

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
Education & Behavioral Science	Military Science
Military Leadership, 733	
Hugo N. Magana, (Interim) Professor of Military Science	
<i>Is this an online program?</i> ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate enhanced individual and collective skills including leader competencies and small unit tactics to effectively plan, coordinate, motivate, and lead formations at the platoon level.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? This Student Learning Outcome remains highly relevant to the mission and structure of the Military Leadership program. Over the last three assessment cycles (2021–2022, 2022–2023, and 2023–2024), this outcome has consistently been a core indicator of Cadet readiness for platoon-level leadership responsibilities, particularly within the context of Cadet Summer Training (CST) and the Advanced Camp Evaluation Report (ACER). The outcome also aligns directly with the course objectives of MS 301 and MS 302, which emphasize tactical leadership, small unit operations, and peer evaluation under stress. Is the outcome measurable? : The instruments used (e.g., ACER performance summaries, land navigation, weapons qualification, and other evaluated CST events) provide quantifiable data on individual and team competencies. Evaluation rubrics include defined thresholds for proficiency levels (e.g., Outstanding, Excellent, Proficient, Capable) which correlate with national ROTC standards. Is it double or triple barreled? ? The outcome is triple-barreled, as it assesses (1) individual skills, (2) collective skills, and (3) application of leader competencies in planning, motivating, and leading. While comprehensive, this breadth could dilute focus. However, in the military leadership context, these elements are tightly integrated and typically assessed together during field exercises, resulting in a unified outcome. Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? : The outcome contains appropriate Bloom's Taxonomy verbs like "plan," "coordinate," "motivate," and "lead," which are all action-oriented and assessable in applied military training settings. Do you have the appropriate numbers of SLOs to measure regularly? : The program currently maintains three core SLOs, with two additional SLOs under consideration in the pending 2025–2026 revision (Communication Skills and Ethical Decision-Making). Three to five SLOs are a manageable number for regular assessment. If a reduction is needed, this outcome is essential and should remain, as it directly supports the program's central objective: preparing Cadets to lead small units in complex operational environments.

Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? The current instruments directly measure the desired outcome. These tools assess Cadets' performance in realistic, high-stakes military scenarios under standardized Army doctrine. Specifically: - ACER (USACC Form 1059) assesses Cadets' leadership, decision-making, planning, and tactical execution in a field environment evaluated by external Army evaluators. - Individual Skill Evaluations (land navigation, weapons qualification, first aid, call for fire, 8-mile ruck march, etc.) validate core tactical proficiencies essential for small unit leadership. These instruments clearly map to the verbs in the SLO (e.g., “plan,” “coordinate,” “lead”) and are aligned with both the Army Leadership Requirements Model and training doctrine used nationally across ROTC programs. If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? If the SLO were revised to be more focused (e.g., narrowed to “demonstrate leader competencies” or “apply small unit tactics”), the existing instruments would still apply, although they might need tighter alignment through disaggregated scoring. Refinement may require adjusting how scores are analyzed, not the tools themselves. For example: ACER results could be analyzed by subcategories like decision-making, communication, and team coordination. Tactical exercises could be assessed individually with specific rubrics for leadership behaviors vs. tactical execution. Is this a direct or indirect measure? These are direct measures, as they evaluate observable student performance against defined criteria in real-world tasks and Army standards. ACER and practical tests are among the most authentic forms of performance-based assessment in applied leadership education. Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Yes, the ACER and skill evaluation artifacts are appropriate and credible for external review. Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? AI is unlikely to affect the current field-based performance evaluations (e.g., ACER or ruck march), as they depend on physical and interpersonal skills. However, AI could affect reflection assignments or tactical plan writing, making it easier for students to generate content. This raises concerns about authenticity in any written assignments. Written components tied to leadership planning could be redesigned to require AI-transparency (e.g., “explain how you used AI in preparing this document”). If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? ACER has fixed Army-wide categories, those criteria are adequate, but not fully customizable. We can develop or adopt rubrics for Leadership Labs and pre-CST training events that focus on dimensions like: Tactical planning, Communication, Motivation of subordinates, Ethical decision-making, and After Action Review (AAR) effectiveness. These rubrics would improve formative assessment and help Cadets better understand how their performance links to expectations before facing external evaluation.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful--ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? The Criteria for Success, requiring Cadets to earn a minimum “Capable” rating or higher on the Advanced Camp Evaluation Report (ACER) and a “Go” on all individual skill evaluations (e.g., land navigation, ruck march, weapons qualification), are reasonable and aligned with baseline commissioning standards set by U.S. Army Cadet Command. However, while “Capable” is the minimum standard for completion, program-level success is currently defined by the percentage of Cadets earning “Outstanding” or “Excellent”, which reflects a higher level of mastery. Given that WKU Cadets surpassed the national average in 2023–2024 (77.27% O+E vs. 75.75% national) , the criteria are currently well-calibrated to both external expectations and internal program goals.

Criteria & Targets	What about targets? If you have successfully made your targets consistently, consider a more challenging target. Targets should be adjusted upward if the program is consistently meeting or exceeding current goals. Internal instructional improvements (labs, cadre mentoring, peer feedback loops) may require an updated minimum success benchmark, for example: “At least 85% of Cadets will receive a rating of ‘Excellent’ or higher on the ACER, and 100% of Cadets will receive a ‘Go’ on all individual skill evaluations on the first attempt.” This raises the bar slightly and reflects continuous improvement goals consistent with Army leadership development expectations.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? This dramatic improvement was not fully anticipated, though it reflects deliberate internal efforts to enhance leadership development, tactical training, and pre-camp preparation. What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Sharp Year-Over-Year Growth: The leap from 17% (2022–2023) to over 77% (2023–2024) in ACER performance is the most striking trend. WKU Cadets outperformed the national average in 23-24. Conclusions: What worked? - Leadership Lab Structure: Peer-led lab instruction (MS IV facilitating MS I/II/III training) has proven highly effective in developing both teaching and tactical leadership skills, aligning well with real-world expectations. - Cadre Coaching and Feedback: Improved cadre engagement and structured feedback during labs and FTXs (Field Training Exercises) appears to have directly enhanced student performance. - Assessment Alignment: Closer integration of internal leadership rubrics and CST preparation with the expectations of ACER evaluators likely narrowed the readiness gap. - Curricular Refinement: The transition from MIL 301/302 into MIL 401 was smoother due to better sequencing and emphasis on leadership modeling during junior year. What didn’t? - Pre-2022 Assessment Support: Limited standardization in internal evaluations and Cadet readiness assessments prior to ACER likely contributed to lower success rates in 2022–2023. - Inconsistent Peer Evaluation Practice: Earlier versions of leadership lab lacked consistent application of peer and self-assessment, reducing developmental feedback opportunities. - Lab Attendance Challenges: While labs are “highly recommended” for MS I Cadets, non-mandatory attendance may limit their early leadership skill development and readiness. Why do you think this? There is no indication that facilities, admission criteria, or textbooks changed substantially, but the shift in methodology and cadre engagement clearly drove better outcomes. This is possibly due to changes in cadre leadership, pre-camp training, or curriculum sequencing. These changes, especially in lab execution, mentorship structures, and performance tracking, reflect a growing professionalization of the ROTC instructional model at WKU. The course content remained largely consistent, but instructional delivery improved, particularly through; more purposeful use of leadership rubrics and ACER standards, increased cadre involvement in scenario-based training, emphasis on resilience, peer leadership, and tactical execution.

****IMPORTANT -
Plans for Next
Assessment Cycle:**

Assessment Cycle 2025–2026:

- **Revise Internal Rubrics:** The program will develop and implement standardized internal rubrics aligned with ACER criteria to assess leadership performance during labs. These rubrics will be piloted in Fall 2025 and refined by Spring 2026 based on cadre and peer feedback.
- **Enhance Formative Feedback Mechanisms:** A structured 360-degree feedback model will be introduced during labs to provide peer and self-assessment opportunities that mirror external evaluations. This will better prepare Cadets for CST.
- **Adjust Performance Targets:** Given that 77.27% of Cadets exceeded current expectations in 2023–2024, the program will raise the performance target to 85% achieving “Excellent” or “Outstanding” ratings on the ACER by the end of the 2025–2026 cycle.

Assessment Cycle 2026–2027:

- **Curriculum Sequencing Review:** A formal review of course sequencing will be conducted to evaluate the timing and alignment between MS 301/302 content and CST preparation. The department will assess whether shifting certain tactical or leadership modules earlier in the junior year would enhance readiness.
- **Artifact Expansion:** Additional assessment artifacts will be collected during the spring FTX, including written operation orders and platoon-level leadership plans. These artifacts will be evaluated using revised rubrics and included in assessment data.
- **Faculty Development Program:** Incoming Cadre will participate in this program with the goal to develop and grow instructor competencies. All Cadre will participate in a fall training session focused on consistent application of the new rubrics and alignment with external ACER expectations. This ensures reliability in formative assessments.

Assessment Cycle 2027–2028:

- **Evaluate Longitudinal Impact:** By comparing results from the 2025 and 2026 assessment cycles, the program will evaluate whether earlier interventions (e.g., rubric use, sequencing shifts, peer feedback) have contributed to sustained improvements in ACER scores and tactical performance.
- **Stakeholder Feedback:** Structured interviews with recent graduates and Advanced Camp evaluators will be used to assess the perceived accuracy and effectiveness of the internal assessments.
- **Plan Revisions:** Based on three years of data, the program will determine if the SLO should be split into two separate outcomes, one focusing on leadership competencies and the other on small unit tactics, or whether the integrated approach remains pedagogically sound.

Closing the Loop; This multi-year approach ensures that assessment practices remain dynamic and purpose-driven. By collecting improved artifacts, refining measurement tools, and realigning instructional supports, the program will promote Cadet development and better prepare future Army leaders for the complex operational environments they will face.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate proficiency in the elements of physical, emotional, and spiritual fitness in order to lead at the platoon level.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Yes. This outcome is aligned with Army expectations for holistic officer readiness, which include physical stamina, emotional resilience, and spiritual grounding; core leadership components emphasized in both Army doctrine and Cadet Summer Training (CST). It remains a vital component of the Military Leadership program. Is the outcome measurable? Yes, this SLO is measurable through: - Army Fitness Test (AFT) scores (direct measure). NOTE: ACFT will change to AFT on 1 June 2025. - Combat Water Survival Test (CWST) pass / fail outcomes (direct measure). Is it double or triple barreled? Yes. It is triple-barreled, addressing physical, emotional, and spiritual fitness. While these are all key leadership traits, they are measured with varying clarity. AFT focuses on physical fitness, CWST offers a proxy for emotional resilience and confidence. However, spiritual fitness is not directly assessed between the outcome and available instruments. Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom’s Taxonomy? Yes. “Demonstrate proficiency” is a measurable verb consistent with Bloom’s taxonomy at the application level.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? Yes, partially. - The AFT directly and effectively measures physical fitness with standardized Army protocols. - The CWST measures emotional resilience under water-based stress and confidence under pressure, which partially supports emotional and spiritual fitness. Spiritual fitness, as defined in Army doctrine (e.g., sense of purpose, moral alignment, inner strength), is not directly or consistently assessed. No formal instrument is in place to measure it. We plan incorporate a reflective wellness/self-awareness artifact (e.g., journaling, resilience case study, or peer review) to assess spiritual/emotional readiness. This could be embedded into the MS 201/202 leadership labs. If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? N/A Is this a direct or indirect measure? Both AFT and CWST are direct measures. However, spiritual/emotional dimensions would benefit from indirect, formative tools such as wellness self-assessments or structured interviews. Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Yes for physical/emotional; not for spiritual. There is a measurable gap that needs addressing to ensure full coverage of the outcome. Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? AI is not a concern for physical or water-based tests. However, if self-reflection or journaling is introduced to capture spiritual/emotional dimensions, AI-drafted reflections could undermine authenticity. A simple fix would be to include live discussion or verbal check-ins as part of the grading process.

	If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Currently, AFT and CWST use Army-established pass/fail or scored protocols. If self-reflection tools are added, rubrics should be created to assess depth of reflection, articulation of coping strategies, and ethical decision-making related to wellness.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? No, the criterias remain relevant. - ACFT: Success = Cadets scoring $\geq 60\%$ in each event (360/600 minimum). - CWST: Success = Pass (all 3 water-based events completed). What about targets? Yes. In 2023–2024, 91.3% passed the then ACFT, and 97% passed CWST. With these consistently high pass rates we plan to raise the AFT target to 80% of Cadets scoring at least 540 points (80% average across all events) by 2026 to push performance beyond minimum standards and build competitive advantage.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? Yes. - 2021-2022: 68% of Cadets met the target ACFT score ($\geq 80\%$); 100% passed CWST. - 2022–2023: 33% of Cadets met the target ACFT score ($\geq 80\%$); 85% passed CWST. - 2023–2024: 91.3% passed ACFT; 97% passed CWST. What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain; Substantial improvement in physical performance year-over-year, likely due to focused pre-CST conditioning and readiness reviews. Cadet withdrawals impacted early cycle numbers. Conclusions: What worked? Year-round ACFT preparation and diagnostics. Faculty advising Cadets identified at risk of failure before CST. Increased promotion of campus wellness resources and swimming support. What didn't? Lack of a clear measure for spiritual fitness. Early reliance on minimal passing thresholds for ACFT discouraged top performance. Non-mandatory physical training outside of ROTC hours may have contributed to underperformance in prior cycles. Why do you think this? Students may not have seen the value of attending physical readiness training early in the morning. We plan to create a new course (Army Physical Readiness Training) that will add structure to the SLO and additional incentive to participate via earning 1 credit hour.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Assessment Cycle 2025–2026 - Introduce a resilience and spiritual wellness reflection in MS 201. - Pilot an adjusted AFT target (80% average or better) to promote higher performance. - Administer baseline and exit self-assessments for emotional/spiritual readiness. Assessment Cycle 2026–2027 - Create a rubric for evaluating non-physical wellness artifacts (self-reflections, leader journals). - Formalize cadre-led coaching sessions for at-risk Cadets before CST. - Offer peer mentor sessions on mental readiness and overcoming adversity.

<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Assessment Cycle 2027–2028 - Analyze impact of new spiritual/emotional assessments on leadership readiness. - Evaluate AFT and CWST performance trends across three cohorts. - Integrate Holistic Health and Fitness (H2F) model training elements to reinforce comprehensive Cadet well-being.
---	---

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Synthesize knowledge, skills, and abilities required of junior officers pertaining to Army operations and company grade officer roles and responsibilities to include the operations process, training management, mission command, and administrative functions as well as written and oral communication.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Yes, this SLO remains highly relevant and mission-critical. It addresses the Army’s doctrinal and operational expectations for newly commissioned Second Lieutenants. The outcome directly aligns with the capstone experiences in MS 401 and MS 402, which are designed to test senior Cadets' grasp of doctrine, leadership responsibilities, and communication effectiveness. Is the outcome measurable? Yes. The program uses two direct measurement tools: - MS 401 Final Exam (written): Tests doctrinal knowledge and planning. - MS 402 Oral Practicum: Tests verbal communication, synthesis, and command presence. Is it double or triple barreled? Yes, this outcome is multi-barreled, as it encompasses: Knowledge synthesis, multiple officer roles / responsibilities, the operations process, written and oral communication. Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom’s Taxonomy? Yes, “synthesize” is a higher-order Bloom’s Taxonomy verb, appropriate for senior Cadets. It encourages integration, not just recall.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? Yes. - The MS 401 Final Exam directly assesses understanding and application of Army operations, doctrine, and training management. - The MS 402 Oral Practicum measures verbal communication, leadership presence, and practical synthesis of officer-level duties and responsibilities. If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? These tools assess the full range of intended competencies. However, given the breadth of this SLO, it may be helpful to disaggregate future assessments by dimension (e.g., operations process vs. mission command vs. communication). Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Both instruments are direct. Students must produce and defend work under instructor observation and standardized expectations.

Measurement Instruments	Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? AI will not affect the oral practicum. However, AI-generated content could potentially influence exam preparation or writing. To address this: - Require students to submit annotated outlines or thought processes along with their exam. - Introduce oral defenses or live discussion questions to verify synthesis was student-led. If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Rubrics are not explicitly referenced in the ASL reports. They are developed or formalized for both assessments. They include criteria such as doctrinal accuracy, clarity of analysis, communication effectiveness, and command presence.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? No. We recommend maintaining current success criteria, but increase the target to 90% scoring $\geq 80\%$ by 2026, given recent performance. The program targets: $\geq 80\%$ of Cadets scoring 80% or better on MS 401 and MS 402 assessments. What about targets? No; - 2021–2022: 100% on MS 401 and 77% on MS 402 met the target. - 2022–2023: 94% met the 80% benchmark on both assessments. - 2023–2024: 100% on MS 401 and 94.44% on MS 402 met the target.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? Yes, both MS 401 and 402 assessments show strong, consistent results, with nearly all Cadets achieving mastery. Slight drop from perfect scores in MS 402 from 2022–23 to 2023–24 may reflect variation in communication confidence or content complexity. What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain; High performance stability across years, suggesting strong instructional alignment and student preparation. Communication skills remained strong, but require continued attention in a world of increasing reliance on digital mediums. Conclusions: What worked? Curriculum sequencing supports cumulative knowledge-building from MS 301 to MS 401/402. Senior Cadets benefit from mentorship and peer leadership roles in labs, reinforcing doctrinal concepts and leadership accountability. Cadre preparation and expectations are well-aligned with assessment standards. What didn't? Rubric use is either informal or undocumented. Written components of assessments may face future AI misuse risks without authentication protocols. Synthesis of administrative duties (e.g., Army HR or logistics functions) may receive less emphasis than tactical or operational content. Why do you think this? MSIV Cadets (future Second Lieutenants) were not required to lead the planning and staffing functions under cadre guidance and assistance. Going forward with the changes planned, MS IV Cadets will be capable of planning, preparing and executing a Field Training Exercise (FTX), MSIIIs prepared for Advanced Camp, MS II Cadet able to demonstrate fundamental proficiency in basic Army tasks, MS I Cadets more confident and competent in basic fire team and squad operations.

****IMPORTANT -**
Plans for Next
Assessment Cycle:

Assessment Cycle 2025–2026

- Develop detailed rubrics for MS 401 and MS 402, breaking down key competencies such as doctrinal accuracy, operations process understanding, and communication effectiveness.
- Require annotated briefs or operational planning artifacts for MS 401 to verify original thinking.
- Introduce mock operational planning oral sessions in MS 302 to prepare students for MS 402 expectations.

Assessment Cycle 2026–2027

- Begin tracking student performance across multiple dimensions of the SLO (e.g., separate scores for written vs. oral communication).
- Launch a communication coaching module for students who score between 70–79% on MS 402.
- Pilot AI integrity statement requirement for written exams and evaluate its impact.

Assessment Cycle 2027–2028

- Assess whether written and oral communication competencies should be separated into a new standalone SLO, based on trends and feedback.
- Conduct a curriculum alignment review to ensure company-grade administrative functions (property management, evaluations, etc.) are properly emphasized.
- Evaluate feasibility of involving external reviewers (e.g., BOLC alumni or National Guard LTs) to simulate MS 402 panels and enhance realism.