they work)?
6. **Validity and Reliability.** How do we know the data are valid and reliable indicators of student achievement (see paragraph 2.d., above)?
7. **Holistic View.** Taken together with the IG process, data from the CMAR process should aid commander's in responding to two holistic questions:
 - a. What is the risk to operations?
 - b. What is the risk to mission?

Checklist Update Crosswalk

Quarter (2023)	New Item # (8 December 2022)	Replaces Item # (17 November 2021)
1	1	<i>1-1; 1-2; 1-3; and 1-4.</i>
1	2	<i>1-5 and 1-6</i>
1	3	<i>1-8</i>
1	4	<i>1-9</i>
1	5	<i>1-7 and 1-10</i>
1	6	<i>2-1; 2-2; 2-3; and 2-4</i>
1	7	<i>2-13 and 2-14</i>
1	8	<i>2-17; 2-18; and 2-19</i>
1	9	<i>2-20; 2-21; 2-22; 2-23; 2-24; and 2-25</i>
1	10	<i>2-26</i>
2	11	<i>2-27; 2-28; and 2-29</i>
2	12	<i>2-30; 2-31; 2-32; and 2-33</i>
2	13	<i>2-34</i>
2	14	<i>3-1 and 3-2</i>
2	15	<i>3-3; 3-4; and 3-5</i>
2	16	<i>3-6 and 3-7</i>
2	17	<i>3-8; 3-9; 3-10; and 3-11</i>
2	18	<i>3-12 and 3-13</i>
3	19	<i>4-1; 4-4; and 4-5</i>
3	20	<i>4-2</i>
3	21	<i>4-3</i>
3	22	<i>1-11</i>
3	23	<i>1-12 and 1-13</i>
3	24	<i>1-14</i>
N/A	DELETED	<i>2-5; 2-6; 2-7; 2-8; 2-9; 2-10; 2-11; 2-12; 2-15; and 2-16</i>

Appendix 1: CMAR Checklists

Overview

The following pages present the CMAR Checklists as quarterly tasks with unique checklist items/actions for each quarter of the calendar year. The annual schedule, by quarter, is as follows.

(1) Q1 (Jan-Mar): TMT suspense ~15 April

- (a) Faculty Management and Development (Checklist items # 1 through 5)
- (b) General Administration (Checklist items # 6 through 10)

(2) Q2 (Apr-Jun): TMT suspense ~ 15 July

- (a) Non-Instructional Services (Checklist items # 11 through 13)
- (b) Student Administration (Checklist items # 14 through 18)

(3) Q3 (July-Sep): TMT suspense ~15 October

- (a) Program Execution (Checklist items # 19 through 21)
- (b) Academic Support (Checklist items # 22 through 24)

(4) Q4 (Oct-Dec): DoDI 1322.35 suspense ~15 January

- (a) Annual analysis: Compile unit analysis of *all* CMAR checklists and the development of data-informed improvements; preparation for Q4 submission. *Note: Schools may document course performance data and improvements in a program report or a format to be provided by the Office of Academic Affairs.*
- (b) DoDI report writing and coordination. *Note: Q4 is for data analysis, report development, and data reporting; there are no CMAR checklist tasks for Q4.*

Quarter 1 Checklist (Faculty; General Admin)

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
1	Faculty Management and Development	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to recruit high-quality military faculty in sufficient numbers with the content expertise and qualifications to execute the program(s). Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; faculty letter of X’s; faculty sufficiency matrix; faculty recruiting results).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Paras. 4.6.b and 5.2.d.3.b. • OPMEP: Para. 5.f; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 5; Enclosure A, Paras. 10 and 12 • DAFI 90-302: Managing Resources (Adequacy) • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.3; 5.2.3.1; 5.2.3.3; 5.2.3.4; 5.2.3.9; 5.2.3.10; 5.6; 5.9. • SACSCOC Standards: CR 6.1; 6.2a; 6.2b; 6.2c; 6.3. • HLC Criteria: 3.C.2; 3.C.3. <p>Personnel counted as “faculty” must meet the definition published in AUI 36-2602.</p>	<p>(Are we doing the right things? // Are we doing things the right way?) The xxxx Center recruits high-quality military faculty IAW Unit OI 36-XXX to ensure the faculty are sustained with current operational experience, content expertise, and other qualifications needed to execute the program. (How well are we doing? // How do we know?) The faculty roster provides details on the quality of all faculty members; the faculty letter of X’s shows the number of faculty needed along with the numbers assigned for all key faculty quality areas. For the current reporting period, the xxxx Center faculty has filled xx% of its authorized military billets; xx% of military specialty billets; and a total faculty (military and civilian) with xx% of its authorized total.</p>
2	Faculty Management and Development	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to evaluate and reward faculty performance. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; summary of quarterly and annual awards results; summary of academic promotion criteria, process, and results; summary of faculty opportunities after AU tour).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Para. 4.6.a. • OPMEP: Para. 5.f; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 5; Enclosure A, Para. 10. • DAFI 90-302: Leading People (Communication). • AUI 36-2602: 5.6.1.5. • SACSCOC Standards: CR 6.1; 6.2a; 6.2b; 6.2c; 6.3. • HLC Criteria: 3.C.4; 3.C.7. <p>Personnel counted as “faculty” must meet the definition published in AUI 36-2602.</p>	<p>(Are we doing the right things? // Are we doing things the right way?) The xxxx Center evaluates and rewards faculty performance IAW Unit OI 36-XXX to ensure the faculty are recognized for superior contributions to the mission—both periodic and long-term. (How well are we doing? // How do we know?) The summary of faculty recognition for the reporting period shows xx% of the faculty received recognition for superior contributions. Of note, xx were recognized for teaching excellence in the classroom; xx were recognized for research and publication excellence; and xx were recognized for service contributions to the mission. Awards for superior contributions are presented (quarterly/semiannually/annually) by the commander during unit-wide // all-call functions. Receipt of these awards and recognition is valued by the faculty.</p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
3	Faculty Management and Development	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>develop faculty as <u>scholars</u> in both initial and ongoing faculty development</i> (e.g., subject matter expertise, publications). Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; summary of faculty scholarly development; summary of faculty publications). College credit-bearing program faculty only.</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Para. 4.6.c. • OPMEP: Para. 5.f; Enclosure A, Para. 10; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 5 . • DAFI 90-302: Leading People (Development). • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.3; 1.2.4.9; 5.2.3.10; 5.2.3.11; 5.6; 5.7; 5.7.6.2. • SACSCOC Standards: 6.5. • HLC Criteria: 3.B.4; 3.C.5. <p>Personnel counted as “faculty” must meet the definition published in AUI 36-2602.</p>	<p>(Are we doing the right things? // Are we doing things the right way?) The xxxx Center develops faculty as scholars during initial on-boarding, as continuing professional development, and through individual research opportunities IAW Unit OI 36-XXX to ensure the faculty are developed and sustained as scholars in their academic fields. (How well are we doing? // How do we know?) The summary of faculty development for the reporting period shows xx faculty were onboarded with initial faculty qualification; xx% completed faculty colloquia prep for course execution; and xx% were actively engaged in research for publication with xx% completing their research with publication.</p>
4	Faculty Management and Development	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>develop faculty as <u>practitioners</u> in both initial and ongoing faculty development</i> (e.g., Airmen; career field development; career broadening). Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; summary of faculty practitioner/career field development; summary of faculty career field broadening).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Para. 4.6.c. • OPMEP: Para. 5.f; Enclosure A, Para. 10; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 5. • DAFI 90-302: Executing the Mission (Readiness). • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.3; 1.2.4.9; 5.2.3.10; 5.2.3.11; 5.6.1.3. 5.7; 5.7.6.3. • SACSCOC Standards: 6.5. • HLC Criteria: 3.C.5. <p>Personnel counted as “faculty” must meet the definition published in AUI 36-2602.</p>	<p>(Are we doing the right things? // Are we doing things the right way?) The xxxx Center develops faculty as practitioners (Airmen) during initial on-boarding, as continuing professional development, and through individual professional development opportunities IAW Unit OI 36-XXX. (How well are we doing? // How do we know?) The summary of faculty development for the reporting period summarizes the content of the initial faculty development course with xx% devoted to topics applicable to all Airmen and the broadening content in the program from several key academic and career fields; and xx% were actively engaged in academic field or career field development (e.g., conferences, operational exercises, HHQ task support) that support the unit mission, professional development, and personal engagement with the mission.</p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
5	Faculty Management and Development	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>develop faculty as <u>teachers</u> in both initial and ongoing faculty development</i>. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents, faculty development program syllabi, colloquia/workshop overview, and other evidence) related to each of the following items. (Note: Initial faculty development includes both onboarding and initial course delivery development.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> policy and strategy shaping the program program content / the institution’s curriculum instructional methodologies (e.g., guided discussion, case study, experiential activities) learning theory (e.g., pedagogy, andragogy) advances in learning theory and the educational technologies employed within the institution. assessment of student achievement (e.g., assessment development, rubric development, inter-rater reliability efforts) education technical applications / specific technological solutions employed within the institution to support learning outcomes and the overarching DoD learning enterprise areas of expertise <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoDI 1322.35: Para. 4.6.c. OPMEP: Para. 5.f; Enclosure A, Para. 10a; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 5. DAFI 90-302: Leading People (Development); Executing the Mission (Daily Ops). AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.3; 1.2.4.9; 5.2.3.9; 5.2.3.10; 5.6.1.1; 5.6.1.3; 5.7; 5.7.6.1. SACSCOC Standards: 6.5. HLC Criteria: 3.C.5. <p>Personnel counted as “faculty” must meet the definition published in AUI 36-2602.</p>	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
6	General Administration: Policy Update	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>periodically update unit/school/center policy</i> to ensure a) compliance with current policy and the removal of superseded requirements; and b) internal/external synchronization of policy to such that faculty, staff and students remain informed. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., synchronization or update policy; policy, process, guidance updates/crosswalk).</p> <p><i>Internal Policy Crosswalk for Internal consistency of internal handbooks; operating instructions; standard operating procedures; briefings; etc.</i></p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: 2.1.e. • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit (Strategic Alignment). • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.1; 1.2.5.1; 1.2.5.2. • SACSCOC Standards: 10.1; 10.2; 10.4; 12.3; 12.4; 14.2; 14.3. • HLC Criteria: 2.A; 2E; 5.C. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
7	General Administration: Operations	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>coordinate student lodging, meals, childcare, etc.</i> Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; email coord, MOAs, MOUs).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPMEP: Appendix C, Enclosure A, Standard 6. • DAFI 90-302: Managing Resources. • AFI 25-201, <i>Intra-Service, Intra-Agency, and Inter-Agency Support Agreements Procedures</i>; and AU Guidance Memorandum (4 May 2022) to AU Supplement • AUI 36-2602: Chapter 13. • SACSCOC Standards: 10.1. • HLC Criteria: 3.D.1. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
8	General Administration: External Reviews	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to <i>assess the program through external reviews</i> (Inspector General, Joint Staff, functional stakeholder, Triennial Review) and how results of any external reviews are used in the program. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; external review reports).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: 5.2.d.3.g. • OPMEP: Enclosure A, Para. 8; Enclosure A, Appendix C, CES 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. • DAFI 36-2670: Para. 3.4.14 (EPME only). • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • AUI 36-2602: 8.5. • HLC Criteria: 4.A.1. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
9	General Administration: EPIC	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to <i>coordinate emerging programmatic initiatives for change (EPIC) with Academic Affairs</i> prior to presentation to AU Commander. Provide evidence of these efforts showing the requirement of the change, alignment of the change to the AU mission, program learning outcomes with the change, resource requirements (time, talent, treasure), and any other factors required for the change to be implemented. Other forms, such as AU50 Request to Create or Change a Concentration, AU51 Air University Course Assessment, AU52 Education and Training Course Announcement (ETCA) Worksheet, and AU54 Emerging Programmatic Initiatives for Change (EPIC) Worksheet, may be used as supporting evidence.</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPMEP: Enclosure A, Para. 10; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 6. • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • AUI 36-2602: 8.3.1.7; 8.4.1; AU Form 54. • SACSCOC Standards: CR 1.1; 10.4; 10.7; 10.8; CR 13.1; 13.7; 14.2; 14.5. • HLC Criteria: 3.C.5. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
10	General Admin: EPIC	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to <i>identify; measure; and evaluate the effects of the change</i> on administrative functions, teaching, and student achievement. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; analysis memorandum).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • AUI 36-2602: 8.3.1.7; 8.4.1. • SACSCOC Standard: 14.2. • HLC Criteria: 5.A.1; 5.C. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>

Quarter 2 Checklist (Non-Instructional Services; Student Admin)

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
11	Non-Instructional Services: Mission	<p>What is the unit's <i>mission</i>? What are the <i>goals, objectives, and desired outcomes</i> established to achieve that mission? How does the unit link its mission, goals, objectives, and desired outcomes to the AU mission and <i>AU Strategic Action Plan</i>?</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPMEP: Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 6. • DAFI 90-302: Executing the Mission / Managing Resources. • AUI 36-2602: 8.6.1; 8.6.2; 11.2.1.5; 11.2.5. • SACSCOC Standards: CR 7.1; CR 8.1; 8.2c; CR 11.1; CR 12.1. • HLC Criteria: 1.A. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
12	Non-Instructional Services: Measures	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to <i>measure the effectiveness of the non-instructional services provided</i> (criterion, targets) and how data collected is used to improve those services. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., analysis reports showing how data indicated the need for change, a summary of the changes implemented, and a summary of impact of the change on the services after the change).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPMEP: Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 6. • DAFI 90-302: Executing the Mission / Managing Resources. • AUI 36-2602: 8.6; 11.2.1.6. • SACSCOC. Standards CR 7.1; CR 8.1; 8.2c; CR 12.1. • HLC Criteria: 2.A.2; 5.B; 5.C. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
13	Non-Instructional Services: Awareness	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to <i>advertise its services to faculty and students</i>. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., brochures, websites, slides).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPMEP: Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 6. • DAFI 90-302: Leading People / Executing the Mission / Managing Resources. • SACSCOC. Standards CR 7.1; CR 8.1; 8.2c; CR 12.1. • HLC Criteria: 1.A.5; 1.B.C. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
14	Student Administration: Diversity	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to assign students to seminars/groups to create a learning environment that leverages diverse perspectives (e.g., genetics, joint experience, sister service, interagency, and international). Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; summary of actions that support classroom diversity and joint acculturation).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPMEP: Enclosure A, Para. 9 and applicable program-specific sub-paragraphs; Appendix C to Enclosure A, CES 1 and CES 2. • JCS Vision: Identify the Right Students. • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • AUI 36-2602: 6.2.2.1; 6.3 and applicable program-specific sub-paragraphs. • SACSCOC Standards: 10.5. • HLC Criteria: N/A 	<p>Response should address four questions: <i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i> <i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i> <i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i> <i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
15	Student Administration: Student Achievement	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to advise senior leaders (the chain of command, HHQ, DAF) on key indicators of student achievement. Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> program's graduation rate program outcome attainment (covered in Q3, item #21) potential in research, writing, analysis, and leadership processes to convey data to personnel systems for enhanced talent management (e.g., assignment potential and selection, career progression, retention). <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: 4.4.c; 4.5a. • OPMEP: Enclosure A, Para. 7 and 9a. • JCS Vision: Demand and Award Academic Excellence; Align Education and Utilization of Talent. • DAFI 90-302: Leading People. • AUI 36-2602: 6.2.2.2; 6.2.5.1 • SACSCOC Standards: CR 8.1; 8.2a; 8.2b; 8.2c. (covered in Q3, item #21) • HLC Criteria: 4.C. <p>Note: Responses to this item support DoD and DAF talent management initiatives.</p>	<p>Response should address four questions: <i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i> <i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i> <i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i> <i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
16	Student Administration: Recognition	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to recognize superior performers (e.g., distinguished graduates, top performers, best paper) and how the unit monitors and analyzes the rate of such recognition. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; student award rosters; analysis of student award recipients).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Para. 4.4.d. and 4.4.e. • JCS Vision. Demand and Award Academic Excellence. • DAFI 90-302: Leading People. • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.1; 6.2.2.2; 6.2.2.3; 6.2.2.4; 14.4 (and all subparagraphs). • SACSCOC Standards: N/A • HLC Criteria: N/A 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
17	Student Administration: Complaints & Grievances	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to address student complaints and grievances. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; summary of guidance alignment to HHQ guidance; summary of record keeping practices).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAFI 90-302: Leading People / Executing the Mission. • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.1; 7.2.2 (and all subordinate paragraphs). • SACSCOC Standards: 10.1; 12.3; 12.4. • HLC Federal Requirement: FDCR A.10.030. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>
18	Student Administration: Disenrollment	<p>Describe the unit's efforts to apply processes for student disenrollment. Provide evidence of these efforts (e.g., policy/process/guidance documents; summary of guidance alignment to HHQ guidance; summary of record keeping practices).</p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAFI 90-302: Leading People / Executing the Mission. • AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.1; 6.7 (and all subordinate paragraphs). • SACSCOC Standards: 10.1; 10.2; 12.3; 12.4. • HLC Criteria: 4.A. 	<p>Response should address four questions:</p> <p><i>Are we doing the right things? (Policy)</i></p> <p><i>Are we doing things the right way? (Process)</i></p> <p><i>How well are we doing? (Evidence)</i></p> <p><i>How do we know? (Analysis)</i></p>

This Page Intentionally Blank

Quarter 3 Checklist (Program Execution; Academic Support Services)

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
19	Program Execution: Requirements	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>ensure program design and execution meets established learning requirements</i>, special areas of emphasis (SAEs), and faculty inputs. Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit policy / process / guidance documents. • Requirements and Standards Crosswalk (AUI 36-2602, Attachment 4 or equivalent unit-generated document) for each program by delivery mode [Resident, Distance Learning, hybrid]) offered. <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35 Paragraphs 1.2 (and all subordinate paragraphs); 3.c; 4.3 and 4.4 (both with all subordinate paragraphs). • DAFI 90-302: Executing the Mission. • SACSCOC Standards: 8.2.a. • HLC Criteria: 4.B; 5.C. 	<p>(Are we doing the right things?) The xxxx Center ensures design and execution meets established learning requirements, special areas of emphasis (SAEs), and faculty inputs by producing the attached xxx unit requirements and standards crosswalk.</p> <p>(Are we doing things the right way?) The process is governed by xxx Center Operating Instruction that directs a process to follow for each time a new requirement is received (or an existing requirement is updated). Faculty follow this prescribed process to ensure integration of the requirement(s) into the overall design of the program and update the standards and requirements crosswalk followed by curriculum development, assessment plan updates and curriculum approval for execution.</p>
20	Program Execution: Effectiveness	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum, teaching, and student learning</i>. Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit policy / process / guidance documents. • Assessment Plan with curriculum map, assessment map, and rubrics for key assessments for each program by delivery mode offered using the last 12-month cycle for the program—standard academic year (July-June), calendar year, or fiscal year (Oct-Sep) (please specific which year is used for the <i>program’s</i> academic year). • Program Assessment Record (AUI 36-2602, Attachment 3 or equivalent unit-generated document) or Annual Outcomes Assessment Reports for each program. <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35 Para 1.2 f; 4.3; 4.4. • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • SACSCOC Standards: 8.2.a. • HLC Criteria: 4.B; 5.C. 	<p>(How well are we doing?) The xxxx Center Operating Instruction requires (program director, course director, dean, etc.) to evaluate curriculum effectiveness, teaching, and student learning. The attached assessment plan contains curriculum map, assessment map, and rubrics for key assessments for each program by delivery mode offered using the last 12-month cycle for the program for AY22 (June 2021 – July 2022). These data show that 98% of the students in the xxx program are achieving PLOs at or above satisfactory.</p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
21	Program Execution: Closed-Loop Analysis	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to conduct closed-loop analysis and feedback to inform decision makers with decision-quality data and inform stakeholders of plans for program improvement. Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit policy / process / guidance documents. Unit reports that link assessment of curriculum to changes made in curriculum, such as dean’s or commander’s guidance. AUI 36-2602, Attach 3, <i>Program Assessment Record</i>, “Use of Results” <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoDI 1322.35 Para 1.2 f; 4.3; 4.4. DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. SACSCOC Standards: 8.2.a. HLC Criteria: 4.B; 5.C. 	<p>(How do we know?) The xxxx Center Operating Instruction requires (program director, course director, dean, etc.) to conduct closed-loop analysis and feedback to inform decision makers with decision-quality data and inform stakeholders of plans for program improvement for each program by delivery mode offered using the last 12-month cycle for the program for AY22 (June 2021 – July 2022). The attached outcomes report shows the results of that analysis and actions taken to improve the program. Additionally, the report shows the validity and reliability analyses of the key assessments used to assess student achievement of the program learning outcomes.</p>
22	Academic Support Services: General	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to provide academic support services (unit, AU, external). Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit policy / process / guidance documents. Document(s) stating academic support services mission, goals, objectives. <p><i>[“Academic Support Services” is defined as academic and student support services that support student success. For example, 1) Unit-level support services would include activities for its population such as tutoring, writing labs, academic advising, orientation, faculty resources, etc., and 2) Academic Services across the AU enterprise activities would include library and learning or information resources, faculty resource centers, tutoring, writing centers, academic computer centers, mission support/educational support offices, registrar offices, information technology, research centers, facility management activities, student activities, etc. All these activities directly support faculty and students in relation to their educational programs, indirect support for student learning, or a specific co-curricular mission supporting the college experience.]</i></p> <p><i>References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoDI 1322.35: Section 3, paragraph g. OPMEP: Appendix C, Enclosure A, Standard 6. DAFI 90-302: Managing Resources. AUI 36-2602: 1.2.4.7; 8.3.1.1. SACSCOC Standards: CR 7.1; 7.3; 8.2c; CR 11.1; 11.3; CR 12.1; 12.2. HLC Criteria: 4.A; 4.B; 4.C. 	<p>(Are we doing the right things?) The xxxx provides the following academic support services which are described in Unit Operating Instruction xx-xxx (or other unit guidance documents) that detail the mission, goals, and objectives for these services.</p> <p>(Are we doing things the right way?) Unit OI xx-xxx provides for specific processes for the delivery of these academic support services in paragraphs xxx through zzz.</p>

#	Area	CMAR Question and Requirements Reference	Sample Response
23	Academic Support Services: Effectiveness	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>evaluate the effectiveness of academic support services and how changes are made to improve the effectiveness of these services.</i> Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit policy / process / guidance documents. • Unit academic support services assessment plan (can be include in the unit’s education program assessment plan, as desired). • Unit academic support services outcomes report (can be included in the unit’s education program outcomes report, as desired). <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Section 3, paragraph g. • OPMEP: Appendix C, Enclosure A, Standard 6. • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • AUI 36-2602: 8.3.1.1; 8.3.1.4; 9.2.5. • SACSCOC Standards: CR 7.1; 8.2c; CR 11.1; 11.3; CR 12.1. • HLC Criteria: 4.A; 4.B; 4.C. 	<p>(How well are we doing?) Unit OI xx-xxx provides process to measure the effectiveness of academic support services in paragraphs xx-zz. Overall, the academic support services are meeting student and faculty needs at satisfactory or above XX% of the time based on feedback (indirect measure) and response time standards (direct measure)</p> <p>(How do we know?) Further details are published in the attached outcomes report. Results from the academic support services outcomes report include analysis for academic support services improves on pages xx-zz.</p>
24	Academic Support Services: Awareness	<p>Describe the unit’s efforts to <i>make students aware of the academic support services available.</i> Provide evidence of these efforts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unit policy / process / guidance documents. 2. Unit flyers, email, briefing excerpt. <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoDI 1322.35: Section 3, paragraph g. • OPMEP: Appendix C, Enclosure A, Standard 6. • DAFI 90-302: Improving the Unit. • AUI 36-2602: 9.2.5. • SACSCOC Standards: 8.2c; CR 12.1. • HLC Criteria: 4.A; 4.B; 4.C. 	<p>(Are we doing the right things; are we doing things the right way?) Unit OI xx-xxx provides policy and process to advertise academic support services to students, faculty, and staff. The attached Unit OI and sample advertising documents are samples of how the policy and process are accomplished.</p>

This Page Intentionally Blank

Appendix 2: CMAR Data-Collection Expectations

The following tables indicate data collection requirements at the program level from the Colleges and Schools within AU as well as from the institutional-level elements of AU with Title 10 faculty (AD faculty) and/or non-instructional services missions. The intent is to leverage existing processes, so *if the data are already collected in another process, please advise OAA so that CMAR data-collection expectations can be refined or reduced.*

Notes:

1. *The following tables have been extensively reviewed and revised for this edition and should be carefully reviewed.*
2. *“Rolled Up” means that data for work centers within a college, school, or center, may be combined into a single “rolled up” report from the front office of the unit.*
3. *Checklist column order revised per the framework for “Individual Units” on page 7, paragraph 11, above.*

Air University (AU) Work Centers

<i>AU institutional-level elements with AD faculty and non-instructional services functions.</i>							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
AU	A3	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	AUiX	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AU	CAO (A7)	Y <small>(Include all A7 faculty)</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	Academic Affairs	Rolled-up	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	AU Press	Rolled-up	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	AU Library	Rolled-up	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	Registrar	Rolled-up	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	Sponsored Programs	Rolled-up	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y
AU	TLC	Rolled-up	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y

Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Civilian Institution Programs (CI)</i> • <i>The Civil Engineer School (CE)</i> • <i>The Graduate School of Engineering & Management (EN)</i> • <i>School of Strategic Force Studies (EX); School of Systems & Logistics (LS)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)*	Academic Support (Q3)*
AFIT	Front Office	EXSUM and Sample of HLC	EXSUM and Sample of HLC	N/A	EXSUM and Sample of HLC	EXSUM and Sample of HLC	EXSUM and Sample of HLC
AFIT	CI	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	N/A	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	See EXSUM
AFIT	CE	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	N/A	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	See EXSUM
AFIT	EN	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	N/A	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	See EXSUM
AFIT	EX	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	N/A	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	See EXSUM
AFIT	LS	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	N/A	See EXSUM	See EXSUM	See EXSUM

*AFIT reports for HLC and other existing source documents recommended for Q3 reporting are as follows:

- Question 4-1: AFIT supplement 2 (when review is completed) and Title 10 US Code 9314
- Question 4-2: ENOI 36-117 and one sample report from each School.
- Question 4-3: "Assessment of Assessment" report and a reference to sample reports would address this question.
- Question 4-4: ENOI 36-126 Academic Affairs Office, Current year academic catalog, current year student handbook
- Question 4-5: Graduating Student Survey results, Graduate Student survey Advisor results, AFITI 90-101 Strategy Management
- Question 4-6: Current year academic catalog, current year student handbook

Air Command and Staff College (ACSC)

• <i>Master of Military Operational Art and Science (MMOAS)</i>							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
ACSC	MMOAS (All concentrations)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y

Air War College (AWC)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Master of Strategic Studies (MSS)</i> • <i>Air Force Culture and Language Center (AFCLC)</i> • <i>Air Force Negotiations Center (AFNC)</i> • <i>Center for Strategy and Technology (CSAT)</i> • <i>Center for Strategic Deterrence Studies (CSDS)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)****
AWC	MSS (All concentrations)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
AWC	AFCLC*	Y	Y		Y	Y	None provided
AWC	AFNC**	Y	Y		Y	N/A	None provided
AWC	CSAT	Y	Y		Y	Y	None provided
AWC	CSDS***	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	None provided

* *AFCLC must report on ITC and Intro to CCC programs (CLTR201 and CLTR202). Note: AFCLC Charter 7. COMMAND RELATIONSHIPS states: “AFCLC receives policy, resource and program requirements guidance and direction primarily from the Senior Language Authority administered through the Headquarters Air Force, LREC Office. AFCLC’s Program Element Manager resides at the HAF/LREC Office and provides support and guidance on resource issues. AFCLC’s budget is administered through Air University/Financial Management via the Air War College. AFCLC receives personnel support through the Air War College. Personnel actions (hiring, dismissal, etc.), appraisals and timekeeping are accomplished through Air War College and Air University. Air University also provides adequate facilities for AFCLC to execute its mission.” This context may help in framing responses for Q4 reporting on the two credit-bearing programs offered by AFCLC.*

** *AFNC does not have any reportable elements for Q3 at this time.*

*** *CSDS does not have any independent, reportable elements for CMAR at this time. The AWC should include CSDS personnel that are teaching AWC elective courses in AWC faculty reporting (Q1).*

**** *Discussion with Centers post-CMAR 2022 revealed that Centers do not offer any Academic Support services.*

Thomas N. Barnes Center for Enlisted Education (BCEE)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Enlisted PME Instructor Course (EPMEIC)</i> • <i>Airman Leadership School (ALS)</i> • <i>Noncommissioned Officer Academy (NCOA)</i> 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Air Force Senior NCOA (AFSNCOA)</i> • <i>Chief Leadership Academy (CLA)</i> 			
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
Barnes	Front Office / Academic Affairs / Education Services	Y	Y		Y		Y (Include all Academic Support)
Barnes	EPMEIC	Y	Y		Y	Y	Rolled-up
Barnes	ALS	Y	Y		Y	Y	Rolled-up
Barnes	NCOA	Y	Y		Y	Y	Rolled-up
Barnes	SNCOA	Y	Y		Y	Y	Rolled-up
Barnes	CLA	Y	Y		Y	Y	Rolled-up

Community College of the Air Force (CCAF)

<i>Associates Degree Program Groups:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Operations</i> • <i>Logistics</i> 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Medical</i> • <i>Support</i> 			
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
CCAF	Front Office	Y	Y		Y		Y
CCAF	Operations (10)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
CCAF	Logistics (18)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
CCAF	Medical (20)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
CCAF	Support (22)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y

Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development (ECPD)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Academic Instructor Course (AIC)</i> • <i>Air Force Chaplain Corps College (AFCCC)</i> • <i>Commander's Professional Development School (CPDS)</i> • <i>Civilian Leadership Development School (CLDS)</i> 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Defense Financial Management & Comptroller School (DFMCS)</i> • <i>First Sergeant Academy (FSA)</i> • <i>Force Support Professional Development School (FSPDS)</i> • <i>Leadership Development Course (LDC)</i> 			
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
Eaker	Front Office and Academic Ops	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Academic Support)
Eaker	AIC	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	AFCCC	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	CPDS	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	CLDS	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	DFMCS	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	FSA	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	FSPDS	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Eaker	LDC	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up

NOTE: CAPD is on the next page.

Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development (ECPD) – CADP Only

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Civilian Associate Degree Programs (CADP)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
Eaker	CADP	Y	Y		Y	Y*	Y*

* Discussion with Eaker Center post-CMAR 2022 indicates that the following supporting documentation should provide valid evidence for each Q4 question as indicated:

4-1: Functionals, Eaker Center OI.

4-2: A holistic CAPD Assessment Plan which includes: curriculum map with IRMA, assessment map with at least key assessments listed, key assessment tools.

4-3: CAPD outcomes report which includes: Program learning outcomes, assessment tools for each outcome, benchmarks for each assessment tool, analysis of assessment results to include student learning strengths and weaknesses in terms of the specific PLO, and how you will use the results from the analysis to improve student learning.

4-4: CADP Handbook.

4-5: Academic Support services assessment plan OR outcomes report.

4-6: Unit flyer, email, or detailed briefing report.

Global College of Professional Military Education (GCPME)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Squadron Officer School Distance Learning (SOS DL)</i> • <i>Air Command and Staff College Distance Learning (ACSC DL)</i> • <i>Air War College Distance Learning (AWC DL)</i> • <i>Airman Leadership School Distance Learning (ALS DL)</i> • <i>Noncommissioned Officer Academy Distance Learning (NCOA DL)</i> • <i>Senior NCOA Distance Learning (SNCOA DL)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
ACSC/DL	Front Office	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		Y (Help Desk Only)
ACSC/DL	SOS DL	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up (Help Desk Only)
ACSC/DL	ACSC DL	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up (Help Desk Only)
ACSC/DL	AWC DL	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up (Help Desk Only)
ACSC/DL	ALS DL	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up (Help Desk Only)
ACSC/DL	NCOA DL	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up (Help Desk Only)
ACSC/DL	SNCOA DL	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up (Help Desk Only)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Master of Military Operational Art and Science (MMOAS) Online Master's Program (OLMP)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
ACSC/DL	MMOAS (All concentrations)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y (Help Desk Only)

Jeanne M. Holm Center for Officer Accessions and Citizen Development (Holm Center)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Officer Training School (OTS)</i> • <i>OTS Instructor Course (OTS-IC)</i> • <i>Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)</i> • <i>Junior ROTC (JROTC)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
Holm	Front Office and Academic Affairs	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Academic Support)
Holm	OTS	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Holm	OTS-IC	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Holm	ROTC	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
Holm	JROTC*		Rolled-up*		Rolled-up*	Y*	Rolled-up*

* *Contact AU Academic Affairs for consultation on specific CMAR data collection expectations.*

International Officer School (IOS)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) Prep Course</i> • <i>Air War College (AWC) Prep Course</i> • <i>Squadron Officer School (SOS) Prep Course</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
IOS	Front Office and Academic Affairs	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)	Y (Roll-up of all Program Execution)	Y (Roll-up of all Academic Support)
IOS	SOS Prep	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Rolled-up	Rolled-up
IOS	ACSC Prep	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Rolled-up	Rolled-up
IOS	AWC Prep	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Rolled-up	Rolled-up

Curtis E. LeMay Center for Doctrine Development and Education (LeMay Center)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Warfighting Education – Intermediate</i> • <i>Warfighting Education – Senior</i> • <i>Wargaming</i> • <i>Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)**
LeMay	Front Office	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		None provided
LeMay	Warfighting Ed: Intermediate	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	None provided
LeMay	Warfighting Ed: Senior	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	None provided
LeMay	Wargaming	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	None provided
LeMay	ISR*	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	None provided

* *ISR added per discussions with LeMay Center POC.*

** *Discussion with LeMay Center post-CMAR 2022 revealed that LeMay Center does not offer any Academic Support services.*

School of Advanced Air and Space Studies (SAASS)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Master of Philosophy in Military Strategy (MPhil)</i> • <i>Doctor of Philosophy in Military Strategy (PhD)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)*
SAASS	Front Office	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		None provided
SAASS	MPhil	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	None provided
SAASS	PhD	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	None provided

* Discussion with SAASS post-CMAR 2022 revealed that SAASS does not offer any Academic Support services.

Squadron Officer School (SOS)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SOS Resident Program</i> • <i>Theories and Principles of Adult Education (TPAE)</i> • <i>Advanced Principles of Instructional Design (APID)</i> 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
SOS	Front Office & Academic Affairs	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Academic Support)
SOS	SOS Resident	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
SOS	TPAE	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up
SOS	APID	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up

USAF Test Pilot School (TPS)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master of Science in Flight Test Engineering (MSFTE) 							
Unit	Work Center or Program	Faculty (Q1)	General Admin (Q1)	Non-instructional Services (Q2)	Student Admin (Q2)	Program Execution (Q3)	Academic Support (Q3)
TPS*	Front Office	Y (Roll-up of all Faculty)	Y (Roll-up of all Gen Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Student Admin)		Y (Roll-up of all Academic Support)
TPS	MSTFE	Rolled-up	Rolled-up		Rolled-up	Y	Rolled-up

* Please contact Academic Affairs at DSN 953-5334 or DSN953-7993 to discuss specific documentation requirements.

(DELETED) Appendix 3: CMAR Checklist Questions for Inspections

Appendix 4: The Road to CMAR

Background: The Education Program Review (EPR) 2015-2021

- 2015 Strategic Plan Line of Effort 2. AU/CC approved restarting the Education Program Review (EPR) and other initiatives to include the creation of the AU Omnibus; a single policy document developed from 29 separate AU instructions.
- 2016-2018.
 - OAA staff developed and coordinated the Omnibus; approved Jan 2018 and mandated the EPR which was developed concurrently with the Omnibus.
 - Revised Omnibus and the EPR checklist (later named the Commanders' Mission Analysis and Review) provided the foundation for clarity, compliance, and accountability.
 - The original EPR was focused on educational programs only, non-instructional programs and academic support were not considered. Schools were assessing educational programs but with no continuity across all aspects of program execution. This issue was addressed in the revised checklist.
- 2018.
 - OAA staff took the lead to facilitate the incremental execution of the EPR across all schools while simultaneously aligning internal school policy with newly published AU policy. The project was called Strategy of Execution.
 - OAA staff held a meeting with school and center POCs to ensure understanding of the project objective...the need to accurately assess where each school's program stood with respect to the new policy and standards.
 - Program Execution and Faculty: the program execution standard was provided to the schools for assessment of each programs' compliance and an appropriate response depending on the current policy and practice.
 - Unit responses showed a basic lack of understanding of instructional design and program assessment and an inability to explain how the school met the requirements or show the existence of school policies, processes and practices now mandated by AUI. The faculty responses yielded the same results.
 - OAA developed rubrics for each standard and provided them to units; the rubrics provided clarity for usable and insufficient responses; but useful responses and evidence lagged.
 - OAA developed sample for each checklist item so that program POCs could update for specific program, insert the policy, process, and evidence for compliance with the standard.
 - October. OAA completed its offsite report for the SACSCOC reaffirmation
 - December. SACSCOC assessment received; AU found noncompliant in 29 areas including institutional planning and assessment, program assessment, and closed loop analysis and documentation for improvement were highlighted as deficient or fractured.
- 2019.
 - January.
 - AU submitted a response to the 29 items and waited for the on-site visit in March
 - OAA continued holding meetings and working with POCs to complete EPR Standards for Academic Support and Student Management. OAA was forced to develop the required language for each school in such a way that all the school needed to do was add their respective information to complete their review.
 - March. SACSCOC made nine (9) recommendations where clear action was required.
 - May. OAA completed the last phase of the strategy of execution project working with the schools to insert their respective information into pre-completed templates.
 - June. OAA notified that EPR process placed on hold; schools didn't see value in the process.

Lessons Learned from the EPR Process

- Academic Programs throughout AU are managed in stovepipes with no central authority having oversight of all aspects of program management
- POCs treated the EPR as a tasker and not a process for improving managing and improving their respective programs.
- Instructional Design across the university was not standardized IAW the ISD model directed.
- POCs did not have mastery of the ISD model, outcomes-based education design or assessment.
- Faculty Management: POCs were not faculty POCs who understood or could speak for how the faculty were managed within assigned programs
- Academic Support not addressed across the board.
- Student Achievement measures were non-existent
- General Administration: No systematic process for implementing the foundational work required to move new initiatives forward.

New Guidance – 2019 and 2020

- CAO directed OAA to revise the EPR
- SACSCOC reaffirmed AU for 10 years with the understanding that there were cleanup actions necessary.
- JCS Vision, draft DoDI on Military Education, and new OPMEP published. OAA used those authoritative documents, the AUI and the SACSCOC principles to establish a complete set of mandatory education program management requirements named as the Commanders Management and Analysis Review (CMAR) which would facilitate a more data-informed Educational Program Review.
- OAA partnered with the Inspector General (IG) to place the CMAR checklists under the purview of the IG and within the Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT). OAA segmented the CMAR checklist to assess major areas of the program management each quarter and establish a cycle of continuous assessment and improvement. The objective was to demonstrate to peers and stakeholders that AU runs an ongoing, comprehensive, integrated, research based, systematic, institutional planning and assessment process whereby HHQ compliance is ensured and inculcate data-based decision-making actions at the program and institutional level to improve AU programs and services.

Commander's Mission Analysis and Review (CMAR) Implementation – 2021 to 2023

- 2021 Jun. SME developed checklist and several rounds of refinement before the final checklist was presented to AU/CC; AU/CC Approved CMAR under IG.
- 2021 Aug. Commanders and Deans Briefed
- 2021 Nov. Q1 CMAR Checklist loaded to MICT
- 2022 Oct. Q4 checklist pulled back from MICT; CMAR quarterly slide task suspended.
- 2022 Nov. CMAR Q4 checklists revised and tasked to units through TMT.
- 2022 Dec. Complete CMAR checklist revised (condensed; many items deleted); CMAR Q4 checklist moved to Q3 for 2023 to support DoDI 1322.35 schedule; CMAR Handbook drafted for review.
- 2023 June. [CMAR Handbook published to units.](#)
- 2023 Sep. [CMAR Handbook with Change 1 published to units.](#)