UNITED STATES ARMY SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT:
THE ACCOUNTABLE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM (AIS)
(*Effective Until Rescinded or Superseded)

1. **PURPOSE.** To provide the framework for conducting the academic governance process and managing the AIS for curriculum Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation (ADDIE) process.

2. **APPLICABILITY.** This bulletin applies to the United States Army Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) under the academic governance of the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) for the development and management of the Sergeants Major Course (SMC) and related educational programs.

3. **REFERENCES.**
   g. Non Commissioned Officer Center of Excellence (NCOL CoE) and USASMA Instructor/Facilitator Certification Program (ICP), 1 July 2017.
   h. SMC Course Management Plan (CMP).

4. **INTRODUCTION.**
   a. The USASMA Mission: Provide the Army with adaptive senior enlisted leaders of character and competence prepared to be effective leaders. These leaders, grounded in Army and Joint doctrine, exploit opportunities by leveraging and applying Army resources.
b. This bulletin describes how the AIS supports development of curriculum (courseware), purpose of and procedure for conducting the Post Instructional Conference (PIC) and Curriculum Design Review (CDR), and explains implementation of the AIS process, and delineates responsibilities. The PIC and CDR are the components of the AIS that make it “accountable.”

5. **AIS OVERVIEW.** The AIS is the curriculum development and change management process used to organize all curriculum development activities within the USASMA – processes and activities that are nested with the CGSC’s AIS. To begin the process, the organization defines the learning outcomes.

   a. **Learning Outcomes.** A learning outcome defines the expertise graduates need in order to be successful throughout the next five-to-ten years of their careers. The organization should review the learning outcomes every three years at a minimum or as needed when its stakeholders change.

   b. **Alignment of Learning Outcomes.** The USASMA verifies alignment, (“nesting”) of learning outcomes with Army Learning Areas (ALAs) and the General Learning Outcomes (GLOs) for noncommissioned officer cohorts (all courses), and applicable joint learning areas/objectives for senior NCO Professional Military Education (PME). The USASMA uses results from these audits to refine course outcomes, Terminal Learning Objectives (TLOs), and Enabling Learning Objectives (ELOs).

   c. **Approval of Learning Outcomes.** The Dean of Academics, CGSC is responsible for assuring all learning outcomes of the course align with applicable Joint and Army requirements. The Deputy Commandant, CGSC request the senior official’s (Commandant, CGSC) approval of the learning outcomes during the CDR.

   d. **Measurement of Learning Outcomes.** Learning outcomes support the organizational mission. TLOs are the connection between the outcomes and the course content. Assessment of outcomes is determined via the assessment of the TLO and ELO. See Annex A (Glossary) for additional words and terms related to this bulletin.

6. **AIS Purpose.**

   a. The purpose of the AIS is to manage educational change. The AIS process develops curriculum and evaluates teaching and learning.

   b. The AIS accomplishes the following:

      (1) Develops instruction and curriculum that is grounded in the USASMA’s mission and learning outcomes.

      (2) Measures achievement of learning outcomes.
(3) Evaluates the need to adjust curriculum, faculty development, or other aspects of the educational model based on evaluation data.

(4) Regularly and methodically reviews all curriculum and learning outcomes.

c. The USASMA AIS is a structured process, nested with the CGSC, for timely, data-informed judgments about curricula effectiveness and continuing relevance to the Army. Effective execution of the AIS is the single most important way that the USASMA remains the continuously adaptive learning organization demanded in the Army Learning Concept for Training and Education.

7. THE AIS MODEL.

a. The AIS Model (see Figure 1 below) demonstrates the relationship between the ADDIE process, AIS, and the CGSC academic governance process.
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Figure 1. AIS Model.

b. The AIS requires curriculum developers to continually evaluate the process and the products of each ADDIE phase:

(1) Analysis. Determine instructional needs.

(2) Design. Identify the curriculum requirements to meet the identified needs.
(3) Development. Create the instructional materials and curriculum to support stated goals, objectives, and learning gaps.

(4) Implementation. Execute the developed curriculum.

(5) Evaluation. Measure the effectiveness of the curriculum, using two types of evaluations, formative and summative.

(a) Formative evaluation is the ongoing review and adjustment of curriculum content and methodology at each step of ADDIE.

(b) Summative evaluation is completed at the end of the process and results in a program evaluation. Program evaluations are the foundation for information presented in the PIC.

c. Phases of AIS.

(1) Analysis: The analysis phase is the critical link between educational outcomes and course content. This phase determines curricula requirements to meet the needs of stakeholders. Analysis identifies: what to teach, how much to teach, student backgrounds, available resources, evaluation plans, and a milestone plans. Conducting a thorough analysis ensures the curriculum’s relevancy, currency, and necessity. Additional descriptions of analysis such as target audience analysis, gap analysis, topic analysis, and resource analysis are provided in CGSC Bulletin 930 and/or TRADOC Regulation 350-70, Chapter 4.

(2) Design: The products created during the analysis phase drive the design phase. The topic list, created during analysis, translates into potential TLOs and subordinate ELOs. The TLOs directly support learning outcomes. Curriculum designers ensure learning is progressive and sequential. Curriculum designers develop an assessment plan and sample assessment instruments using both direct and indirect measures, conduct preliminary research for possible supporting materials, design the lesson plan outline, and update the availability of resources and milestone plan. They also design the evaluation plan to ensure the course or lesson meets its stated objectives.

(3) Development: The development phase expands on the products of the design phase. Curriculum developers continue the research process by gathering references and supporting materials. Instructional methodologies and media are selected and/or developed. The primary goal of development is to produce curriculum and instructional materials ready for implementation and use, validate assessment instruments and instructional materials, and develop the evaluation tools.

(4) Implementation: Implementation is a multi-phased process. It contains the following: Common Faculty Development - Instructor Course (CFD-IC) and Common Faculty Development - Developer Course (CFD-DC) including curriculum content “train-
up”; classroom implementation (delivery of the curriculum), the assessment of student learning (reflected in an assessment plan); and collection of student-learning data using indirect measures such as focus groups or surveys.

(5) Evaluation: Evaluation is a continuous process that consists of data collection and analysis to determine the effectiveness and value of a course or program. The Master Evaluation Plan (MEP) outlines program evaluations by academic year. The USASMA presents their respective program evaluation at the PIC per the MEP. Curriculum developers have responsibilities to coordinate data collection (direct and indirect measures of student achievement and feedback from students, faculty, staff, and graduates, when appropriate). The Quality Assurance Office (QAO) will provide assistance.

8. Mini-PICs and PIC.

a. The Chief of Education (COE) organizes Mini-PICs and PIC with the Director, USASMA, Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA, and Commandant, USASMA and announces the events to participants. The COE collects and documents results from department meetings prior to the Mini-PICs and PIC where faculty, curriculum designers and developers, and course administrators meet to discuss direct and indirect assessment of student learning results.

b. Mini-PIC Purpose. Faculty, curriculum developers, and administrators meet twice (November and March) to discuss what happened during implementation of the curriculum.

(1) The school documents the results of the Mini-PICs.

(2) The COE ensures a memorandum (minutes) is prepared, identifying:

(a) Who participated;

(b) The program achievement of outcomes and TLOs;

(c) Analysis of the assessment of student learning as appropriate;

(d) What evidence-based recommendations were identified for discussion for the upcoming AIS meeting; and

(e) The USASMA includes the memorandum (minutes) in the PIC read-ahead material and files a copy and all supporting documents, such as assessment data, in an approved archival repository developed and maintained by the USASMA and CGSC’s SharePoint site, as directed. These materials are important evidence for accreditors.

c. PIC Purpose. To seek the Deputy Commandant’s, CGSC, guidance and confirm the agenda for the CDR. The PIC is normally scheduled between mid-June and mid-
July in order to provide sufficient time for the subsequent CDR, which occurs approximately four weeks after the PIC.

d. The PIC is chaired by Commandant, USASMA who presents the PIC to the Deputy Commandant, CGSC and the Dean of Academics, CGSC.

e. The PIC is attended by the Director, USASMA, Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA, COE, Department Chairs, Department Vice-Chairs, and Curriculum Development Team. Members of the faculty, QAO, SFDD, International Military Student Office, Learning Resource Center, and Registrar are encouraged to attend, subject to the availability of seating at the USASMA campus. The USASMA is responsible to provide briefing slides (read-ahead slides) to CGSC participants at least three days prior to the PIC.

(1) The USASMA documents the results of the PIC.

(2) The COE ensures a memorandum (minutes) is prepared, identifying:

(a) Who participated;

(b) The program achievement of outcomes and TLOs;

(c) Analysis of the assessment of student learning as appropriate;

(d) What evidence-based recommendations were identified for discussion for the upcoming AIS meeting; and

(e) The USASMA includes the memorandum (minutes) in the CDR read-ahead material and files a copy and all supporting documents, such as assessment data, in an approved archival repository developed and maintained by the USASMA and CGSC’s SharePoint site, as directed. These materials are important evidence for accreditors.

f. The agenda of the PIC is as follows:

(1) The USASMA mission and learning outcomes and the SMC mission statement (presented as context).

(2) The SMC purpose, outcomes, TLOs (current academic year (AY)).

(3) Commandant’s, CGSC decisions/Deputy Commandant’s, CGSC guidance (from the previous AY’s PIC/CDR), if applicable.

(4) SMC overview and course flow (current AY).

(5) SMC departments mapped to TLOs (current AY).
(6) Department Chairs’ Assessments (Optional).

(7) Issues and insights from USASMA Staff and Faculty Council (Education Council) meetings and Mini-PICs (Optional).

(8) Recommended changes to the SMC purpose/outcomes/TLOs (Next AY).

(9) Recommended SMC course flow (Next AY).

(10) Commandant’s, USASMA assessment, to include;

   (a) Course met TLOs and outcomes.

   (b) Course met Joint learning objectives, if applicable.

   g. Essential Outputs of the PIC.

(1) Deputy Commandant’s, CGSC decisions and guidance that enable the USASMA to proceed with the CDR.

(2) Deputy Commandant, CGSC and Dean of Academics, CGSC confirm:

   (a) Course alignment with prescribed ALAs and GLOs, and Joint learning objectives (if applicable).

   (b) Proposed assessment plan for next AY.

(3) Deputy Commandant, CGSC endorses recommendations to be made at the CDR.

9. **CDR.**

   a. CDR Purpose. For the Commandant, CGSC to approve the purpose, outcomes, and TLOs for coming AY and issue guidance - the CDR is the approval process for curriculum. The CDR is normally scheduled in late-July, allowing sufficient time before the SMC’s normal start dates on/about the second week of August.

   b. The Commandant, USASMA presents the CDR to the Commandant, CGSC and Dean of Academics, CGSC (as an academic advisor to the Commandant, CGSC).

   c. The CDR is attended by the Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA.

      (1) The USASMA documents the results of the CDR.

      (2) The COE ensures a memorandum (minutes) is prepared, identifying:
(a) Who participated;

(b) The program achievement of outcomes and TLOs;

(c) Analysis of the assessment of student learning as appropriate;

(d) What evidence-based recommendations were identified for discussion for the upcoming AIS meeting, which will likely begin with the process starting over with Mini-PICs in November and March of the next AY; and

(e) The USASMA files a copy of the memorandum (minutes) and all supporting documents, such as assessment data, in an approved archival repository developed and maintained by the USASMA and CGSC’s SharePoint site, as directed. These materials are important evidence for accreditors.

d. The agenda for the CDR is as follows;

   (1) CGSC mission and learning outcomes and the USASMA mission.

   (2) The SMC purpose/outcomes/TLOs (current AY).

   (3) Commandant, CGSC decisions and guidance (last CDR).

   (4) SMC course flow (currently AY).

   (5) USASMA Commandant’s assessment.

   (6) Recommended SMC purpose/outcomes/TLOs/course flow for next AY.

   (7) Other Commandant, USASMA recommendations.

   (8) Commandant, CGSC guidance.

e. Essential Outputs of the CDR. The senior College official at the CDR approves changes to curriculum and the course/program outcomes for the next AY.

10. RESPONSIBILITIES.

   a. Commandant, CGSC. When available, the Commandant attends the CDR.

   b. Deputy Commandant, CGSC. Attends the PIC and CDR to ensure the curriculum is relevant and meets the Army’s needs, and provides vision to address the future needs of PME in leader development.
c. Dean of Academics, CGSC. As the Chief Academic Officer, the Dean of Academics, CGSC has overall responsibility for ensuring horizontal and vertical integration of all educational programs. The Dean of Academics, CGSC uses the PIC to determine if learning outcomes were met and offers suggestions for curriculum change if needed. The Dean of Academics, CGSC also ensures all programs comply with Army PME requirements and, if applicable, Joint PME requirements.

d. Commandant, USASMA. Serves as the proponent for senior NCO leader core competencies for all NCO PME, is responsible for the management and execution of the SMC, and is the approving authority of NCO PME curriculum development. The Commandant, USASMA chairs the organizational-level Mini-PICs and PIC to determine subject content, relevance and currency of the SMC educational programs and presents course educational material at the Provost-level PIC and CDR.

e. Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA. Serves as the Chief Academic Officer within the USASMA and has authoritative responsibilities for the horizontal and vertical integration of NCO education programs. The Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA uses the Mini-PICs and PICs to present recommendations of learning outcomes for curriculum change as needed. The Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA chairs the monthly USASMA Staff and Faculty Council (Education Council) to consider concerns and initiatives or transmit information to the Commandant, USASMA relevant to the interests of the SMC staff and faculty or to the CGSC as a participant of CGSC’s Education Council.

f. Director, USASMA. The AIS process requires the course Director, USASMA to play a key role in curriculum planning and implementation. To accomplish this, the Director, USASMA:

(1) Participates in the USASMA Mini-PICs and PIC and recommends changes in student, course, and learning management based on research and the needs of the stakeholders.

(2) Requires Department Chairs and Instructors to attend the CFD-DC before being assigned curriculum development duties and responsibilities.

(3) Participates in the AIS academic governance process.

(4) Ensures the COE documents results of the Mini-PICs, PIC, and CDR in memorandum (minutes) format.

g. Chief of Education (COE). Serves as the lead instructional systems specialist and course academic officer. The COE serves as a member of and participates in USASMA’s Staff and Faculty Council (Education Council), Mini-PICs, and PIC, advising and recommending changes to learning outcomes as needed. The AIS process requires the COE to play a key role in curriculum planning and development. To accomplish this, the COE:
(1) Participates in the USASMA PIC and recommends changes in student, course and learning management based on research and the needs of the stakeholders.

(2) Requires Department Chairs and Instructors to attend CFD-DC before being assigned curriculum development duties and responsibilities.

(3) Participates in the AIS academic governance process.

(4) Documents results of the Mini-PICs, PIC, and CDR in memorandum (minutes) format.

(5) Coordinates with CGSC’s Accreditation Coordination Division and CGSC’s Registrar to crosswalk the curricula to ensure support and integration of Joint learning areas and objectives, if applicable, and special areas of emphasis per the course management plan.

h. Curriculum Designers/Developers/Course Authors.

(1) Attend CFD-DC to learn the AIS process and current instructional design practices.

(2) Based on guidance from leadership, develop educational programs in accordance with the AIS that support the USASMA mission, educational philosophy, and learning outcomes.

i. Department Chairs. Serve as department directors in the management and execution of student management, learning management and course management. Serve as department leads for the horizontal and vertical integration of course curriculum. Department Chairs serve as members of the USASMA Staff and Faculty Council (Education Council) and on the Mini-PICs and PIC to advise and recommend changes to learning outcomes as needed.

j. USASMA Staff and Faculty Council (Education Council). Staff and faculty members of the SMC consist of the Instructors, Department Vice-Chairs, Department Chairs, and COE, who serve as members of the council. Members are responsible for representing a consortium on issues affecting the development and execution of learning management, student management, and course management.

k. QAO.

(1) Collaborates with the Commandant, USASMA, Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA, COE, and the Department Chairs to produce the MEP to submit to Army University no later than 1 June for the upcoming AY.
(2) Collaborates with the SMC to evaluate achievement of learning outcomes and objectives by collecting data through internal and external surveys, formative evaluations, curriculum reviews, classroom observations, and focus groups. Analyses collected data and provides summarized results to the Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA. Supports the Mini-PICs, PIC and CDR processes.

(3) Provides guidance and assistance for program evaluations per the MEP schedule.

(4) Ensures program evaluation documentation is archived through the USASMA Learning Resource Center and when applicable in the Combined Arms Research Library (CARL).

I. SFDD.

(1) Gathers information to improve and enhance faculty development courses and determine professional development opportunities.

(2) Educates curriculum designers and developers concerning the AIS process during the CFD-IC and the CFD-DC.

(3) Provides curriculum development assistance.

11. PROPONENT. The proponent of this bulletin is the Assistant Dean of Academic, USASMA. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on Department of the Army Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to the Assistant Dean of Academics, USASMA, 11291 SGT E. Churchill Street, Fort Bliss, TX 79918.
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ANNEX A
Glossary

**Assessment of Student Learning.**  Process of documenting the student achievement of the learning objectives. Assessment is defined in measurable terms gathered using rubrics, classroom assessment techniques, examinations, etc.

**Direct Assessment.** Gathers and analyzes data to assess students' learning.

**Indirect Assessment.** Collects and analyzes data from learners' behavior tied directly to perceptions about mastery of learning outcomes/TLOs/ELOs. It seeks outcomes. These perceptions may be self-demonstrable evidence that students reported or made by others. Surveys and interviews are common forms of indirect assessment:

- Examinations (where questions end-of-course student surveys correlate to specific learning outcomes).
- Focus groups.
- Papers, projects or exercises graded.
- Graduate surveys with a rubric, where elements of the employer surveys rubric correlate to specific learning outcomes).
- ePortfolio/ portfolio evaluation.

Note: HLC emphasizes using a blend of direct and indirect measures to assess students' learning.

**Effective Course-level Direct and Indirect Assessment of Student Learning:** (a) assures leaders that established learning objectives are being met; and (b) ensures that decisions within the USASMA and CGSC's AIS leading to curricula change and program improvement are evidence-based and data-informed.

**Course.** A discrete body of related lessons arranged in a prescribed form.

**Course Author.** Designs the course and coordinates with the lesson authors, other course authors, and other teaching departments/schools to establish the relationship to other courses within the institution and the Army. This prevents unnecessary duplication of course materials and ensures both horizontal and vertical alignment. The course author must be a graduate of the CFD-DC.

**Curriculum Designer/Developer.** Anyone who has completed CFD-DC and designs or develops curriculum. The term *designer* infers a greater level of expertise and potential certification such certification/training as an Instructional Systems Specialist or in instructional design.
**Common Faculty Development-Instructor Course (CFD-IC).** Entry-level course for new instructors. New faculty members are introduced to the foundation of the CGSC and USASMA’s educational philosophies. The CFD-IC uses small group instruction to model teaching methods that provide classroom experiences based on adult learning principles, the Experiential Learning Model, learning style theory, and adult learning environments. The CFD-IC is required prior to teaching in leadership development and education programs.

**Faculty Development Phase 4 (FDP4).** The required instruction for lesson or course authors. In FDP4, the authors learn how to use the AIS - an ADDIE process to write and revise courseware and manage change in a learning organization. A senior educator facilitates FDP4. Completion of the CFD-IC and a minimum of six months teaching experience is a prerequisite to FDP4. This prerequisite requirement is based on the imperative that lesson and course authors use the knowledge they gain in the CFD-IC/DC and actual content teaching experience. This enables them to develop interactive lessons and courses to achieve optimum student learning in an adult collaborative environment. Verifying learning outcomes alignment is an important part of the Analysis Phase in ADDIE. Outcomes alignment enables the USASMA to assert ELO/TLO mastery also demonstrates achievement of higher order learning outcomes. Army, Joint, and civilian accreditor(s) analyze learning outcomes alignment during re-accreditation visits.

**Evaluation.** A systematic formalized process of gathering and analyzing data (usually both qualitative and quantitative) to determine the merit, worth, and significance of the USASMA’s program. Program evaluation determines whether the course supports the learning outcomes.

**Internal Evaluation.** A continuous process used for maintaining and improving educational programs. The focus of internal evaluation is to determine how effectively the courses/lessons achieve learning objectives. An internal evaluation solicits feedback from students and faculty identifying course/lesson strengths and weaknesses. Tools for conducting internal evaluations include after action reviews, surveys, focus groups, observations, and curriculum reviews.

**External Surveys.** Provide feedback from graduates and their supervisors. The purpose of external surveys is to evaluate how well the program meets the Army’s needs. Additionally, external surveys provide data to curriculum developers regarding transfer of student learning to their jobs. Tools for conducting external evaluations include surveys, focused interviews, and site visits.

**Formative Evaluation.** Involves making adjustments during the course/lesson development process and is ongoing throughout each AIS phase. The formative evaluation process enables improvement to the course or lesson before and during implementation.
**Master Evaluation Plan (MEP).** Planning document that defines the organization's program evaluation requirements for the current AY. It projects program evaluation requirements for the follow-on two years. It contains a program evaluation plan for each program receiving an evaluation during the current AY.

**Objectives.** Primary building blocks of curriculum design. They support the learning outcome in that each is a small step in arriving at what learners are supposed to know or be able to do for success in their profession.

**Program.** The integrated courses and other formally established learning objectives and experiences which constitute a particular body of study.

**Program Evaluation.** Program evaluation takes place at least every three years per the MEP. It shows the linkage among the learning outcomes, TLOs, and student assessment. It presents both direct measures (assessment data) and indirect measures (survey data) of the success of the program. When available, program evaluations present the data from external surveys. Basically, program evaluation provides information on the curriculum's ability to do what it was designed to do.