

ultimately to the highest quality level. These quality levels as metrics are in stark contrast to the more inductive and traditional metrics often used to assess performance of institutions, programs, curriculum, faculty and staff, and student support services.

For MEP, the Banta Model provided a meaningful and useful process for developing standards and metrics; the Baldrige Model provided a meaningful and useful philosophy as DoD civilian post secondary institutions strive for excellence, and the CHEA model provided a concrete format for quality-based metrics. The quality levels in the CHEA model make clear what an institution must do to achieve the next quality level and ultimately become excellent in a given category.

Development of Standards

The process of developing world-class standards for curriculum, faculty, and student support services for DoD educational institutions was indeed collaborative and iterative. Bearing in mind the key elements of the Banta, Baldrige, and CHEA models and the concerns of the Chancellor, the Academic Programs Division prepared three baseline, six-column matrices of standards used by six accrediting bodies – the first, a matrix of curriculum standards; the second, one of faculty standards; and the third, a matrix of student support standards.

DoD Conference on Civilian Education and Professional Development

The Third DoD Conference on Civilian Education and Professional Development will be co-hosted by The Joint Military Intelligence College, Bolling AFB, June 26–27, 2001. Watch for more details of the conference on the DoD Chancellor's Web site at <http://www.chancellor.osd.mil>.

The Metrics of Excellence Project model will be validated and then presented as the DoD Model for high-quality civilian post secondary education and professional development.

The Academic Programs Division presented these matrices to the AQWG for their consideration in developing standards for DoD civilian post secondary institutions. Standards were presented from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Council on Occupational Education (COE), Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training (ACCET), and Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS).

Upon review and further refinement of the three baseline sets of standards, the Steering Group approved 11 standards covering the academic quality areas of curriculum, faculty and staff, and students on June 28, 2000. Several iterations were developed before the final version was approved.

From Standards to Objectives and Metric Topics

Shortly after the 11 standards were approved by the Steering Group, two brainstorming sessions were held to discuss how to ensure the achievement of the standards and how to determine if indeed the standards are being met. Following these sessions, the staff proceeded to develop the first iteration of draft objectives and metric topics as a

baseline to present to the peer groups. Each peer group was presented with the same set of baseline objectives and metric topics to review, revise, and edit. They were charged to generate a set of objectives and metric topics for their respective institutions, programs, and curriculum.

The peer group on degree-granting institutions participated in a two-day workshop at the National Defense University July 25–26, 2000. The all-day discussions were rich with input from all members of the peer group, the Deputy Chancellor, and the staff. The draft objectives and metric topics attendant to the 11 standards were transformed into a derived version of objectives and metric topics.

Likewise, the other two peer groups met and were presented with the same draft objectives and metric topics as were presented to the degree-granting Peer Group two weeks earlier. The Job-Specific Peer Group met for a one-day session on Aug. 10, 2000. All of the Career Development (and International Group) Peer Group member institutions were represented at Fort Belvoir, Va., on Aug. 21, 2000, to complete the same task presented to the other groups.

Once again, the Deputy Chancellor was present, the discussions were lively, and the groups were focused on completing the task for the day in consensus-building sessions. By the end of each peer group session, a derived matrix of objectives and metric topics was developed for the respective peer groups in each of the academic quality areas: curriculum, faculty, and student support services.

At this point, all three peer groups had met and agreed upon a refined list of objectives and metric topics for each of the general topics: curriculum, faculty, and student support services. Now the challenge of the staff turned to preparing and presenting to the Steering Group at its Sept. 12, 2000, meeting (only three weeks away) a consolidated and integrated set of objectives and metric topics for each of the general topics. These matrices consisted of the final set of ob-