

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----|---|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| Note: (1) A learning organization is an organization where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together. <u>The Fifth Discipline</u> . (2) "School" under "Applicability" indicates an independent TRADOC (non-CoE) or a non-TRADOC school for this standard. | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion 1a: Program office/structure and support: 1a(1): The CoE or independent school has a QA Office (QAO) as a Special Staff element of the command group per Department of the Army (DA) policy and guidance. | 1a(1): Review organization's mission and functions regulations and wiring diagrams. | a. AR 350-1, ADD CHAPTER, Training and Leader Development , 18 Dec 09. b. Army Quality Assurance (QA) Program Guidance for Implementation of Army Enterprise Accreditation Standards (AEAS), 4 Nov 2010. c. Current TRADOC policy and guidance. | Org mission and function regulation and wiring diagram. | X | X | | | Document <u>standard</u> as "Not Met" if the institution does not have a QAO or it is not part of the command per DA policy and guidance. |
| 1a(2): The CoE/school has a QA <u>Special Staff</u> Element aligned under the QAO and respective commandant IAW DA and TRADOC policy and guidance. | 1a(2): Review organization's mission and functions regulations and wiring diagrams. | | | | X | | | Document <u>standard</u> as "Not Met" if the CoE/school does not have a QAE for the subordinate school aligned under the QAO and respective commandant IAW DA and TRADOC policy and guidance. |
| 1a(3): Learning institution has a <u>QA organization</u> or <u>QA personnel/officer</u> identified to provide QA functions <u>IAW DA and TRADOC policy and guidance</u> . *Note: Applicability includes former FORSCOM NCOAs. | | a. AR 350-1 b. Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS at Reserve Component (RC) Training Institutions, 12 Jan 11. | | | | X | X | Document <u>standard</u> as "Not Met" if the RC institution does not have an organization or person identified to provide QA functions. <u>*Note: Interim to AR 350-1 change that requires the RC QAO/officer be in a special staff position under the command group, document as "value added if the QA functions at the RC unit is</u> |

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| | | | | | | | | <u>structured as such.</u> |
| 1a(4): QAO/E promotes the CoE or school as a "Learning Organization" by <u>conducting commander-directed functions; providing additional support functions, and fostering a climate of continuous improvement through fostering</u> open communication, assistance, and shared knowledge/ <u>best practices.</u> | 1a(4): Collect evidence of QAO's conduct of QA or non-QA Program-directed initiatives that support the CoE/school leadership and a learning environment from interviews (QA Director and other institution directors) and focus groups. | Same as criterion 1a(1). | Documents that evidence QA support to QA or non-QA Program initiatives. | X | X | | | Document as " value added " or "best practice" any initiative outside of QA Program requirements that promotes the institution as a "Learning Organization." |
| 1a(5): QAO/E personnel have attended QA Evaluator Course <u>*Note: Applicability includes former FORSCOM NCOAs.</u> | 1a(5): Review QAEC certificates of training | TRADOC memo, ATTG-CD, 20 Jan 04, subject: TRADOC Quality Assurance (QA) Program and Accreditation of Army Education and Training. | | X | X | X * | X | Document instances where QAO/E personnel have not submitted enrollment applications to attend the QAEC. |
| Criterion 1b: Master Evaluation Plan (MEP): the CoE or independent school QAO develops and submits a MEP that provides a framework for the QAO to conduct and provide stakeholders feedback on internal, external, and accreditation evaluations over a three-year period. <u>Course evaluations include ALM pilots.</u> | 1b(1): Review MEP to determine it contains a three-year schedule for internal and external evaluations, and, if applicable, accreditation of aligned RC training units; validate that the same courses were identified for internal and external evaluation. Note 1: MEP provides a framework for the QAO to conduct and provide stakeholders feedback on internal, external and RC accreditation evaluations over a three-year period. Note 2: If a RC learning institution has a MEP, it would need to cover internal evaluation only (i.e., a three-year schedule for internal evaluation of courses taught IAW Army QA Program policy). | a. Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS b. Current TRADOC policy and guidance. | Institution's MEP. | X | X | | | Document <u>standard</u> as " Met with Comment " if the institution does not have a MEP that depicts required internal and external evaluations and RC accreditations (if applicable) or if the MEP was not forwarded to TRADOC QAO in correct format via SharePoint. Document as " value added " if a RC learning institution has a MEP. |

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | | |
|--|---|---|--|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|----|--|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| <p>Criterion 1c: The QAO coordinates and conducts internal evaluations that provide feedback to stakeholders which enable them to identify and correct deficiencies.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Document <u>standard</u> as "Not Met" if the institution does not conduct internal evaluations IAW DA and TRADOC policy and guidance.</p> <p>Document all major deficiencies, HHIs, and best practices.</p> |
| <p>1c(1): Pre-accreditation self assessments (<u>SAs</u>): Using CoE/school DOTMLPF matrixed team <u>of stakeholders in all accreditation standards</u>, QAO/E <u>conducts-leads</u> a self assessment against all standards and submits <u>commander/commandant-approved</u> report to TRADOC QAO IAW required timelines prior to accreditation.</p> | <p>1c(1): Review the QAO's self assessment report to determine if report is in proper format, all standards were evaluated, and report was submitted within the required timeframe per the Letter of Notification.</p> | <p>a. AR 350-1 b. Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS c. Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS at RC Training Institutions d. Current TRADOC policy and guidance.</p> | | X | X | X | X | <p>Document <u>standard</u> as "Met with Comment" if institution does not conduct a pre-accreditation self-assessment report and submit report to TRADOC QAO.</p> |
| <p>1c(2): Course/non-course assessments: <u>-</u>; <u>-</u> QAO/E conducts internal evaluation of all of the institution's proponent courses over a three-year period against course-related accreditation standards (to include evaluation of instructor and student records) in order to assess the institution's ability to meet accreditation standards; <u>-</u> Conduct internal evaluations of non-course related standards at least annually;</p> | <p>1c(2): Review MEP to validate 1/3 of all courses were scheduled for internal evaluation each year, resulting in all courses being evaluated over a three-year period; review internal evaluation reports/briefings to department heads and institution's leadership to validate ratings were documented for each course-related standard, efficiencies and deficiencies were noted, and recommendations for solutions to deficiencies were provided; review documents that annotate tracking of correction to deficiencies review instructor and student records IAW institution or local QA Program policy. Review documentation that indicates QAO/E evaluation support and guidance in design, development and implementation of ALC 2015 pilots/programs.</p> | | MEP; internal evaluation reports and briefings for all focus courses (at a minimum). | X | X | | X* | <p>Document <u>standard</u> as "Met with Comment" if institution does not conduct course/non-course internal evaluation against accreditation standards.</p> <p>* Document as a "best practice" if RC learning institution QA personnel conduct annual internal evaluation against accreditation standards for courses taught in the</p> |

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | | |
|---|--|------------|---|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|----|--------------------|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| <p>– Evaluate evolving pilot Army Learning Concept (ALC) programs to ensure effectiveness of instructional strategies and technologies.</p> | | | | | | | | institution. |
| <p>1c(3): Off-site evaluations: QAO/E conducts assessments of off-site proponent courses against course-related accreditation standards; briefs unit leadership on findings and recommended solutions; and tracks correction of identified deficiencies. Note: Off-site courses are proponent courses taught at other training locations other than at RC TASS units, to include MTTs and courses taught in residence.</p> | <p>1c(3): Review off-site assessment reports: ensure report packages include memo; executive summary; Summary Record of Accreditation Ratings; and Summary of Findings, Recommendations, and Higher Headquarters Issues. Packages may include briefing charts presented to evaluated unit leadership and proponent leadership as well as documentation that tracks correction of deficiencies. Individual reports for each evaluated standard need to be included in the package or provided electronically to the unit. Note: "Off-sites include proponent courses taught at other sites as well as a sampling (per course) of training conducted via mobile training teams (MTTs).</p> | | MEP; off-site evaluation reports and briefings. | X | X | | | |
| <p>1c(4): Follows up on TRADOC Accreditation Team findings and recommendations and monitors their implementation.</p> | <p>1c(4): Review write-up in institution's previous accreditation report for this standard; review QAO's "post-accreditation get well plan" and validate if corrections to deficiencies were made.</p> | | Institution's previous accreditation report. | X | X | X | X | |

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------|--------------------------|---------|----|--|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| <p>Criterion 1d: Conducts external evaluations: includes development, fielding (to graduates and their supervisors), and analysis of external course evaluations using DA/TRADOC-approved software to provide stakeholders feedback on graduate ability to perform tasks to standard and/or meet education outcomes. Includes other initiatives to garner feedback from the operational force on education/training outcomes.</p> | <p>1d(1): Review MEP to validate 1/3 of all courses were scheduled for external evaluation each year, resulting in all courses being evaluated over a three-year period and the same courses were identified for internal and external evaluation; review external evaluation reports /briefings to institution's senior leadership to validate standards reported as not met by graduates and supervisors were identified, reasons why standards were not met, trends were identified, and recommendations were made as appropriate. Includes all types of external evaluation processes to garner feedback from the operational force on education/training outcomes, e.g., conferences, R-CAATS, special surveys, etc.</p> | <p>a. AR 350-1 b. Memo, HQ TRADOC, ATCS-Q, 02 May 07, Dec-06, subject: Quality Assurance Program External Evaluation Survey Policy and Requirements. c. Memo, HQ TRADOC, ATCS-Q, 21 Sep 11, subjectsubject: Release of Automatic Survey Generator (AUTOGEN) Version 4.53. d. Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS</p> | <p>MEP; summary external evaluation report in SharePoint (including data on % of tasks trained to standard); external evaluation reports for all focus courses.</p> | X | X | | | <p>Document standard as "Not Met" if the institution does not conduct external evaluations IAW DA and TRADOC policy and guidance, to include DA-directed survey requirements.</p> <p>Document all major deficiencies, HHIs, and best practices.</p> |
| <p>Criterion 1e: Internal/ External Reports/Briefings: QAO ---</p> | | <p>Same as for Criterion 1d.</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>1e(1): Coordinates DOTMLPF-type matrix team assessment of feedback data from internal and external evaluations and RC accreditations (if applicable); determines trends, and consolidates team recommendations in quarterly (at a</p> | <p>1e(1)(a): Interview QA Director and CoE/school staff to ascertain if a DOTMLPF matrix team was used to review internal and external evaluation reports to identify trends and recommend solutions.</p> <p>1e(1)(b): Review <u>internal evaluation reports/briefings</u> to department heads and institution's leadership to validate ratings were documented for each course-related standard,</p> | <p>Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS</p> | | X | X | | | <p>Document standard as "Not Met" if the institution's QAO/QAE is not analyzing internal and external evaluation data and providing reports on trends, deficiencies, and recommended solutions to</p> |

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---------------|--------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| minimum, semi-annually) briefings and reports to units and CoE/school commander/ <u>commandant</u> . Team should include appropriate staff representatives, e.g., DOT, DOTD, instructors, lessons-learned representatives. <u>Briefs commander/commandant and senior leadership at least annually on QA-led self assessment against Army accreditation standards.</u> | <p>efficiencies and deficiencies were noted, and recommendations for solutions to deficiencies were provided; review documents that annotate tracking of correction to deficiencies.</p> <p>1e(1)(c): Review <u>external evaluation reports /briefings</u> to institution's senior leadership to validate standards reported as not met by graduates and supervisors were identified, reasons why standards were not met, trends were identified, and recommendations were made as appropriate.</p> <p>1e(1)(d): <u>Review documentation of annual SA reports/briefings.</u></p> | | | | | | <p>the Commander/Commandant and staff.</p> <p>Document all major deficiencies, HHIs, and best practices.</p> | |
| 1e(2): Submits report data to HQ, TRADOC via QAO SharePoint as required, e.g., Master Evaluation Plan; external evaluation data on percent of tasks trained to standard; status of RC TASS unit accreditations; RC TASS unit assessment reports. | 1e(2)(a): Ensure documentation is posted in SharePoint. | Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of AEAS | MEP, summary external evaluation report in SharePoint (including data on % of tasks trained to standard); status of RC TASS unit accreditations; RC TASS unit accreditation reports; other required documents. | X | X | | | |
| Criterion 1f: RC unit accreditations: CoE/school QAO conducts accreditation evaluations and recommends to the Commander/Commandant | 1f(1): Review RC unit accreditation reports (for focus courses at a minimum): ensure report packages include memo; executive summary; Summary Record of Accreditation Ratings; and Summary of Findings, Recommendations, and Higher Headquarters Issues. | a. AR 350-1, 18 Dec 09. b. Army QA Prog Guidance for Implementation of | RC unit accreditation reports (for focus courses at a minimum); | X | X | | | Document <u>standard</u> as "Not Met" if the institution has failed to make accreditation visits to its functionally aligned RC learning |

| GOV-1: Institution has an effective Quality Assurance Program that empowers the institution to perform its mission and to become a "Learning Organization." | | | | | | As of: 2012 WORKING COPY | | |
|--|---|--|---|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|----|---|
| Criteria | Criteria Guidelines | References | Required Documents | Applicability | | | | Mandatory Comments |
| | | | | CoE | School/College | TR NCOA | RC | |
| <p>accreditation rating for all functionally aligned RC learning institution every three years; supports TRADOC-led accreditation of Regional Training Institutes (RTIs), Multi-Functional Training Brigades/Units (MFTB/U), and NCOAs, as applicable; identifies RC learning institution Higher Headquarters Issues (HHIs) and follows up for resolution.</p> | <p>Individual reports for each evaluated standard need to be included in the package or provided electronically to the unit.</p> <p>1f(2): Review briefing charts presented to evaluated unit and proponent leadership. Get pre-visit feedback from TRADOC QAO Green Team Chief on CoE/school support to RC RTI, MFTB, and NCOA accreditation teams/reports.</p> <p>1f(3): Review documentation that tracks resolution of RC unit accreditation HHIs.</p> | <p>AEAS at RC Training Institutions c. Current TRADOC policy and guidance.</p> | <p>related briefings; documents tracking resolution of RC unit HHIs.</p> | | | | | <p>institutions IAW required references and accreditation standards or if institution has not followed up on resolution of a RC unit HHI.</p> <p>Document all major deficiencies, HHIs, and best practices.</p> |
| <p>Criterion 1g: Codifies QA Program roles and responsibilities for respective CoE, school, MFTB, RTI, NCOA, e.g., policy, SOP.</p> | <p>1g(1): Review all institution QA Program policy or guidance documents, to include regulations, pamphlets, and SOPs.</p> | <p>Same as criterion 1b.</p> | <p>Institution's regulations, pamphlets, or SOPs that contain QA Program policy and guidance.</p> | X | X | | | <p>Document if the institution does not have codified QA Program policy or guidance. Document as "value added" if a RC learning institution has a QA SOP or QA guidance included in a SOP.</p> |